


ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

Τόμ. 8 (2007)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008)



Inscribing a Ritualized Past: The Attic Restoration Decree IG II2 1035 and Cultural Memory in Augustan Athens

Geoffrey C.R. Schmalz

doi: [10.12681/eul.32783](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32783)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗΝ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 8-9
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2007-2008

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ
ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ
Π. Μανουσάκη 5-Β. Χάλη 8
GR 741 00-Ρέθυμνο

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ-ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λιτίνας (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)

ΒΟΗΘΟΙ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη (Αθήνα)
Σταυρούλα Οικονόμου (Αθήνα)

PUBLISHER
MEDITERRANEAN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
P. Manousaki 5-V. Chali 8
GR 741 00-Rethymnon

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITORS

Dr. Dimitra Tsangari (Athens)
Stavroula Oikonomou (Athens)

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Δρ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. François Lefèvre (Παρίσι)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Χαϊδελβέργη)
Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Νίκος Λιτίνας (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελαράκης (Adelphi)
Καθ. Σταύρος Περεντίδης (Βόλος)

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymnon)
Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymnon)
Dr. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Prof. François Lefèvre (Paris)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg)
Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (Adelphi)
Prof. Stavros Perentidis (Volos)

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ είναι μία επιστημονική περιοδική έκδοση με κριτες που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομιμοτική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινοϊκή / Υπομινωϊκή / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12th / 11th αι. π.Χ.) έως και την ύστερη αρχαιότητα (5th / 6th αι. μ.Χ.).

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβιτανολογία, Ζωοαρχαιολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περιληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.
2. Συντομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology, Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP*.
3. Τα γραμμικά οχέδια γίνονται με μαύρο μελάνι σε καλής ποιότητας χαρτί με ξεκάθαρους χαρακτήρες, ώστε να επιδέχονται ορικρυνοη. Οι φωτογραφίες είναι ασπρόμαυρες, τυπωμένες σε γναλιστερό χαρτί. Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.
4. Οι εργασίες στέλνονται σε δύο εκτυπωμένα αντίτυπα συνοδευόμενα από το κείμενο σε δισκέτα ηλεκτρονικού υπολογιστή.

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν ανάτυπο της εργασίας τους ηλεκτρονικά σε μορφή αρχείου pdf και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού.

Συνδρομές – Συνεργασίες – Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Π. Μανουσάκη 5 – Β. Χάλη 8, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Μεσογειακών Σπουδών, Ρόδος – GR 85100

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

EULIMENE is a refereed academic periodical which contains studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on anthropology, palaeodemography, palaio-environmental, botanical and faunal archaeology, the ancient economy and the history of science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, other than that of the paper.

2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology, Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP*.

3. Line drawings should be in black ink on good quality paper with clear lettering, suitable for reduction. Photographs should be glossy black-and-white prints. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.

4. Please send two hard copies of your text and one version on computer disc.

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Offprint of each paper in pdf format, and a volume of the journal will be provided to the contributors.

Subscriptions – Contributions – Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society, P. Manousaki 5 – V. Chali 8, Rethymnon – GR 74100

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Department of Philology, Rethymnon – GR 74100

Dr. Manolis I. Stefanakis, University of the Aegean, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes – GR 85100

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

Περιεχόμενα
ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008)

List of Contents
EULIMENE 8-9 (2007-2008)

Περιλήψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	6
Geoffrey C.R. Schmalz, Inscribing a Ritualized Past: The Attic Restoration Decree IG II2 1035 and Cultural Memory in Augustan Athens	9
Vassiliki E. Stefanaki, La politique monétaire des cités crétoises à l'époque classique et hellénistique	47
Βασιλική Ε. Στεφανάκη – Κερασία Α. Στρατίκη, Ο Απόλλωνας στα νομίσματα της Ελεύθερνας. Ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση	81
'Ελενα Β. Βλαχογιάννη, Οι αποκρύψεις έκτακτης ανάγκης στην κυρίως Ελλάδα επί Γαλλιηνού (253-268 μ.Χ.) με αφορμή των «θησαυρώ» Χαιρώνεια/2001. Η Βοιωτία του α' μισού του 3ου αι. μ.Χ. και οι Έρουλοι.....	107
Alain Delattre, Deux protocoles byzantins.....	165
Βιβλιοκρισίες / Book Reviews	
Katerini Liampi, <i>Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Deutschland. Staatliche Münzsammlung München, 12. Heft, Thessalien – Illyrien – Epirus – Korkyra</i>, Nr. 1-701. 2007 (Dubravka Ujes Morgan).....	169
I.Π. Τουράτσογλου, <i>Η Ελλάς και τα Βαλκάνια πριν από τα Τέλη της Αρχαιότητας</i>, Βιβλιοθήκη της Ελληνικής Νομισματικής Εταιρείας 8. Αθήνα 2006 (Κατερίνη Λιάμπη).....	172

Περιλήψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen /

Sommaires / Riassunti

Geoffrey C.R. Schmalz, *Inscribing a Ritualized Past: The Attic Restoration Decree IG II² 1035 and Cultural Memory in Augustan Athens*, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008), 11-46.

Το ψήφισμα *IG II² 1035* και η πολιτιστική μνήμη στην Αθήνα της εποχής των Αυγούστου. Το ψήφισμα *IG II² 1035* καταγράφει ένα από τα πιο εκτεταμένα δημόσια προγράμματα στην ιστορία της πόλεως: την αποκατάσταση των μικρών αλλά σημαντικών ιερών και των ιερών εκτάσεων της Αθήνας και της Αττικής, «στους θεούς και τους ήρωες, στους οποίους ανήκουν». Επιβεβαιώνοντας τη χρονολόγηση του ψηφίσματος περίπου στο 10 π.Χ. η επιγραφή *IG II² 1035* μελετάται για πρώτη φορά εντός του ιστορικού-πολιτιστικού πλαισίου της Αθήνας κατά τη διάρκεια της «Αυγούστειας ανανεώσεως» της πόλεως. Μέσω του ψηφίσματος της θρησκευτικής αποκατάστασης, η αρχαία κληρονομιά της ελληνικής πόλεως ενισχύεται και αναδεικνύεται σε πηγή πολιτιστικής ταυτότητας και κύρους κατά την έλευση της νέας εποχής.

Vassiliki E. Stefanaki, *La politique monétaire des cités crétoises à l'époque classique et hellénistique*, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008), 47-80.

The monetary policy of the Cretan cities during the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The monetary policy of the Cretan cities during the Classical and Hellenistic periods appears to have been rather unstable and inconsistent. It depended as much on the financial means and interests of each city, as on monetary needs that were often dictated by their political partners. The standard and the types used for silver coinage appear to have been influenced by foreign coins circulating in the island. The implementation of Aeginetan, Rhodian or Attic standards testifies to the influence exerted on the monetary policy of the island by «international» coinages, the imitation of which (pseudo-Aeginetan, pseudo-Rhodian and pseudo-Athenian) is occasionally linked to political or financial causes. Cretan cities, however, in various periods, also adopted “international” monetary standards by reducing their original weight and, at the same time, frequently overstriking and countermarking the coins; this would indicate an official monetary policy of profit. Finally, given the resultant reduced standard, Cretan coins rarely circulated off-island, suggesting that Cretan cities probably used the “international” coins for both their distant and local transactions.

Βασιλική Ε. Στεφανάκη – Κερασία Α. Στρατίκη, *Ο Απόλλωνας στα νομίσματα της Ελεύθερνας. Ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση*, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008), 81-106.

Essai d'interprétation de la figure du dieu Apollon sur le monnayage d'Eleutherna. Apollon est le dieu *par excellence* de la cité crétoise d'Eleutherna, située au nord-ouest de l'île. Son culte est attesté par les sources littéraires et épigraphiques, les trouvailles archéologiques et les types monétaires de la cité.

Apollon était vénéré à Eleutherna comme *Sasthraios*. L'épithète d'Apollon, *Sasthraios*, est très importante puisqu'elle n'est pas attestée dans les autres cités crétoises, ce qui prouve l'existence de ce culte local dans la région d'Eleutherna. L'épithète *Sasthraios* renvoie à l'ancien nom d'Eleutherna, *Satra*.

La cité d'Eleutherna commence à frapper monnaie à l'époque classique tardive, vers le milieu du IV^e siècle av. J.-C. Sur ses monnaies d'argent et de bronze, Apollon se présente nu, debout ou assis sur un rocher, accompagné d'un chien ou d'une lyre ou d'un arbre et tenant un arc de sa main gauche –ou ayant l'arc et le carquois sur les épaules– et de sa main droite, un objet sphérique qui constitue le symbole *par excellence* du dieu Apollon, vénéré dans la région d'Eleutherna.

Les opinions des spécialistes sur l'identification de cet objet sphérique sont divergentes: pomme, disque, sphère, pierre ou résine de styrax. Dans ce dernier cas, le dieu a été interprété comme Apollon *Styrakîtēs*. L'épithète *Styrakîtēs* provient du nom de la montagne *Styrakion*, selon le témoignage d'Etienne de Byzance, ainsi que du nom de la plante locale, *styrax officinalis*, utilisée pour la fabrication des parfums et des médicaments.

Selon notre opinion, l'objet sphérique a une signification religieuse et cultuelle et constitue probablement une offrande locale au dieu Apollon, comme nous atteste également la similitude de l'iconographie entre les pièces eleutherniennes et celles d'autres cités crétoises où Apollon, à la place de l'objet sphérique, tient une phiale ou une tête de bouc. En outre, plusieurs objets en terre cuite de l'époque hellénistique, de forme sphérique, exactement la même que celle de l'objet qu'Apollon tient sur les monnaies, ont été trouvés dans la région d'Eleutherna. Selon les archéologues, ces objets sphériques pourraient avoir constitué soit une sorte de jouet soit des modèles de fruits offerts aux divinités et aux morts. D'après notre opinion, ces objets sphériques constituent plutôt des modèles des fruits et sont liés probablement au culte local d'Apollon.

Cependant, dans l'état actuel de notre documentation, on ne peut pas savoir si ces objets sphériques renvoient à un fruit spécial (fruit de styrax?) ou à des fruits, dans un sens général, en soulignant de cette façon le caractère végétal de la divinité locale d'Apollon.

Έλενα Β. Βλαχογιάννη. Οι αποκρύψεις έκτακτης ανάγκης στην κυρίως Ελλάδα επί Γαλλιηνού (253-268 μ.Χ.) με αφορμή των «θησαυρώ» Χαιρώνεια/2001. Η Βοιωτία του α' μισού του 3ου αι. μ.Χ. και οι Έρουλοι, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9 (2007-2008), 107-164.

*Emergency hoards concealed in mainland Greece during the reign of Gallienus (A.D. 253-268) and the Chaironeia/2001 'hoard'. Boeotia during the first half of the third cent. A.D. and the Herulians. The Chaironeia/2001 coin hoard, exhibited today in the Numismatic Collection of the Chaironeia Archaeological Museum, was found during a rescue excavation of a Roman farmhouse (*villa rustica*), 500 m. outside of modern Chaironeia. This hoard consists of 10 antoniniani issued either during the joined reign of Valerianus I – Gallienus (A.D. 253-260) or the sole reign of Gallienus (A.D. 260-268).*

The date of the latest coin, issued from 266 to the middle of 267 or to the beginning of A.D. 268, establishes either the date of hoard's concealment or the date of farmhouse's abandonment. The short space between the earliest and the latest coin of the hoard, 10-11 years, the almost good condition of the coins, and their

small number suggests that the house's owner concealed the money lest he suffer some danger, so that he could regain his money safely at a later date.

Prompted by this small find an overview of the emergency hoards concealed in mainland Greece during the reign of Gallienus (A.D. 253-268) has been undertaken, so that conclusions concerning their geographical distribution, the quality, and the quantity of hoards can be deduced.

When looking for reasons why a farmer would feel the need to hide his money, one possible explanation comes from the literary evidence. In *Historia Augusta, Vita Gallieni* 13.8, the Herulians are going through Boeotia and sacking villages and farms. Their course, in combination with the findspots of the emergency hoards and the scattered information collected from the partly preserved *Itinerarium Antonini* 325/6, of Diocletianus era, and *Tabula Peutingeriana* map, of the second half of the fourth century A.D., helps strengthen the argument that Boeotians had reason to hide their money until it was safe to go back to their homes.

Finally, it is likely that the Herulian going through Boeotia is more than possible, since the German intruders eventually fled northwards to Epirus and Macedonia. The Chaironeia/2001 hoard constitutes one of a lost link in a chain of emergency hiding places deposited during the reign of Gallienus. To the unproved indication of Herulian presence in Lebadeia could be added now the more secure proof of Chaironeia, which is based on the heavier numismatic evidence. The fact that the Herulian troops were persecuted by the Roman legions could be a good reason for the absence of well-founded destruction remains throughout Boeotia.

Alain Delattre, Deux protocoles byzantins, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 8-9, 2007-2008, 165-168.

Two Byzantine protocols. From the fifth century A.D. papyrus rolls have sometimes on the first page a few lines of text in cursive script, a "protocol", mentioning the names of the Byzantine *comes sacrarum largitionum* and his representative in Egypt. The article contains the edition of two new documents of this kind.

INSCRIBING A RITUALIZED PAST: THE ATTIC RESTORATION DECREE *IG II² 1035* AND CULTURAL MEMORY IN AUGUSTAN ATHENS

The most extensive public-works project ever undertaken by Athens in the post-Classical period is recorded in a well-known civic decree of disputed Augustan date, *IG II² 1035*.¹ The decree is principally devoted to the reclamation of the city's smaller shrines and various sacred properties, and their proper restoration "to the gods and heroes, to whom they belonged." The topographical scope and cultural symbolism of the decree is profound, for the work of restoration addressed as many as eighty distinct sites and entailed the explicit reassertion of their historical and sacred traditions. The overarching theme of the decree is the "glory (*doxa*) of the Demos", as represented in the recovery and security of the ancestral customs that governed the traditional administration and inviolability of the sites and properties concerned. This program of restoration sought to culminate the efforts of previous decrees to address the condition of other Attic shrines and sacred lands, most notably the properties of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis. The work of the surviving decree gives particular attention to the rehabilitation of the small rural shrines and cult properties scattered across Athens, Attica and the island of Salamis.² Indeed, the dense catalogue of restored and revived sites vividly illustrates the famous claim that "Attica belongs to the gods, who took it for themselves, and to the ancestral heroes".³

The theme of renewed civic piety naturally frames the explicit narrative of the restoration decree. Necessarily taken in concert with this civic effort was the revival of many cult traditions, and so the inscription's catalogue of restoration work emerges as

¹ With expanded restoration in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121, after G. R. Culley, "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: *IG II², 1035*", *Hesperia* 44 (1975) 207-223; with the unattached Fragment B of the inscription now placed as an initial decree (I) before the restoration decree (II). For other suggested restorations to *IG II² 1035*, see particularly those noted in *SEG* 31 (1981) no. 107 and 33 (1983) no. 136 (as well as further references cited below).

² The shrines and other properties restored outside of Athens totaled about forty, while only twelve sites are listed for the city; see the catalogue of sites in *IG II² 1035* II. 29-59. For commentary on the restoration catalogue, see G.R. Culley, "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: *IG II², 1035*", *Hesperia* 46 (1977) 282-298. "Glory of the Demos", in *IG II² 1035* I. 26: [τὰ π]επολιτευμ[ένα πρ]ός ἀείμνηστον δό[ξ]αν τοῦ δ[ῆμου].

³ Thus Hegesias of Magnesia (*FGrH* 142 F24; as preserved in Strabo 9.1.16 [C396], without Jones' interpolation of *τέμενος* in the participial clause). The Athenian reputation for exceptional piety is well known from the assertion in Pausanias (1.17.1) that the "Athenians more than others show their piety to the gods"; suitably adopted as a prefatory statement in R.E. Wycherley, "Minor Shrines in Ancient Athens", *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 283.

something of a sacred manifesto in its implicit narrative of Athenian cultural memory.⁴ Implicit in the work of the decree is the collective desire to revive and cultivate an ancestral *kosmos* –a pious sense of ritual order and adornment– within the ancient religious life of Athens.⁵ In many instances the monuments and properties entailed are evocative of the mytho-historical traditions that most potently defined the ancestral identity of Athens and its people; a ritualized past that exploited a competitive cultural resource and served as a social charter.⁶ In its systematic projection of an image of tradition across the cultic landscape of Athens and Attica, the restoration decree therefore promotes a powerful and timeless civic and cultural message that was intended to revive and reinforce the historical and religious integrity, and cultural grandeur, of the ancient Athenian *polis*. In this commemorative representation of historical and sacred space, the decree effectively celebrates the various cults and monuments that were associated with the early aspirations and territorial development of Athens and its centuries-long struggle against rival city-states and threatening foreign invaders. Indeed the catalogue of shrines emerges as a ritual chronicle of much of the city's most symbolic history, from its beginnings in the sustained defense of Attica in the heroic age down to Athenian resistance to the threat of Persia and the rule of Macedonian kings.⁷ Invoked along the way are the cultural memories of such great “savior figures” as Solon and Themistokles, together with the Homeric Ajax and various ancestral heroes. Indeed the

⁴ For the decree as important evidence for the “cultural memory of the Athenians”, see A. Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic Period. A Social and Cultural History* (Blackwell, Oxford 2005) 239-240; with an excellent relationship drawn with the ritualized ephebic tour of war monuments in Athens and Attica (pp. 237-239). For the socio-anthropological concept of cultural memory adopted here, see J. Assmann, “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity”, *New German Critique* 65 (1995) 125-133 (esp. 128-133): as an “objectivized culture”, which “comprises that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch, whose ‘cultivation’ serves to stabilize and convey that society’s image” (p. 128); and particularly in the instance of “actual cultural memories” (in contrast to “potential”), “when representations of the past ... are adopted and given new meaning in new social and historical perspectives” (p. 132). For a methodological preference for “cultural memory” over the more temporally restrictive approach of “collective memory”, see the memory studies critique in W. Kansteiner, “Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory”, *History and Theory* 41 (2002) 179-197 (esp. p. 182). The related concept of “social memory” (arguably less suited to a pre-modern context) is employed in brief reference to the restoration decree in S.E. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge 2002) 78-79, as part of the study of “Old Greece within the Empire” (Ch. 2, pp. 36-98).

⁵ Such was the overarching theme in Lykourgos’ religious reforms: J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1998) 23-24.

⁶ On this concept, in socio-anthropological terms, see A. Appadurai, “The Past as Scarce Resource”, *Man* (N.S.) 16 (1981) 201 (working from Malinowski’s original notion of “myth as social charter”): with such social or cultural charters as “collectively held, publicly expressed and ideological charged versions of the past”; often competed over since the past, especially in regard to established myth, represents an inherently limited cultural resource (pp. 202-204). See also M. Bloch, “The Past and the Present in the Present”, *Man* (N.S.) 12 (1977) 278-292, for a critical re-evaluation of the “ritualized past” as a methodological construct.

⁷ In its own fashion the catalogue portion of the decree therefore reads rather like the chronicles of the Attidographic tradition, though probably more closely inspired and sourced from the long antiquarian tradition that followed, with its interest in historical monuments and sacred traditions. In particular, the *Atthis* of Philochorus would appear to have spanned Athenian history from the foundation of Kekrops down to the Chremonidean War of resistance to Macedonian rule in the 260s B.C.; as reconstructed in F. Jacoby, *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford 1949) 107 and 111-112.

restoration decree charters precisely the same themes of heroic salvation that the Athenians had eloquently invoked for centuries past.⁸

The spirit of civic and religious renewal (*ananeosis*) was nearly universal throughout the Greek world in the Augustan period. In addition to the revived emphasis on civic pride, such restoration programs were fueled by the essential fact that cultural and ritual traditions functioned as a crucial idiom in the cultural discourse of the period; in terms of both inter-state relationships within Greece and Asia Minor and between Greek states and the ruling power of Rome. In its demonstration of the great “cultic depth” of Attica the restoration program emerges as a vivid narrative of how the ancient heritage of a Greek city could be emphasized and translated into an authoritative source of cultural identity and prestige in a new historical era, one that brought about such profound change and (often) displacement throughout the Greek world. The decree’s particular focus on cults and monuments that continued to symbolize the protection and security of Athens illustrates the degree to which a contemporary cultural significance might determine the survival of local religious traditions during the Roman period.⁹ The Athenians were also fortunate in the richness and complexity of their heroic heritage. Unlike so many Greek states of the era, especially those of Asia Minor (and beyond), in order to proclaim the culturally privileged status of collective *eugeneia* or elite-descent, the people of Athens never had to resort to the kinds of creative claims of *syngeneia* or “ancestral-kinship” with older Greek communities that dominated so much civic discourse throughout the Hellenistic and the Roman periods.¹⁰ Moreover, since much of the Athenian mythographic tradition had always wielded a considerable political weight,¹¹ the city’s “political mythology” was ideally suited for the ideologically charged

⁸ See E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (BICS Suppl. 57, London 1989) 44-63 (Ch. 3 “The Hero and the City: The Saviour-Hero”); with many of the same “cast of characters”.

⁹ Thus offering a self-selective model for the survival of local religious traditions during the Roman period; as observed in S.E. Alcock, “Minding the Gap in Hellenistic and Roman Greece”, in *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, eds. S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (Oxford 1994) 259-260. On the significance of religious tradition for civic identity in the Roman East, see Chaniotis (note 21) 177-190. Change and displacement: cf. F. Millar, “The Mediterranean and the Roman Revolution: Politics, War and the Economy”, *Past and Present* 102 (1984) 3-24.

¹⁰ On claims of kinship through heroic descent as a form of cultural diplomacy with the ruling power of Rome, see most conveniently C.P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge MA and London 1999) 106-121 (Ch. 9 “The Roman Empire”). By the 2nd century A.D. civic claims of *eugenia* became so competitive as to sometimes result in inter-state conflict; for which, see the excellent case-study in L. Robert, “La titulature de Nicée et de Nicomédie: la gloire et la haine”, *HSCP* 82 (1977) 1-39. The scholarship on the topic of *syngeneia* continues to grow: for the Roman period, especially within the context of the so-called Second Sophistic and the Hadrianic Panhellenion league, see O. Curty, *Les Parentés Légendaires Entre Cités Grecques* (Geneva 1995) esp. 259-263; the term itself is further treated in O. Curty, “Un usage fort controversé: la parenté dans le langage diplomatique de l’époque hellénistique”, *Ancient Society* 35 (2005) esp. 106-111; in response to S. Lücke, *Sungeneia: Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie* (Frankfurt 2000) esp. 87, for the propaganda value and prestige of kinship claims. See also J.H.M. Strubbe, “Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realitäte”, *Ancient Society* 15-17 (1984-1986) 253-304; especially in the context of civic competition (p. 262), and on the role of putative founder-heroes in the promotion of a Greek identity for the Hellenized communities of Asia Minor (pp. 273-277).

¹¹ The thesis in R. Parker, “Myths of Early Athens”, in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. J. Bremmer (London 1988) 187; and also, N. Léroux, “Cité grecque”, in *Dictionnaire des mythologies et des religions des sociétés traditionnelles et du monde antique*, ed. Y. Bonnefoy (Paris 1981) 203-209.

atmosphere of cultural discourse under the empire. By the period of the restoration decree, the universal dimensions of Athenian mythology were well enough established for the city to fruitfully exploit in attracting the generosity of foreign benefactors, through the promised award of prestige-bearing heroic epithets. Plainly put, in the Roman period, as in the Hellenistic, Athenian tradition enjoyed a tremendously high sales-value. “If you bring ten sacks of charcoal you, too, will be a citizen; and if you bring a pig, also, you will be Triptolemus himself... Have these with you and call yourself Erechtheus, Cecrops, Codrus, whoever you wish; no one pays no mind to it.”¹² The poet Ovid, a great expert on Attic mythology, could be similarly inspired to characterize his final literary patron, a royal Thracian benefactor of Athens, as a descendent of both Eumolpus and Erechtheus.¹³

Most distinctly, the long “Athenian memory of war” –especially as a cultural memory of victories achieved through the city’s consistent religious devotion– is triumphantly heralded throughout the decree. In its account of restoration work the decree refers explicitly to the three most defining wars of Athenian history: first, the Persian Wars, in the context of the Battle of Salamis; then to the early and long conflict with Megara over the island of Salamis; and finally, and most unusually (from a commemorative perspective), the Peloponnesian War.¹⁴ Other famous conflicts of victorious memory, from the Eleusinian War of the heroic age to the expulsion of the city’s Macedonian overlords in the 3rd century B.C., are remembered within the cult traditions of the sites restored in the decree. Of the many conflicts ritually and symbolically encompassed by the restoration decree, the Persian Wars –Greece’s great culture-victory– naturally remained unrivaled in its universal and timeless appeal as a “shared symbol” of Greek heritage. Indeed the cultural memory of the Persian Wars, as first and most influentially constructed by Herodotus, functioned for so many centuries as such a vital authoritative voice as to project a crucial formative and normative force on the Greeks, and so offered a most compelling “charter of identity” on both civic and panhellenic levels.¹⁵

¹² Thus the well-known satirical epigram by Automedon (*Anth. Pal.* 11.319), probably dating to the early 1st century A.D.; see the excellent historical commentary in L. Robert, “Une épigramme satirique d’Automédon et Athènes au début de l’empire (*Anthologie Palatine XI* 319)”, *REG* 94 (1981) 338-361. On this practice, best attested elsewhere in the Greek world in the 2nd century A.D., cf. also Strubbe (note 9) 301-302.

¹³ In the person of King Kotys of Thrace, a poet himself: *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.9 (ll. 1-2 and 19-20); presumably inspired by the king’s Athenian archonship (recorded in *IG II²* 1070 ll. 9-10 [now *Agora* XV no. 304]).

¹⁴ Respectively in *IG II²* 1035 ll. 33, 34, and 41. For the decree as an expression of “war memory”, see Chaniotis (note 4) 240.

¹⁵ For the essential formative and normative aspects to the practice of cultural memory, see Assmann (note 4) 132; the crucial nature of authority in any cultural construction of the past is emphasized in Appadurai (note 6) 203. For the Persian Wars as a “shared symbol” and “charter of identity”, see recently H.-J. Gehrke, “History and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond”, in *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. N. Luraghi (Oxford 2001) esp. 302. The scholarship on this topic has grown ever larger since initially investigated in N. Loraux, “Marathon’ ou l’histoire idéologique”, *REA* 75 (1973) 13-42; also, now exhaustively treated in M. Jung, *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als “Lieux de mémoire” im antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen 2006).

In the period of Roman imperial rule the Persian-Wars tradition emerged as a particularly precious resource for cultural prestige.¹⁶ However, as a cultural construct the past inherently represents a limited and thus potentially contestable heritage. Hence even as late as the Roman period the civic commemoration of the Persian Wars tended to promote and privilege a particular local tradition of the conflict, a constructive practice of “memory politics” that often produced mutually antagonistic attitudes and perspectives.¹⁷ Throughout the early empire the Athenians would consistently engage in this emotive discourse –an evolving narrative of “intentional history”– by endeavoring to exploit their special role in Greece’s defeat of Persia; and thus reassert their heroic and timeless role as defenders of Hellas and Hellenic values against the hubristic and uncivilized forces of an outside world.¹⁸ The city’s privileged historical status in this regard helped to foster a special cultural and political synergy between Athens and Rome, wherein the two states could appear together as guardians past-and-present of the civilized world against the barbarian “Other,” represented by the Persian-Parthian East. For Athens the Persian Wars would always very much remain a living memory: as late as the 2nd century A.D. the city’s population could still personally experience the effects of the Persian destruction of Attica. Thus the shrine of Demeter in Phaleron and the sanctuary of Hera that stood on the road to the old harbor remained in their “half-burnt” condition, with their cults presumably long defunct.¹⁹

Such important conceptual considerations should not overshadow the crucial practical purpose of the restoration decree. At issue throughout the work of restoration is the proper reclamation of a large and varied collection of sacred properties that were a traditional source of state revenue, especially for the city’s sacred treasuries. Taken at face value the magnitude of the restoration decree is immense, even though in many instances it merely entailed the re-establishment of property boundaries that had been encumbered by private encroachment and disputed leasing records. While much of the

¹⁶ See Alcock (note 4) 74-86, esp. 83-84 (under “Persian War Blues”). On the role of the “Greek past” generally in the period of the so-called Second Sophistic, where it provided a mutual cultural framework for dialogue between Greeks and their Roman rulers, see S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (Oxford 1996) 66-79.

¹⁷ So, for example, just as the major states of the Panhellenic League quarreled over prizes of valor and military honors in the face of Xerxes’ invading forces in 480-479 B.C., they would do so again in such commemorative contexts as the Eleutheria festival at Plataea; and criticized for it by such contemporary intellectuals as Dio Chrysostom (*Oration 38.38*). On this contest, see N.D. Robertson, “A Point of Precedence at Plataia: The Dispute between Athens and Sparta over Leading the Procession”, *Hesperia* 55 (1986) 88-102. See also Alcock (note 4) 82-83, for the Eleutheria as an example of conflicting commemorative practices that could arise from the celebration and promotion of “particular civic histories” of the Persian Wars (also p. 75); and for the practice of “memory politics” (pp. 17-19). The past as a “scarce resource”, and therefore a perennial source of collective antagonism and competition, is the principle thesis in Appadurai (note 6), and so inherently charged ideologically (p. 201).

¹⁸ For Athens’ experience of the “Persian Wars Mania”, see A.J.S. Spawforth, “Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire”, in *Greek Historiography*, ed. S. Hornblower (Oxford 1994) 233-247. This topic is discussed further below, in the analysis of the restoration decree. For the notion of an “intentional history”, with Athenian historical tradition providing the most complete example, see most fully J.-H. Gehrke, “Mythos, Geschichte, Politik –antik und modern”, *Saeculum* 45 (1994) 239-264: as a cultural and social process of “self-categorization” in defining a collective identity, achieved by way of a contemporary construction of a shared past.

¹⁹ According to Pausanias 10.35.2.

actual work was presumably minor in scale, such as the repair of the starting cables in the 300 year-old Panathenaic Stadium, the sheer scope of the decree's provisions would have been considerably burdensome to the state. Also to be taken into consideration are the numerous blood sacrifices (presumably in the form of purifying piglets) required to ritually cleanse all of the sacred sites. To a certain extent, however, the restoration program was evidently designed to help pay for itself. Hence the decree makes provision for the production of public revenues through a systematic reorganization of state-sanctioned leases for sacred and public properties, which may represent the first major overhaul of such revenues since the Lykourgan era.

THE AUGUSTAN DATE & CONTEXT OF THE RESTORATION DECREE

The program and overall tone of the restoration decree is noticeably reminiscent of Athens' last great civic revival, in the broad institutional and financial reforms undertaken by Lykourgos in the 4th century B.C.²⁰ In like manner and analogous spirit, the decree's monumental investment in cult activity and tradition attests an increased public interest in a shared cultural and religious heritage. Such a new climate of traditionalism, where the "old ways" were not to be forgotten, was inspired by the personal initiative shown by the city's elite in the generous years of the Augustan peace and renewal that followed the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. and witnessed the emergence of a new social and political order in the Greek world. The experience of Athens was rather universal in this regard, particularly among the old cities of Asia Minor and their established elites.²¹

The cultural and historical significance of the restoration decree has been rather obscured by the long-running debate concerning its date. Although the Augustan period (toward the end of the 1st century B.C.) has generally been regarded as the most likely context for the decree, such a conclusion still remains largely based on circumstantial considerations, including the conducive cultural climate of that period. Otherwise, estimates for the decree have ranged widely, from the immediate post-Sullan era (the 80s-70s B.C.) to the 2nd century A.D.²² A closer look at the prosopography of the

²⁰ As a cultural revival of religious traditions, see especially S.C. Humphreys, "Lykourgos of Butadae: An Athenian Aristocrat", in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, eds. J.W. Eadie and J. Ober (Lanham MD. 1985) 199-252, at 213 (as state-inspired); cf. also F.W. Mitchel, "Lykourgan Athens: 338-322", in *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple; 2nd Series, 1966-1970* (University of Cincinnati Classical Studies 2, Norman Okla. 1973) 163-214.

²¹ On the initiative and cultural strategies of the urban elite in this period's revival of civic religious traditions, see S. Hotz, "Ritual Traditions in the Discourse of the Imperial Period", in *Ritual and Commemoration in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. E. Stavrianopoulou (*Kernos* Suppl. 16, Liège 2006) 287-296 (with Augustan date for *IG II²* 1035, p. 284); with concluding reference to the traditionalist statement in Athenaeus (14 632a-b): "There are men who do not forget the old ways". See also A. Chaniotis, "Negotiating Religion in the Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces", *Kernos* 16 (2003) 82, for the revival of ancestral customs in the Roman period as occurring "at the initiative of individuals, usually educated members of the elite".

²² As reviewed by Culley (note 1) 217-221, with date of ca. 10/9-2/1 B.C.; also cf. E. Kapetanopoulos, "Salamis and Julius Nikanor", *Hellenika* 33 (1981) 223-224. An Augustan date is accepted most recently in D.J. Geagan, "The Athenian Elite: Romanization, Resistance, and the Exercise of Power", in *The Romanization of Athens*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff (Oxbow Monograph 94, Oxford 1997) 30 n. 41; now also argued in G.C.R. Schmalz, *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens, A New Epigraphy and Prosopography* (Brill forthcoming) s.v. *IG II²* 1035. For a post-Sullan date, see J. von Freeden, *OIKIA KURRHSTOU. Studien zum sogenannten Turn*

inscription easily solves this chronological puzzle. The chief religious official in charge of the restoration program, the *basileus* or “king-archon” Mantias (a member of the priestly Kleomenes-Mantias family of Marathon), can be recognized as the son of an early Augustan official, the *basileus* Dositheos.²³ Inheriting the family’s proud Hellenistic tradition of priestly service as members of the venerable *genos* of the Kerykes, in the decade after Actium Dositheos held an important group of Eleusinian offices and priesthoods, including the *lithophoros* of the “Sacred Stone”. In ca. 20/19 B.C. Dositheos joined with his fellow Kerykids in honoring the Eleusinian ‘torch-bearer’ (*dadouchos*) and cult-reformer Themistokles of Hagnous.²⁴ Mantias is also known as the father of the thesmothete official Kleomenes (II) of Marathon, whose tenure dates to the early 1st century A.D.²⁵ From the relative careers of these family members, Mantias’ service as

der Winde in Athen (Archaeologica 29, Rome 1983) 157-160, on the slim basis of the problematic reference to the so-called Tower of the Winds (ll. 54-55). Even more dubious is the proposed Claudian date, based on a post-Augustan chronology for the career of G. Julius Nicanor (discussed further below): T.L. Shear Jr., “Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town”, *Hesperia* 53 (1981) 265-267; derived in large part from considerations in E. Kapetanopoulos, “G. Julius Nicanor, *Neos Homeros kai Neos Themistokles*”, *Riv. Fil.* (1976) 375-377, where an even later date of ca. 61-110 A.D. is canvassed. A date of ca. A.D. 150 was conventional up until the 1970s, based partly on the restoration of Lykomedes as the decree’s eponymous archon (with that name better attested for the 2nd century A.D.): as in *Agora* III 176 under no. 579 (W.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora, III. Literary and Epigraphic Testimonia* [Princeton 1957]); after the initial view in P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l’empire* (Brussels 1922) 145-147; similarly in W.B. Dinsmoor, Sr., *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, MA 1931) 294.

²³ With Mantias’ patronymic thus to be restored in *IG* II² 1035 (ll. 12-13) as [Δωσιθέου]; *contra*, Culley (note 1) 219-220, with the restoration in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 13 [Κλεομένους], after Kirchner’s incomplete family stemma under *IG* II² 3488, constructed before the existence of Dositheos was attested; this Kleomenes is now the grandfather of Mantias. Cf. the tentative identification in *LPGN* II (*A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* II, *Attica*, eds. M.J. Osborne and S. Byrne [Oxford 1994]) Μαντίας (3) and (5): with (5) as the son of Dositheos, and (3) the *basileus* as “? = (5)”. Dositheos as *basileus* in the early 20s B.C., during the archonship of Nikostratos: in *IG* II² 1727 l. 4 (Δωσιθέος Κλεομένους Μ[αραθώνιος]); as read in E. Kapetanopoulos, “Attic Inscriptions: Notes and Nova Addenda”, *ArchEphem* (1968) 177-178 no. 1, with new Augustan date (cf. *LPGN* II Δωσιθέος (11)). The prosopography of *IG* II² 1727 is indicative of the early Augustan era: the epimelete Menekrates of Phlya served as a representative during the Lemnian disputes of ca. 20 B.C. (in *IG* II² 1053 [+ 1052 + 1063] l. 4; now *BE* [1998] no. 168, as newly studied and dated in R.M. Kallet-Marx and R.S. Stroud, “Two Athenian Decrees Concerning Lemnos of the Late First Century B.C.”, *Chiron* 27 [1997] 162-164, after the previous “Lemnian Decree” *IG* II² 1051 + 1058, from the archonship of Apolexis [II] *Apellikόntos* of Oion); also, the epimelete Theorikos of Steiria is now dated to this period (in S.B. Aleshire, *Asklepios at Athens. Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults* [Amsterdam 1991] 133 s.v.); so that the *dodekais* record in *F.Delphes* III.2 no. 64, from the archonship of Nikostratos, should now date to the very beginning of the principate. Unfortunately, the genealogical significance of this new evidence is not recognized in *Persons of Ancient Athens*, ed. J.S. Traill (Toronto 2003), where Mantias (no. 632575) remains the son of Kleomenes, as restored by Culley; Dositheos is rendered as two figures: the Kerykid priest (as no. 379245), and the *basileus* (as no. 379244, with Stirling Dow’s tentative revised date of ca. 63/2 B.C. for *IG* II² 1727).

²⁴ As recorded in *SEG* 30 (1980) no. 93 (ll. 15-18), from the archonship of Apolexis (II) *Apellikόntos* of Oion; see K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* [TAPS 64.3, Baltimore 1974] 98 s.v. On the date of this archonship, see now Kallet-Marx and Stroud (note 23) 178-181.

²⁵ Under the archon Polycharmos of Marathon, in *IG* II² 1730 l. 13; see *LPGN* II Κλεομένης (13). Also, Kleomenes was the son-in-law of the Augustan *pyloros* Leukios of Piraeus, and father of the early 1st-century hearth-initiate Phileto (recorded in *IG* II² 3529; with Clinton [note 9] 101 no. 13); for the father-in-law, see A.E. Raubitschek, “The Pyloroi of the Akropolis”, *TAPA* 76 (1945) 105. See J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin 1901-1903) no. 9668.

archon *basileus* can be firmly assigned to the last decade of the 1st century B.C. His participation therefore confirms a mid-Augustan date for the restoration decree. There is also the decree's hoplite general, Metrodoros of Phyle, to consider. Since Metrodoros' eponymous archonship would have to date after 11/10 B.C.,²⁶ his subsequent generalship is therefore probably best placed (at the earliest) sometime around the middle of the last decade of the 1st century B.C. Finally, the eponymous archon “[- -]komedēs” is best restored as [Ni]komedēs; and likely identified with the contemporary Nikomedes family from the influential deme of Oion, whose senior representative is attested in two Leontid tribal catalogues of comparable date to the restoration decree.²⁷

Among the various circumstantial arguments for the decree's Augustan date, the most influential remains the perceived connection between the work of restoration on the island of Salamis and the famous Salamis benefaction of the Syrian poet G. Julius Nikanor, who was consequently hailed as the “New Themistokles”.²⁸ Yet it is evident that Nikanor's activities occurred a decade or so after the decree, so that benefactor's interest in Salamis was, if anything, inspired by the public attention drawn to the island by the work of restoration there.²⁹ While Nikanor is usually credited with somehow buying the

²⁶ The likely date of the final preserved entry in *IG II²* 1713 Col. IV (l. 31), recording the archonship of Theophilos (probably of Besa); Col. IV represents the archon-years 17/16-11/10 B.C., while the archonships previous to that record are generally accounted for (e.g., from ca. 22 B.C., those of Diotimos of Halai, Apolexis II, Arcios of Paiania, Demeas, and Apolexis III). The *strategos* Metrodoros is otherwise unknown (see T. C. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General in Athens* [Ares Press, Chicago 1976] 26 and 70-71); a possible grandson may be found in the Claudian archon Metrodoros (cited eponymously in *IG II²* 1973).

²⁷ In *IG II²* 2461 l. 24 and 2462 l. 7 (= *LPGN II* Νικομήδης 9); for their date and character, see S. Dow, “*Catalogi Generis Incerti* *IG II²* 2364-2489. A Check-List”, *AncW* 8 (1983) 104. Thus *IG II²* 1035 l. 30 can be restored as [ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Νικομήδους ἄρχοντο[s]] (the alternate genitive ending, Νικομήδου, is used in the tribal catalogues). Attic names taking the form “[-]komedes” are restricted to Lycomedes and Nikomedes: this fact suggested to Johannes Kirchner (*apud IG II²* 1035) the restoration Λυκομήδους; a rather common name in Athens from the 5th to 3rd centuries B.C., but not attested for the Augustan period (and only once in the Julio-Claudian era, as a patronymic in *IG II²* 1945 l. 94 = *LPGN II* Λυκομήδης 19). The limited onomastic choice is also recognized in Dinsmoor Sr. (note 22) 294, where the alternate restoration Νικομήδους is recognized. The only other possible candidate known to this author is Nikomedes (*neoteros*) of Melite (in *IG II²* 4711, “s. I a.”); the name is also found in a family from Pambotadai, last attested in the early 1st century B.C. (as the father of an ephebe in *IG II²* 1039 l. 77). A likely older brother (or cousin) of the probable archon appears in the earlier tribal list (*IG II²* 2461 l. 20). For other instances in which names ending in -ης appear inconsistently under both possible genitive cases, cf. for example, the inscriptions relating to the late Julio-Claudian official Kallikratides (VI) of Trikorynthos: as archon in *IG II²* 2995, [Καλλ]ικρατί[δου]; as *strategos* in *IG II²* 1946, [Κ]αλλικρατίδους.

²⁸ For the most recent overview, see C. Habicht, “Salamis in der Zeit nach Sulla”, *ZPE* 111 (1996) 79-87 (esp. p. 85). The public acclaim, which was combined with the simultaneous award of the heroic epithet of the “New Homer”, is recorded in the honorific decree to Nikanor in *IG II²* 1069 (now *Agora XVI* no. 337 [A. G. Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora, XVI. Inscriptions: The Decrees* (Princeton 1997)]; also, see *BE* [1999] no. 211), granted for his generous liturgical service as *agonothetes* of the ‘Games of the *Sebastoi*’ (Σεβαστῶν ἀγρῶνων), l. 7); dating to the archonship of G. Julius Lakon of Sparta. Nikanor was also awarded with four honorific statues, which were inscribed with his honorific epithets (preserved in *IG II²* 3785-3789); for the likely artistic pretensions signified in the “New Homer” title, see originally K. Keil, “Zum Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum”, *RhM* 18 (1863) 59-60, with Augustan date for Nikanor's career.

²⁹ Dated to the late Augustan period in P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo 1927) 92; with the archonship of Lakon dated to ca. A.D. 4 in P. Cartledge and A.J. Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A Tale of Two Cities* (Routledge 1989) 101; also, general Augustan date for Nikanor's career in, for example, C.P. Jones, “Three Foreigners in Attica”, *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 227-228. The honorific decree *IG II²* 1069 should

entire island of Salamis, it is far more likely that his acquisition consisted of the purchase of extensive parcels of agricultural properties.³⁰ According to the preserved charter of Nikanor's settlement, the real estate entailed was not gifted outright to Athens, but was instead established as an unusual *synktēsis*, a “joint-foundation” or “co-ownership.” This formal agreement, which by the Flavian would be annulled through Roman intervention (when the properties were transferred to the *ager publicus* of Rome), provided for the tariff-free importation of Salamis produce to the Piraeus and Eleusis, as well as the availability of rental properties on the island.³¹

The Athenian restoration program evidently culminated from recent reform legislation, which can now be placed in the earlier Augustan period. In establishing the basic framework for Metrodoros' duties in supervising the program, the surviving inscription refers to “previous decrees” which had already addressed the condition of certain Attic “shrines and precincts.” These sites, which were presently being restored, were to be set-aside immediately by Metrodoros for the purpose of “[making sacrifices] and honors [to the gods and heroes].”³² It would appear that these previous efforts were aimed at the more significant or venerable of the city's sacred properties, in particular the landholdings of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis. At the end of the enabling decree Eleusis is addressed in regard to the free use of certain marginal lands belonging to Demeter and Kore, and penalties for transgressing their sacred boundaries.³³ Following this statement is an unusual reference to the offering of “First Fruits”, perhaps defining

point to the years A.D. 4-14: first in the likely restoration of its invocation to both Augustus and Tiberius as “Caesar” (line 1, Αγαθὴ τύχη τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος); and secondly in the fact that Nikanor's imperial festival was held in honor of the *Sebastoi*, rather than simply the *Sebastos* Augustus. See, more fully, in G.C.R. Schmalz, “Euergetism, Memory, and Cultural Dissonance in the Athenian Career of G. Julius Nicanor, ‘the New Homer’” (in preparation). As another consideration to put aside, the common reference to Strabo (9.1.10 [C394]) as evidence that Salamis did not belong to Athens in the Augustan period, so that the restoration decree must be either pre- or post-Augustan in date, is unwarranted: no contemporary significance is intended in his brief history of Salamis, where Strabo simply contrasts the long historical status of the island (καὶ νῦν μέν) as Athenian territory with its original status (δέ) as an independent territory, fought over by Athens and Megara; for Strabo's characteristic use of the μέν-δέ construction for such broad temporal contrasts, see S. Pothecary, “The Expression ‘Our Times’ in Strabo's Geography”, *CP* 92 (1997) 237-238. There is otherwise no record of the city's loss of the island in the Augustan (or any other) period: Augustus' well-recorded Athenian settlement of 21 B.C. (Dio 54.7.1-4) only affected the status of Aegina and Euboea, which were not proper territories of Athens; see G. C.R. Schmalz, “Athens, Augustus, and the Settlement of 21 B.C.”, *GRBS* 37 (1996) 382-389.

³⁰ Owing to an overly literal reading of the polemical, and no doubt exaggerated, criticism in Dio Chrysostom, *Rhodian Oration* (31) 116: δει αὐτοῖς (i.e., for the Athenians) καὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα ἐωνήσατο. The purchase or award of entire territories, such as islands, was more the habit and prerogative of Hellenistic kings and Roman dynasts; such as in the case of the island of Aegina, which was bought by Attalos I of Pergamon, and two centuries later awarded to Athens by Marcus Antonius.

³¹ The charter is preserved in the “Salamis Statutes” *IG II²* 1119 (now *Agora XVI* no. 337) and (as an Eleusinian copy) *IG II²* 1086 (+ *ArchEphem* [1895] 121 no. 34). The Athenian copy is revised and thoroughly studied, as summarized above, in S. Follet, “Iulius Nicanor et le statut de Salamine (*IG II²*, 1119 complété = *Agora XVI*, 337)”, in *L'Hellénism d'Époque Romaine*, ed. S. Follet (Paris 2004) 139-170: new text (pp. 142-143); *synktēsis* (pp. 140 and 153-154); importation and lease-use, which were to remain in effect after the foundation's transfer to the Roman *ager publicus* (pp. 155-156).

³² *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 7; with commentary in Culley (note 2) 284.

³³ *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 ll. 20-22: “The public lands and public [eschatia - - -] of Demeter and Kore [are to be left free (?)] to all; but if anyone has transgressed the sacred boundaries and encroached upon [the sacred land (?) - - - -] for the repair of the sanctuary in Eleusis... .”

the form those particular penalties were to take: “rendering her tithe (*aparche*) from the first-fruits to the goddess.” The Athenian custom of dedicating a portion of the annual grain harvest to Demeter and Kore dates back to the Classical period, when it was used in part to promote the panhellenic claims of imperial Athens as the birthplace of Greek civilization; but is unheard of after the end of the 4th century B.C. This ancient custom makes its only other post-Classical appearance in the 2nd century A.D., during the Hadrianic “renaissance” of Eleusis, when the newly founded Panhellenic League took a special interest in the sanctuary.³⁴

In the same context it is worth observing that contemporary with the restoration decree another venerable Eleusinian rite was revived. At least by the 4th century B.C. it was customary for the most notable of the married Athenian elite to offer a *theoxenia* or “guest-party” in honor of Ploutos, the god of abundance. Toward the end of the 1st century B.C. the Eleusinian hierophant, perhaps Menekleides of Kydathenaia, invited a group of such married men to furnish a special banquet-couch and cult-table for Ploutos, “in accordance with the oracle of the god (Apollo).”³⁵ This evocative ritual, which presumably took place near the Agora in the City Eleusinion, appears as a careful revival of a Lykourgan innovation, and is indicative of the heightened prosperity of that age.³⁶ In effect, therefore, this Augustan revival proclaimed the emergence of a bright, new generation of civic-minded Athenians, emblematic of local aspirations inspired by the *pax Augusta* in the middle years of the Augustan principate. The happy note of family and civic prosperity is underlined (with perhaps a hint of “oligarchization”) by the emphasis given in the surviving inscription to notable pairs of brothers and cousins. Hence the imperial priest Pammenes of Marathon and his younger brother Zenon appear together with their adopted cousins, the similarly prominent brothers Diotimos and Theophilos of Halai.³⁷

Also at Eleusis the great and venerable Mysteries of Demeter and Kore were revitalized in the early Augustan period. Under the inspiring leadership of the Eleusinian *dadouchos* Themistokles of Hagnous, the “awesomeness (*ekplexis*) and reverence of the rites” were markedly enlivened, presumably in relation to the profound moment of the torch-lit summoning of Kore. As the most prominent member of the Kerykes Themistokles also worked steadfastly to “recover” the ancestral customs and privileges (*patria*) of his *genos*, which claimed a total of six priesthoods.³⁸ One element of

³⁴ See K. Clinton, “Hadrian’s Contribution to the Renaissance of Eleusis”, in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron (BICS Suppl. 55, London 1989) 57; an administrative role for the league is therein suggested. Cf. the contemporary dedications *IG II²* 2956 and 2957, made from the proceeds of the “First Fruits”.

³⁵ Recorded in the twin monuments *IG II²* 2464 (Athens) and *IG II²* 1935 (Eleusis), with Kirchner’s date retained; on the latter’s identification, see Dow (note 27) 104, with earlier references. For the hierophant Menekleides (known from *IG II²* 3512), see Clinton (note 24) 28 no. 13.

³⁶ Cf. Humphreys (note 20) 206, with n. 28 (evidence in *IG II²* 1933 and 1934). Cf. also Clinton (note 24) 29; also, *idem*, *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Athens 1992) 18-22 on the nature of the ritual.

³⁷ Between them they held no less than three archonships and two hoplite generalships. Also appearing together are two cousins of the active Kallikratides/Syndromos family of Steiria (*IG II²* 2464 ll. 8-9): the *strategos* Kallicratides (V) and Oinophilos (II). Cf. Aleshire (note 23) 135, under no. 8.

³⁸ For all his efforts Themistokles was honored in grandiose fashion by the twenty-two-member committee of the *hymnagogoi* of the Kerykes, as attested in *SEG* 30 (1980) no. 93, from the archonship of

the newly asserted Kerykid *patria* may well have been the article of sacred law concerning the proper ritual cleansing of suppliants. In the same years further prominence was awarded to Themistokles and the Eleusinian Mysteries in the double-initiation of Augustus, which would have been personally conducted by the *dadouchos*.³⁹ The reforms of Themistokles were evidently authoritarian enough in their privileging of the Kerykes to provoke a conflict with the rival Eleusinian *genos* of the Eumolpidai, which became so heated as to require the intervention and arbitration of the initiated emperor himself. The “genetic” antagonism may have been further exacerbated by the fact that Themistokles also held the important priesthood of Poseidon-Erechtheus on the Acropolis, in which capacity he sought to re-organize the cult by somehow “setting it in order”. Perhaps the *dadouchos* sought to consolidate the religious authority of the Kerykes and the Eteoboutadai, the *genos* that administered the Poseidon cult. Altogether the cult initiatives of Themistokles are thought to mark a “significant archaizing movement in Augustan Athens”, in the sense that they sought to restore the elite, pre-Kleisthenic authority of the city’s aristocratic *genê* and their religious autonomy and privileges.⁴⁰

As priest of Poseidon-Erechtheus, Themistokles of Hagnous would also have been involved in the extensive repairs that were carried out on the Erechtheion at the very beginning of the principate, when a fire severely damaged the interior of the temple. The western portion of the Erechtheion, with its shrines of Poseidon and Boutes, were particularly injured, necessitating an extensive rebuilding of the north porch and inspiring a newly windowed design for the west façade.⁴¹ There was evidently imperial interest in this project, for casts were made from the temple’s Ionic capitals and also the famous Caryatid sculptures to serve as models for elements in the Forum of Augustus at

Apolexis (II) of Oion (ca. 20 B.C.); studied in Clinton (note 24) 50-54; on the Kerykid priesthoods recorded, see also P. Roussel, “Un nouveau document concernant le *génos* des Céryces”, *Mélanges Bidez. Annuaire de l’Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales* 2 (1934) 819-834 (pp. 822-827). The decree is republished in K. Clinton, *Eleusis, The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme* (Archaeological Society at Athens 236, Athens 2005) 297-300 no. 300.

³⁹ As recorded in Dio Cassius 51.4.1, with the emperor’s second initiation (the *epopteia*) occurring in 19 B.C. (54.9.10); for the complex question of Augustus’ two degrees of initiation, see R. Bernhardt, “Athen, Augustus und die eleusinische Mysterien”, *AthMitt* 90 (1975) 233-237. The ritual cleansing regulation is recorded in an Augustan context in Athenaeus 9.410a; treated within the context of Themistokles’ reforms in J.H. Oliver, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* (Baltimore 1950) 50 note 31.

⁴⁰ Thus S. Aleshire, “Archaism and the Athenian Religious Reform of 21 B.C.”, *AJA* 99 (1995) 349 (abstract). Themistokles’ reforms of the Poseidon cult are recorded, vaguely, in Plutarch, *Moralia* 843C; with Themistokles’ priesthood owed to his marriage to the Eteoboutad Nikostrata, whose ancestors had once monopolized the priesthood of Poseidon-Erechtheus. Conflict and imperial arbitration: Plutarch, *Numa* 9.8; also alluded to in Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 31.121. For the analysis offered above, see also S. Aleshire “The Demos and the Priests: The Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus”, in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts, Presented to David Lewis*, eds. R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (Oxford 1994) 331 note 29.

⁴¹ See M. Korres, “The History of the Acropolis Monuments”, *Acropolis Restoration. The CCAM Interventions* (London 1994) 48, with early Augustan date for both the fire and the repairs; the architect is also credited with the construction of the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Akropolis, which was probably dedicated in 19 B.C., during the emperor’s final visit to the city. The repairs resulted in a number of disused epistyle blocks, which were often recycled to serve as statue bases (e.g., for Queen Glaphyra in *IG II²* 3437/3438, as studied in N. Kokkinos, “Re-Assembling the Inscription of Glaphyra from Athens”, *ZPE* 68 [1987] 288-290).

Rome, whose construction began in 20 B.C.⁴² The work on the Erechtheion would appear to have affected the adjoining shrine of Kekrops, whose *temenos* wall was restored in the Roman period. Certainly the Attic *genos* that traditionally administered the cult, the Amynandridai, experienced a significant revival in the very same years. Thanks to the “unstinting *philanthropia*” of a prominent official within the *genos*, the ancestral customs and privileges of the Amynandridai were reasserted and its membership was rejuvenated.⁴³

A reinvigorated sense of public spirit also brought about a revival of cult traditions that were associated with the political institutions of the city. Thus resumed by traditionally minded officers of the council were the customary ritual observances of the Athenian Boule, which featured the traditional sacrificial offerings (to the “good counsel” deities Zeus, Athena, and Hestia Boulaia) and formal prytany processions.⁴⁴ While the fabric of the Bouleuterion itself remained unchanged, the modest appearance of the adjoining complex of the Prytanikon or “Tholos” was considerably enhanced in appropriately classicizing fashion. The building program provided an impressive entranceway into the courtyard of the complex in the form of a Doric propylon, within a new enclosure wall, and gave a rather charming “face-lift” to the façade of the Tholos in the addition of a small porch in the Ionic order; the new furnishings also included a fountain and a monumental exedra.⁴⁵ The restoration decree may itself have given some attention to the Agora in the refurbishment of civic shrine of the “Hero Strategos,” if this is to be identified with the ancient Strategion in the far southwest corner of the Agora.⁴⁶

Not neglected in the period’s revitalization efforts was the “Old Agora” of Athens, situated below the eastern slope of the Akropolis. In that hallowed location the venerable Prytaneion, the office of the board of archons and the setting for the city’s public hearth

⁴² B. Wesenberg, “Augustusforum und Akropolis”, *JDAI* 99 (1984) 161-185.

⁴³ As recorded in *SEG* 30 (1980) no. 99, the honorific decree awarded by the *genos* to its benefactor (name and position lost); see also the new membership list of the Amynandridai in *IG II²* 2338. Particularly active among the *gennetai* were the archon of 19/18 B.C., Areios of Paania, and the priest of the eponymous Kekrops, Ariston of Athmonon (also known in *Agora* XV no. 292b ll. 36-42 [B.D. Benjamin and J.S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora*, XV. *The Athenian Councilors* (Princeton 1974)] = *SEG* 28 [1978] no. 161). The surviving membership list was evidently only inscribed in a later period, when it served as the cap-stone of the southern entrance-way into Kekropeion; reconstructed in J.M. Paton, *The Erechtheum* (Cambridge, MA 1927) 127-137, with fig. 84.

⁴⁴ As attested in the special posthumous honors awarded to the generous prytany treasurer in *Agora* XV no. 295 ll. 4-6; from *SEG* 25 (1971) no. 134 (= *Hesp.* 37 [1968] 278-279 no. 16, ed. B. D. Meritt). Such observances to the deities of “good counsel” are last attested in the 50s B.C.; in *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 63-64 nos. 16 and 17 (no. 16 now *SEG* 33 [1983] no. 198). In the reign of Tiberius, the dowager empress Livia (as Julia Sebaste) would be honored as Hestia Boulaia: *SEG* 22 (1967) no. 152; as restored in Schmalz (note 22) under no. 135.

⁴⁵ H.A. Thompson, *The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors* (*Hesperia Suppl.* 4 Princeton 1940) 56-57, 87-88, 119-121, and 136; see also briefly in *Agora* XIV 46 (H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, XIV. *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center* [Princeton 1972]). A date for the building project in the years immediately after ca. 20/19 B.C. is indicated by the discovery of a small assemblage of final-issue Athenian “New Style” (IVD) coinage, which has been connected with the imperial visit of 19 B.C.; see J.H. Kroll, “Two Hoards of Athenian Bronze Coins”, *ArchDelt* 27 (1972) 100-101.

⁴⁶ Cited in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 53, as possibly identified with the Agora’s Strategion; cf. Wycherley (note 3) 290-291; also, D. J. Geagan, “Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture I. 86 B.C.-A.D. 267”, *ANRW* 2.17.1, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin 1979) 381.

of Hestia, was restored in some measure in this period. This restoration work evidently inspired the dedication of a new series of commemorated plaques by the city's board of archons; and by the later Augustan period the Prytaneion was again a popular setting for the display of honorific statues awarded to civic benefactors, including the rededicated images of Miltiades and Themistokles.⁴⁷ Meanwhile on the south slope of the Akropolis, the rejuvenated health of Athens is also veritably reflected in the new prominence enjoyed by the City Asklepieion, following the construction of a new stoa for the sanctuary (dedicated to Augustus, as well as Asklepios and Hygeia). Soon after ca. 20 B.C. the cult's annual priesthood was transformed into a life-long office.⁴⁸ The Asklepieion, in its proximity to the Theater of Dionysos, would remain an elite setting for commemorative dedications into the 2nd century A.D.⁴⁹

From this period there is even a rare record of the city's celebration of its three principal civic festivals, the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, and the Eleusinia.⁵⁰ The City Dionysia is also attested from the early 20s B.C., when the prize-winning poet, Thrasykles (III) of Lakiadai, received public acclaim at Delphi.⁵¹ This poet also participated in the lavish new staging of the ancient Pythian procession to Delphi, referred to in the surviving records as the *Dodekais*. Established in the first years of the principate and sponsored by the Athenian priest of Pythian Apollo, Eukles of Marathon, this *theoria* would appear to have been a "scaled-down" version of the old *Pythaides* (last attested some twenty years previously). The *Dodekais* was held on at least five occasions during the course of just over a decade.⁵² Significantly enough, these Delphic celebrations

⁴⁷ As reflected in the dedication *IG II²* 2877, offered by the *epimeletes* of the prytaneion (Theophilos of Halai); on the significance of the inscription, see G.C.R. Schmalz, "The Athenian Prytaneion Discovered?", *Hesperia* 75 (2006) 73-75 (and pp. 69-70 for the archon-lists). Statues of Roman-era benefactors: Pausanias (1.18.3), where the statues of Themistocles and Miltiades are described as having had their titles "changed to a Roman and a Thracian"; the former statue may well have been rededicated to G. Julius Nikanor, as the "New Themistokles", as suggested in L. Robert, "Deux poètes grecs à l'époque impériale", in *Stele: Tomos eis Mnemen for Nikolaou Kontoleontos*, ed. V. Labrinoudakes (Athens 1977) 15 note 46 (and earlier in *BE* [1962] 137).

⁴⁸ Life-long priesthood: Aleshire (note 23) 129 and 132. Stoa dedication in *IG II²* 3176; with remains published in F. Versakis, "Ἀρχιτεκτονικὰ μνημεῖα τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀσκληπείου", *ArchEphem* (1908) 277-280; also, *idem*, "Τοῦ Ἀθήνησιν Ἀσκληπείου οἰκήματα", *ArchEphem* (1913) 69-70. Subsequent monumental dedications: cf. *IG II²* 4308 and 3181 (latter a dedication to Tiberius as "Caesar"). The sanctuary had received extensive repairs in the third quarter of the 1st century B.C., as carried out in the priesthoods of Socrates and Diokles of Kephisia, as recorded in *IG II²* 4464 and 1046, respectively; with building-dedication *IG II²* 3174, as re-dated in S. Follet, "Contribution à la chronologie attique du premier siècle de notre ère", in *The Greek Renaissance*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron (*BICS Suppl.* 55, London 1989) 43-44 (with notice in *SEG* 39 [1989] no. 212).

⁴⁹ See D.J. Geagan, "The Serapion Monument and the Quest for Status in Roman Athens", *ZPE* 85 (1991) esp. 154-155.

⁵⁰ In the ephebic inscription *IG II²* 1040 (+ 1051 = *SEG* 22 [1967] no. 111), from the archonship of Apolexis (II) *Apellikontos* of Oion (ca. 20 B.C.); for the revised date, see Kallet-Marx and Stroud (note 23) 178-181; also, D.J. Geagan, "The Third Hoplite Generalship of Antipatros of Phlya", *AJP* 100 (1979) 66-67.

⁵¹ Honored in *F.Delphes* III.2 no. 67 (= *Syll.*³ 772); in response to the poet's symbolic gift of his victory crown to the Delphians.

⁵² The records of these celebrations were inscribed on the south wall of the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, in *F.Delphes* III.2 nos. 59-64; initially published and studied in G. Colin, "Inscriptions de Delphes: la Théorie athénienne à Delphes", *BCH* 30 (1906) 306-321; see also Graindor (note 29) 139-147. The chronological span of the *dodekais* was evidently much shorter than conventionally understood, lasting only

represent a rare point of religious continuity between the pre- and post-Actian eras, for Eukles of Marathon had sponsored two similar *theoria* at Delphi in the 30s B.C., for the Pythia festival of 38/37 B.C. and perhaps that of 34/33 B.C.⁵³

Perhaps the most dramatic cult measure of the period remains the city's decision to transfer to the Agora the Persian-Wars cult of Ares and Athena Areia in the deme of Acharnai. A suitably impressive shrine for the newly centralized cult was found in the abandoned 5th-century temple of Athena Pallenis, which was transported from the deme of Pallene (modern Stavros) and carefully re-erected on the north side of the Agora, directly below its "sister-temple" the Hephaisteion.⁵⁴ A new entablature and roof were provided by salvaging the requisite material from the equally defunct temple of Poseidon at Sounion, one of the true gems of Classical Athenian architecture.⁵⁵ In the Lykourgan period the Persian-Wars symbolism of Acharnian Ares had been cultivated enough for the cult to become a civic concern in regard to the religious life of the city's ephebic corps, as reflected in the grand new altar that was jointly consecrated in the sanctuary by the deme and the city. This 4th-century altar would appear to have been transplanted to the Agora together with the cult.⁵⁶ Hence one of the principal functions of the new Agora cult must have been its inclusion in the ritual tour of the city's *ephebeia*. Importantly, the setting of the temple, at the turn of the Panathenaic Way, had long served as rather

from ca. 30/29-17/16 B.C., for the "late" records are earlier than supposed: that in *F.Delphes* III.2 no. 64 should belong to the early Augustan archonship of Nikostratos (rather than a spurious son; cf. *IG II²* 1727, as redated in J.S. Traill, "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora", *Hesperia* 47 [1978] 294, under line 30); that from the archonship of Apolexis (III) *Philokratous* of Oion (in *F.Delphes* III.2 no. 63) should date to shortly after 20 B.C. (cf. Kallet-Marx and Stroud [note 23] 179); and the *dodekais* dated to 11/10 B.C. actually belongs to the 20s B.C. (the *floruit* of the eponymous archon Theophilos of Halai in *F.Delphes* III.2 no. 62, who should be distinguished from the archon Theophilos of 11/10 B.C., as attested in *IG II²* 1713 l. 31 [probably instead Theophilos of Besa]). A shorter chronology is also preferable in view of the consistent participation throughout of the same chief religious officials; such continuity would be unlikely over the course of four decades, as the conventional chronology has it.

⁵³ See Colin (note 52) 303-305 no. 55 (*theoria* I of 38/37 B.C.), coinciding with the Athenian residence of Marcus Antonius and Octavia, and 305-306 no. 56 (*theoria* II, dated to 32/1 B.C.).

⁵⁴ As identified through the testimony of Pausanias (1.8.4); evaluated in E. Vanderpool, "The Route of Pausanias in the Athenian Agora", *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 132. For the original location and identity of the temple, recently discovered in modern village of Stavros, see M. Korres, "Από τον Σταύρο στην Αγορά", *Horos* 10-12 (1992-1998) 83-104; with a nice catalogue entry in H.R. Goette, *Athens, Attica and the Megarid. An Archaeological Guide* (London and New York 2001) 81. For the temple's original setting, see also H.R. Goette, "Athena Pallenis und ihre Beziehungen zu Akropolis von Athens", in *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis. Internationales Symposium Berlin vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, ed. W. Hoepfner (Berlin 1997) esp. 119-126 (also published in *Horos* 10-12 [1992-1998] 105-118). The connection between the cult of Ares at Acharnai and the Persian Wars is reflected in the so-called Oath of Plataea, an inscribed copy of which was dedicated in the Ares sanctuary by the cult's priest; see P. Siewert, "The Ephebic Oath in Fifth-Century Athens", *JHS* 97 (1977) 102-111; see also W.R. Conner, "'Sacred' and 'Secular': Ιερά καὶ θαυμά and the Classical Athenian Concept of the State", *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 168.

⁵⁵ For the Ares temple and its historical setting, see H.A. Thompson, "Athens Faces Adversity", *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 352-353. The temple's remains, including its altar, are published in W.B. Dinsmoor Sr., "The Temple of Ares at Athens", *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 1-52; with repairs made from the Poseidon temple, in W.B. Dinsmoor Jr., "The Temple of Poseidon: A Missing Sima and Other Matters", *AJA* 78 (1974) 233-237.

⁵⁶ See K.J. Hartwick, "The Ares Borghese Reconsidered", *Revue Archéologique* (N.S.) 10 (1990) 262-263. The epigraphic evidence for the Lykourgan altar is treated in L. Robert, *Études Épigraphiques et Philologiques* (Paris 1938) 293-295; two separate altars are attributed in G. Daux, "Deux stèles d'Acharnes", in *Χαριστήριον εἰς Αναστάσιον Κ. Όρλανδον*, ed. F. Kontoglou (Athens 1965) 78-84.

hallowed ground, as the site of the cult monument of the “Tyrannicides” Harmodios and Aristogeiton (both the original statues by Antenor, recovered in Alexander’s conquest of Persia, and the copies of Kritias). The cult of Harmodios and Aristogeiton is, incidentally, relevant to the work of the restoration decree: in the Augustan period it was associated with Delphic consultations concerning the agricultural exploitation of the sacred plain of Thria, neighboring Eleusis.⁵⁷ According to Pausanias a statue of Ares by Alkamenes was placed in the new sanctuary, together with one of Athena (also statues of Aphrodite and Enyo). A deliberate air of cultural venerability was given to the cult in the cluster of historic statues that stood around the new sanctuary, including images of Theseus and Demosthenes.⁵⁸ It may well be that the Ares cult in the Agora was integrated into two festivals commemorative of the Persian Wars, the *Charisteria* for Artemis Agrotera and the *Boedromia* for Apollo; both featured sacrificial offerings to Ares, as supervised by the city’s polemarch, and included the participation of the ephebic corps after their ‘Plataean’ oath.⁵⁹

Inspiration for the siting of the Ares temple was also likely drawn from the grand odeion that Marcus Agrippa built for the Athenians on the southern flank of the Agora during his Eastern *imperium* (16-13 B.C.).⁶⁰ The two structures combined in a deliberate formal relationship, as well as a stylistic and historical contrast, to fill the center of the Agora as a new cultural center.⁶¹ Although it has very much become the fashion to characterize the “monumentalization” of the Athenian Agora in this period as an architectural process of “Romanization”,⁶² an essential Hellenistic ideal of civic prosperity is as likely at issue: materially reflected in the *eueteria* or “good condition” of a town’s public center, as embodied in the concept of “an agora full of good things (*agatha*)”.⁶³

The ancient Acharnian involvement in the cult of Athena Pallenis (as ritual *parasites*) presumably helped to influence the selection of the Pellene temple, which remained dedicated to Athena as well as Ares.⁶⁴ The new Agora cult was evidently

⁵⁷ See Graindor (note 29) 147; initially in *idem, Album d’Inscriptions Attiques d’Époque Impériale* (Ghent 1924) 14 no. 7.

⁵⁸ Pausanias 1.8.4-5: around “the temple stand images of Heracles, Theseus, Apollo binding his hair with a fillet, and statues of Calades, who it is said framed laws for the Athenians, and of Pindar, the statue being one of the rewards the Athenians gave him for praising them in an ode”.

⁵⁹ For the *Charisteria* (on 6 Boedromion), see Plutarch, *Moralia* 862a; with reconstruction of rites in E. Simon, *The Festivals of Attica. An Archaeological Commentary* (Madison 1983) 82-83. *Boedromia* (7 Boedromion): [Aristotle], *AthPol* 58.1, and Plutarch, *Camillus* 19.6; for its possible association with the Ares cult, see N.D. Robertson, “The Ritual Background of the Erysichthon Story”, *AJP* 105 (1984) 392-393.

⁶⁰ Published in magisterial fashion in H.A. Thompson, “The Odeion in the Athenian Agora”, *Hesperia* 19 (1950) 31-141; succinctly treated in *Agora* XIV 112-114.

⁶¹ Hence the conventional date of ca. 15-10 B.C. for the dedication of the Ares Temple; see *Agora* XIV 162. It is not impossible, however, that the Ares temple was actually erected before the Odeion of Agrippa.

⁶² With Athens as a civic monument to be annexed by Rome: S. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993) 196-197; while in Shear Jr. (note 22) 361-362 the Agora is portrayed as exhibiting a “museum quality”, with Agrippa’s Odeion as “a monument to a city where sophists and philosophers had replaced generals and orators as the most notable citizens”.

⁶³ See R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford 1996) 356, with note 3.

⁶⁴ As part of the religious *koinon* that administered the Pallene cult; see R. Schlaifer, “The Cult of Athena Pallenis (Athenaeus VI 234-235)”, *HSCP* 54 (1943) 35-67; for the *koinon*, cf. also *idem*, “The Attic

administered by the *koinon* of Acharnai, perhaps a contemporary institution, which upon the consecration of the sanctuary (or soon thereafter) dedicated a thank-offering to both Ares and the emperor Augustus.⁶⁵ This dedication has naturally suggested to scholars that the new cult was created to resonate with the recent Persian-Wars propaganda that the princeps had carefully generated around his diplomatic triumph over the kingdom of Parthia in 20 B.C.⁶⁶ Achieved under the divine favor of Mars the “Avenger” (Ultor), this event was celebrated throughout the Greek world as a “victory” over the barbarian east.⁶⁷ In Athens the imperial achievement was appropriately commemorated within the city’s cultural experience of the ancient Persian Wars, in the dedication of a temple to the goddess Roma and the emperor Augustus on the Acropolis sited in front of the greatest of all Persian War monuments, the Parthenon.⁶⁸ Visiting Athens in the summer of 19 B.C. the emperor evidently reciprocated in the same historical vein by dedicating an elaborate victory tripod in the city’s great sanctuary of Zeus Olympios. This marble and bronze monument featured statues of bound Parthians as tripod-legs.⁶⁹ To

Association of the ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΟΙ”, *CP* 39 (1944) 23. The Pallene sanctuary is otherwise known from Hesychius, *s.v.* Παρθένου Παλληνίδος· ἵερὸν ... ἐν Παλληνίδι.

⁶⁵ Preserved in *IG II²* 2953; recording two “temple-keepers” (*zakoroi*) as well as the priest of the new cult. Most recently on the dedication, see A.J. Spawforth, “The Early Reception of the Imperial Cult in Athens: Problems and Ambiguities”, in *The Romanization of Athens*, eds. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff (Oxbow Monograph 94, Oxford 1997) 186-188; with notice in *AE* (1998) 1266.

⁶⁶ The perceived imperial connection was first made in R.E. Raubitschek, “Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar”, *JRS* 44 (1954) 75; most recently, see T. Schäfer, “Spolia et signa. Baupolitik und Reichskultur nach dem Parthererfolg des Augustus”, *Nachrichten der Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 2 (1998) 46-123; with the Ares temple attributed as a benefaction of Augustus. Previously, scholars have frequently drawn a connection between the new cult and the Parthian campaign of Gaius Caesar, which Augustus promoted as a ‘sequel’ to his own achievement, with the young prince cast in the role of Mars Ultor: for Gaius was proclaimed the “New Ares” during his visit to the city in 1 B.C. (as recorded in his statue-base, in *IG II²* 3250; with improved transcription in *SEG* 21 [1965] no. 702). Thus G.W. Bowersock, “Augustus and the East: The Problem of Succession”, in *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, eds. F. Millar and E. Segal (Oxford 1984) 175-179, as orchestrated by G. Julius Nikanor; while in Hartswick (note 56) 268-270, the Ares temple is identified as the location for a posthumous cult to the prince. Similarly in Thompson (note 55) 353: “The cult of Gaius Caesar was apparently added to the original cult, and it may well be that Augustus himself was involved in the undertaking”.

⁶⁷ Celebrated by the princeps himself in his *Res Gestae* (29.2); see also Dio Cassius 54.8.1-3, including record of the great diplomatic fanfare that occurred during the subsequent imperial residence on Samos. For the ideology involved, see E.S. Gruen, “Augustus and the Ideology of War and Peace”, in *The Age of Augustus*, ed. R. Winkes (Providence 1985) 63-67; also, T.D. Barnes, “The Victories of Augustus”, *JRS* 64 (1974) 22. On the ideologically influence of the Roman cult of Mars generally on the Ares cult in Greece and Asia Minor, see M. Vollgraff, “Une offrande à Enyalios”, *BCH* 58 (1934) 153.

⁶⁸ For such an interpretation of the new temple, see Spawforth (note 18) 234-235. Cf. also A. Baldassarri, “Augustus *Soter*: ipotesi sul *monopteros* dell’Acropolis ateniese”, *Ostraka* 4.1 (1995) 69-84.

⁶⁹ As described by Pausanias (1.18.8); and convincingly dated, with analysis, in R.M. Schneider, *Bunte Barbaren. Orientalenstatuen aus farbigem Marmor in der römischen Repräsentationskunst* (Worms) 82 and 89-90; a similar monument was dedicated by Augustus in his new sanctuary of Apollo Palatinus, and the same iconography was employed by the emperor in his restoration of the Basilica Aemilia in the Roman Forum, with its sculpted colonnade of twenty-two marble Parthian warriors (Schneider, pp. 50-57, 78-82, and 115-125). Due to the monument’s location in the Olympieion, a Hadrianic date is conventionally assumed; see Spawforth (note 18) 239, with bibliography. The imperial visit of 19 B.C. is recorded in Dio Cassius 54.9.9-10; this may have been the occasion for the Apolline birthday-honors that were awarded to Augustus in the fragmentary decree *IG II²* 1071 (expanded as *SEG* 16 [1960] no. 34), as argued in Bernhardt (note 39) 237.

anticipate an item from the decree's catalogue of works, the historical resonance of the Persian Wars evidently helped to inform the city's decision to restore –as an historic symbol of the city's deliverance from foreign threat– a related monument on the Akropolis, the so-called Little Barbarians monument, which was erected (ca. 200 B.C.) by Attalos I of Pergamon to commemorate the defeat of Philip V of Macedon, after that king's devastating campaign against Athens.⁷⁰ The monument, which was erected in front of the Parthenon along the south wall of the Akropolis, took the statuary forms of a Gigantomachy, an Amazonomachy, a Persianomachy, and (innovatively) a “Galatomachy” (featuring the famous “Dying Gaul”); and so was clearly designed to portray the city's delivery from Philip as a new chapter in the enduring narrative of Hellenic triumph against the dark and uncivilized forces of the world, both mythological and historical. The Persian-Wars significance of the Parthenon itself would be “updated” during the reign Nero, in the famous “Parthenon Inscription”: an honorific inscription to the emperor that was awarded as a historicizing response to Rome's Armenian Wars and displayed in monumental bronze letters attached to the eastern architrave of the temple.⁷¹

That the important Attic cults of Sounion Poseidon and Athena Pallenis were in enough of a neglected state to allow for the recycling of their famous temples is a tragically eloquent illustration of the pressing necessity for the restoration decree. Famously, the great temple of Poseidon lost its identity to such an extent that Pausanias would later conflate it with the neighboring sanctuary of Athena, which evidently had also come to be abandoned and appears to have been moved to the Agora.⁷² The practical limitations and culturally selective scope of the restoration decree is perhaps most dramatically highlighted in the omission of two other Attic sanctuaries of comparable significance, that of Nemesis at Rhamnous and the *telesterion* of Demeter at Thorikos. The temple of Nemesis, another construction by the so-called Hesphaisteion Architect, was evidently in a poor state of condition at the time of the decree, for it was

⁷⁰ As restored in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121, ll. 25-27: [ἀναθήματα καὶ ἀγάλματα | τὰ ἀνατεθέντα ύπῳ Αττάλου βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τῆς | [πόλεως]. For the monument, its remains and historical significance, see A.F. Stewart, *Attalos, Athens, and the Akropolis: The Pergamene “Little Barbarians” and their Roman and Renaissance Legacy* (Cambridge 2004) 181-236, esp. 220-226 (historical context) and 226-228 (restoration decree and symbolism), with reconstruction drawings in p. 187 figs. 218 and 219 and pp. 194-195 fig. 227; the surviving remains of the four monument bases are published in an attached essay by Manolis Korres (“The Pedestals and the Akropolis South Wall”, pp. 242-287). The older view of the monument, that it commemorated solely Attalos' Galatian victory, is maintained in reference to the restoration decree in W. Ameling *et al.*, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil 1. Zeugnisse und Kommentare* (Berlin 1995) 60-61 no. 26a, with date of ca. 240 B.C.; the identification of the Attalid monument in the decree is treated with some skepticism in C. Habicht, “Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century B.C.”, *Hesperia* 59 (1990) 563, note 8.

⁷¹ *IG II²* 3277; with improved transcription in *SEG* 32 (1982) no. 251 (also *BE* [1983] no. 174), after K.K. Carroll *The Parthenon Inscription* (GRBS Monograph 9, Durham 1982) 16 (with date and historical context in pp. 27-28); working from the investigation of S. Dow, “Andrews of Cornell”, *Cornell Alumni News* 75.5 (1972) 13-21 (with notice in *BE* [1976] no. 204). Spawforth (note 18) 234-237 further explores the dedication's Persian-Wars symbolism.

⁷² Pausanias 1.1.1. Remains of the Athena Sounion temple in the Agora: in the series of Ionic columns found embedded in the Post-Herulian Wall, as published in W.B. Dinsmoor Jr., “Anchoring Two Floating Temples”, *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 429-431.

repaired (re-roofed) in the late Augustan period (ca. A.D. 4-10), when it was then re-dedicated to the empress Livia.⁷³ The fate of the Demeter temple was only decided in the 2nd century A.D., when it too was transplanted to the Agora, together with its cult-statue.⁷⁴

In Greece the Athenian restoration decree has as its most comparable contemporary a subscription undertaken by the local notables of Messene, together with the town's long-resident Roman merchants, for the repair and reconstruction of their town's civic buildings and shrines.⁷⁵ Unlike the Athenian decree, with its distinctly internalized and retrospective cultural discourse, the Messenian program was proclaimed as a tribute "to the Roman People and to Augustus Caesar." Such formal recognition of (and appeal to) the power of Rome was only natural in a region that featured not only the historical presence of Roman *negotatores* but also a certain number of imperial estates.⁷⁶ Elsewhere in the province, Augustan Sparta clearly benefited from close ties with the imperial house and the influence and wealth of its new dynast, G. Julius Eurykles. With such resources the city was able to cultivate a new urban image of its venerable Lykourgan traditions.⁷⁷ Argos also experienced the beginning of an

⁷³ Architrave dedication in *IG II²* 3242; with improved reading and transcription in *SEG* 39 (1989) no. 216, after V. Petrakos, "Η Ἐπιγραφική τοῦ Ὁρωποῦ καὶ τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος", *Praktika of the 8th Congress for Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Athens, 1983* (Athens 1984) 309-338. The inscription is re-treated in V. Petrakos, *Ο Δῆμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος: Σύνοψη τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν καὶ ἐρευνῶν* (1813-1998), II. Οἱ Ἐπιγραφὲς (Athens 1990) 123-124 no. 156. For the (new) date, see Schmalz (22) under no. 132 (*IG II²* 3242); also in F. Lozano, "Thea Livia in Athens: Redating *IG II²* 3242", *ZPE* 148 (2004) 177-180; also, C.B. Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (Cambridge 1997) 222 n. 112. The repairs to the temple are fully studied in M.M. Miles, "A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous", *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 131-249; with conventional Claudian date for the dedication (in pp. 235-239), despite the fact that the dedication is to Livia and not *Julia Sebaste* (post-14 A.D.), as well as the Augustan prosopography of the participating officials.

⁷⁴ As the so-called Southeast Temple: *Agora* XIV 167; the identification is doubted in Dinsmoor Jr. (note 72) 431-433, with preference for the so-called Ionic Temple (perhaps from the temple of Athena at Sounion) and re-dating of foundations to the first half of the 2nd century A.D. (from the ceramic evidence).

⁷⁵ The subscription inscription is now published as *SEG* 23 (1968) no. 207; also, cf. *BE* (1966) no. 200. But see the revised text and historical commentary in L. Migeotte "Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste", *BCH* 109 (1985) 597-607; a broad Augustan date is suggested, sometime after ca. 15 B.C. Excavators have begun to identify several of the structures mentioned in the subscription, such as the gymnasium, various stoas, the temple of Demeter, and the temple of Heracles and Hermes: see *SEG* 41 (1991) nos. 327 and 361 (dedication to Hermes) and no. 363 (architraval dedication to Heracles and to the city, from the gymnasium; cf. also *BE* [1994] no. 93).

⁷⁶ The tribute may well also have functioned as an attempt to exploit the heightening tensions between Augustus and Sparta, Messene's traditional antagonist: thus Bowersock (note 66) 174. For continued territorial rivalry into the reign of Tiberius, see Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.43.1-6; cf. also *SEG* 41 (1991) no. 328 of A.D. 14, recording a settlement over the contested territory of the Denthelatis. Imperial estates in Messenia: evidence in *IG V.1* 1432 and 1438; with A. Giovannini, *Rome et la Circulation Monétaire en Grèce au IIe siècle avant Jésus-Christ* (Basel 1978) 115-122. Messene also featured an imperial cult under Augustus; on which now see N. Deshous, "Cultes de Déméter, d'Artémis Ortheia et culte impérial à Messène (Ier s. av. notre ère – Ier s. de notre ère)", *ZPE* 146 (2004) 115-127.

⁷⁷ As treated and catalogued in Cartledge and Spawforth (note 29) 127-131 and 190-211, and App. I nos. 14 and 16 (for the construction of imperial shrines, the city theater, and perhaps a *marcellum* in the Augustan period); for this new urban "image of tradition", see also Alcock (note 4) 72-73. Sparta's *prytaneion* or "town-hall" may also have been restored in the Augustan period, for which see N.M. Kennell, "Where Was Sparta's Prytaneion?", *AJA* 91 (1987) 421-422.

architectural specialization of civic space, which would only culminate in the second century A.D. Significantly, throughout this long period of urban development the Argives would make consistent use of their own epic traditions (involving particularly Perseus and the Temenids) to create a rich “mythological topography.”⁷⁸ As a general cultural trend under the empire, the Dorian states of Greece made a consistent and systematic effort to promote their ancient *eugenia* and ethnic primacy as the proud heirs of a Heraclid legacy.⁷⁹

For so many other Greek cities, particularly those of Asia Minor, the revival of neglected cult traditions was of paramount concern from the Augustan period onward. Sometimes combined with major building projects, these restoration programs characteristically emphasized the evocation of local history (both real and imagined) and a venerable mythic past.⁸⁰ The difficult proconsular inscription from Cyme in Asia Minor (from the 20s B.C.), which cites an edict of Augustus and Agrippa for the restoration of sacred property, demonstrates an imperial interest in the re-assertion of civic traditionalism, which tended to reinforce social conservatism and communal stability.⁸¹ Similarly at Ephesus the princeps provided for the use of temple revenues from the great cult of Aphrodite to fund a series of restoration projects in the city.⁸² The city’s prytaneion appears to have been one of the beneficiaries, with an expansion of its cult-life.⁸³

THE PRACTICAL FUNCTION & CULTURAL MEANING OF THE RESTORATION DECREE

As the presiding hoplite general Metrodoros of Phyle officiated over the formulation and implementation of the restoration decree. Two copies of the decree

⁷⁸ See P. Marchetti and Y. Rizakis, “Recherches sur les mythes et la topographie d’Argos IV. L’Agora revisitée”, *BCH* 119 (1995) 439-440 and 458-460.

⁷⁹ As compellingly studied in Y. Lafond, “Le myth, référence identitaire pour les cités grecques d’époque impériale. L’exemple du Péloponnèse”, *Kernos* 18 (2005) 329-346 (esp. pp. 340-345, “Les cultes et l’identité civique”).

⁸⁰ See the brief examples presented in Hotz (note 21) 283-286, and 286-287 for the various causes of civic neglect. For their traditionalist aspect, see Alcock (note 4) 72 and 94-95 (for Asia Minor); with excellent case studies offered in P. Gros, “Les nouveaux espaces civiques du début de l’Empire en Asie Mineure: les exemples d’Ephèse, Iasos et Aphrodisias”, in *Aphrodisias Papers 3. The Setting and Quarries, Mythological and Other Sculptural Decoration, Architectural Development, Portico of Tiberius, and Tetrapylon*, eds. C. Roueché and R.R.R. Smith (*JRA Suppl.* 20, Ann Arbor 1996) 111-120.

⁸¹ Now published as *I. Kyme* no. 13 (H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Kyme* [IGSK 5, Bonn 1976] = *AE* [1979] 596); also, see P. Scherrer, “Augustus, die Mission des Vedius Pollio und die Artemis Ephesia”, *JÖAI* 60 (1990) 87-101. The bibliography on this inscription is large, but see also F. Millar, “The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces”, *JRS* (1966) 161 and *idem, The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.-A.D. 337)* (London 1977) 317-318; J.-M. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (BEFAR 253, Rome 1984) 427-431; also, S. Mitchell, “Imperial Building in the Eastern Provinces”, *HSCP* 91 (1987) 343.

⁸² The funds were used to restore, for example, the central Embolos Street; see G. Alfödy, “Epigraphische Notizen aus Kleinasiens I. Ein beneficium des Augustus in Ephesos”, *ZPE* 87 (1991) esp. 161-162 (with notice in *SEG* 41 [1991] no. 971). Generally on Augustan Ephesus, see W. Alzinger, *Augustische Architektur in Ephesos* (Vienna 1974) esp. 9-37; for the princeps’ involvement, cf. also D. Kienast, *Augustus: Princeps und Monarch* (Darmstadt 1982) 357 and 359-360.

⁸³ See R. Merkelbach, “Der Kult der Hestia im Prytaneion der griechischen Städte”, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 77-92, including a new cult to *Thea Roma*.

were erected, one (the surviving inscription) on the Akropolis and the other in the sanctuary of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in the Piraeus, whose cult gained prominence under Lykourgos.⁸⁴ As inscribed, the restoration decree is actually a compilation of three related documents. The first two are successive decrees passed by the Athenian assembly, with one confirming the initial resolution by a balloted vote (3,461 for the measure and 155 against, recorded in an archaic numbering system),⁸⁵ while the other records its implementation.⁸⁶ The third and longest preserved document is the catalogue of restoration work, listing the shrines, precincts, and various types of public properties restored during the tenures of Metrodoros and Mantias.⁸⁷ Some eighty sites were originally catalogued in all. Although Athens is given pride of place (at the very end), the preponderance of the sites preserved in the decree are situated outside the city, particularly on the island of Salamis or in the Piraeus, with an additional (small) scattering in central Attica. Appointed to oversee the project, publish a financial account of it, and ensure its prolonged impact was the city's board of religious officials. The hoplite general and the archon *basileus* were charged not only with supervising the work of restoration, but also with the offering of propitiatory sacrifices at each of the recovered shrines, in a customary manner "pleasing to each of the gods and heroes". There was also the treasurer of the "sacred funds", responsible for both the purchasing of the victims required for the propitiatory sacrifices and publishing the inscribed record of the decree and its restoration work; and one (or both) of the city's two religious experts (the *exegetai*), who were charged with determining the proper rituals for the cleansing and re-consecration of each of the restored shrines. The *exegetai* were probably Polykritos of Azenia and Diotimos of Halai; the latter also served as the priest of the Bouzygos and Zeus in the Palladion.⁸⁸

Taken at face value the magnitude of the restoration decree is immense, even though in many instances it merely entailed the re-establishment of property boundaries that had been encumbered by private encroachment and disputed leasing records. It remains unclear just how much building-work was commissioned by the restoration program. Presumably much of the construction entailed was relatively minor in scale,

⁸⁴ On the cult of Zeus Soter, see Humphreys (note 20) 210; with Pausanias 1.1.3.

⁸⁵ *IG II²* 1035 l. 3. Such voting figures in Athenian inscriptions appear to be characteristic of the later 1st century B.C., perhaps even specifically Augustan; cf. *IG II²* 1051c ll. 26-27 (now *Agora XVI* no. 335; after *SEG* 24 [1969] no. 14); *IG II²* 1053 ll. 11-13; 1343 ll. 44-46; 1353 ll. 5-6. See P.J. Rhodes, "Notes on Voting in Athens", *GRBS* 22 (1981) 125-126 (with outmoded dates), where the use of the ballot is thought to imply a quorum requirement. On the archaic use of acrophonic numerals, see M.N. Tod, in *ABSA* 18 (1913) 128-129; with another Augustan example in *IG II²* 1052 (l. 11).

⁸⁶ See analysis in Culley (note 2) 282-291. *IG II²* 1035 ll. 1-2a (first decree); ll. 3-28 (second decree).

⁸⁷ Catalogue in *IG II²* 1035 ll. 29-59.

⁸⁸ *IG II²* 1035 ll. 11-14; on the functions of these officials, see D.J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla* (*Hesperia Suppl.* 12, Princeton 1967) 10-11, 29, 113-114. Culley restores only one *exegetes* in the inscription (ll. 11-12), even though they normally worked together (cf. *F.Delphes* III.2 nos. 59-64); the Augustan *exegetai*, at least down to ca. 17 B.C., were Polykritos of Azenia and Diotimos of Halai (as recorded in the same *F.Delphes* reference). On the "treasurer of the sacred *diataxis*", cf. A.S. Henry, "Athenian Financial Officers after 303 B.C.", *Chiron* 14 (1984) 86 with n. 189 (also, cf. p. 90); though it can now be shown that this office continued into the 1st century A.D. (e.g., in *Agora XV* no. 307 ll. 15ff.). From the first generalship of Antipatros of Phlya, ca. 29/28 B.C., there is the treasurer Alexandros of Eupyridai (in *Agora XV* no. 287 ll. 16-21).

such as the repair of the starting cables in the 300 year-old Panathenaic Stadium. Likely the most common jobs involved small renovations to such key sacred monuments as altars, together with the rather painstaking sculptural task of restoring various religious dedications, including those cited from the sanctuary of Asklepios in the Piraeus and the great sculpture-groups dedicated on the Akropolis by Attalos II. Yet, as noted in the introduction, the sheer scope and relatively compressed timeframe of the decree's provisions would certainly have required a significant financial outlay by the city.⁸⁹ Also to be taken into consideration are the numerous blood sacrifices (presumably in the form of purifying piglets) required to ritually cleanse all of the sacred sites, as determined by the participating *exegetai*.⁹⁰ Above all there would be the projected costs related to the collective revival of Attic cult-life that represented the ultimate mandate of the restoration decree.

To a certain extent, however, the restoration program was evidently designed to help pay for itself. Hence the decree makes provision for the production of public revenues through a systematic reorganization of state-sanctioned leases for sacred and public properties. These new sacred revenues could then serve as an endowment, administrated by the city's treasurers of the "sacred funds", to maintain the cult-life of the shrines restored by the decree.⁹¹ Instrumental in this new administrative structure was the archon *basileus*. As the city's traditional leasing authority (since most public properties belonged to the city's deities), that sacred official would have overseen the modification of leasing procedures, including a new policy of four-year contracts (as opposed to the old decennial system) which allowed for closer state supervision.⁹²

This restrictive leasing policy may have remained in force at least throughout the rest of the Augustan period, as is attested in the fragmentary statute of Nikanor's Salamis benefaction. The actual extent of these rental properties should not be exaggerated, however, since some kind of compromise was probably reached with the larger private landowners (perhaps representing the decree's dissenters) to encourage their co-operation, perhaps by restricting the amount (or condition) of public property illegally held that was to be returned to state control.⁹³ Marginal lands (*eschatia*), such as the

⁸⁹ By the standards of the Messenian program, at least, the expense of the Athenian program could have entailed something on the order of 40,000 denarii (HS 160,000) –comparable in cost to the most expensive urbanization programs known from North Africa; cf. Migeotte (note 75) 604 and 606, who also draws attention to the use of the Roman standard. The Athenian figure is derived from the number of restored sites, about eighty in all, multiplied by the average cost per Messenian site of 524 denarii.

⁹⁰ "Cleansing" the miasma of polluted sites: as partially restored in *IG II²* 1035 ll. 11-13.

⁹¹ For such a model of restoration and endowment, see the Hellenistic case-study of Carian Mylasa in B. Dignas, "The Leases of Sacred Property at Mylasa: An Alimentary Scheme for the Gods", *Kernos* 13 (2000) esp. 122-126.

⁹² See Culley (note 2) 288-289. Generally on public leasing in Classical and Hellenistic Athens, see R. Osborne, "Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece", *Chiron* 18 (1988) esp. 281-292; with Humphreys (note 20) 204-205 and 213-214 on the "Lykourgan" reforms. Cf. also M.B. Walbank, "Leases of Sacred Properties in Attica, Parts I-IV", *Hesperia* 52 (1983) 216-217 and 225-226 for the *basileus'* probable role in the great leases of 340-330 B.C.

⁹³ On the need for the co-operation of the landowning elite in the reclamation of sacred property, see Dignas (note 91) 121 and 125. This state of affairs stands in contrast to the conditions of Attic landholding in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.; as observed in Culley (note 2) 289 with n. 26: a period when "vast amounts of land had reverted to the state and the problem was how to get some of it under cultivation".

mountain pastures of Hymettos (historically renowned for its honey), would naturally have remained relatively unencumbered, and so less disputed; and were evidently more easily restored to open grazing and wood-gathering. Nonetheless, the sudden availability for cultivation of such prime and centrally-located sacred lands (*temene*) –always in demand by the wealthiest and more status-conscious– may have had important social implications, especially since the short-term nature of the new leases would have required the possession of immediate and substantial capital. In disputed cases, at least, the reclaimed lands could have simply been leased out to their previous owners. In traditional Greek society the leasing of such public and corporate property often had a noticeably conservative affect on local communities, strengthening and further defining the inherent bonds within the ruling and landed elite.⁹⁴

Turning now to the work of the decree, the catalogue of restored sites is divided into three distinct geographic sections. Taking a rather outside-in approach, the extra-territorial island of Salamis is recorded first, followed by the neighboring Piraeus with its mass of public spaces and properties. Then reaching into the historic core of the ancient state, Athens and central Attika take pride of place at the end of the catalogue, with the sites of the city itself largely serving as the venerable conclusion of the record of restoration work.⁹⁵

The initiating position given to Salamis is probably due to the fact that historically the island did not belong to the political territory of Attica.⁹⁶ Yet a privileging of Salamis may also be intended, in light of the great historical importance that Salamis still held for the Athenians. Under the empire the island remained a potent symbol not only of the city's cultural virtues in the historic defeat of Persia at the Battle of Salamis, but also of Athens' earliest territorial identity and hegemonic ambitions in relation to neighboring Megara and the strategic resources of the Saronic Gulf. At the time of the Athenian restoration decree, so many centuries later, the city's mytho-historical claims over the

⁹⁴ Thus Osborne (note 92) esp. 289-292.

⁹⁵ *IG II²* 1035 l. 30, κατ[έστη]σεν: Salamis (ll. 31-35); Piraeus (ll. 36-47); Athens and Attika (ll. 48-59). For the purpose of analysis Culley (note 2) 286-287 divides the final section into Athens sites and Attic sites, although there is significant overlap between them: “environs” (in ll. 48-51, with two urban sites included, in the Panathenaic Stadium and the Hyakinthion), also, “Athens” (in ll. 52-57, with two sites on Mt. Hymettos included); with an addendum following (ll. 58-59).

⁹⁶ On the unusual and still problematic status of Salamis, as an “unofficial deme” of Attica, see M.C. Taylor, *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos* (Archaia Hellas 5, Amsterdam 1997) 11-12 and esp. 74-95 (in context of the Kleisthenic reforms and subsequent status of the island's Athenian inhabitants). See also R. Osborne, “Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the Politics of Sacred Space in Archaic Attica”, in *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, eds. S.E. Alcock and R. Osborne (Oxford 1994) 155-159. Not at issue here is the *genos Salaminioi*: whatever its origins, the *genos* clearly had no material connection to Salamis, although it did administer the cult of Ajax's son Eurysakes (in Melite), as well as that of the Phaleron cult of Skiros and Athena Skiras; see most recently Parker (note 63) 308-316, *s.v.* Salaminioi (esp. p. 312); also, Taylor pp. 59-61 (endorsing the non-Salaminian view in W.S. Ferguson, “The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion”, *Hesperia* 7 [1938] 16-17). There are also new advocates for the old ‘Salaminian’ view of the *genos*, despite the lack of any significant link attested between that clan and the island: S.D. Lambert, “The Attic Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis”, *ZPE* 119 (1997) esp. 97-104, with the *genos* representing Athenian settlers on the island in the 6th c. B.C.; also, M.-L. L'Homme-Wery, “Les héros de Salamine en Attique. Cultes, mythes et intégration politique”, in *Héros et Héroïnes en Grèce ancienne*, eds. V. Pirenne-Delforge and E. Suarez (*Kernos Suppl.* 10, 2000) 333-349, arguing for the Attic integration of Salaminian families and cults in the period of Solon.

neighboring island of Salamis remained a vital civic concern. As late as the 2nd century A.D. such ancient territorial grievances against Athens caused Megara to exclude all Athenians from participating in their Pythian games; the matter was only resolved by the persuasive ability of a visiting sophist of Megaran descent.⁹⁷ At the same time, certain leading families of Athens asserted genealogical claims on the island's great Homeric hero, Ajax.⁹⁸ These twin historical aspects of Salamis, which were both still celebrated in state festivals, are equally addressed in the work of the restoration decree.

A number of the island's sacred sites belonged historically to the “unofficial *demos*” of Salamis.⁹⁹ Upon the conclusion of the turbulent period of Macedonian domination in the 3rd century B.C., the Salaminians engaged in a determined effort to revive their island's civic and religious life, with the active participation of the city of Athens.¹⁰⁰ A similar recovery does not appear to have occurred, however, after the upheavals of the Mithridatic Wars in the early 1st century B.C. Neither the island nor its community are afterward attested¹⁰¹ –not until the work of the restoration decree. The work of the restoration decree therefore represents something of a ritualized annexation of the island by the state of Athens.

The decree makes quite remarkable use of the city's ancient claims on Salamis, which were both heroic and historical in character. Indeed this enduring narrative of territorial authority frames the record of restoration work on the island, which begins with an assertion of a sacred entitlement to the island and then nearly concludes with a site associated with the long conflict with Megara over Salamis that took place six centuries earlier. Positioned between these two references is the record of most of the restoration work, which addressed various sites in Salamis-town and the memorials of the Battle of Salamis on the Kynosaura peninsula. Altogether the Salamis catalogue, with its veritable “constellation” of sacred and historical monuments, represents a compelling example of the cultural process in which “monuments feed off the associations, not only of places, but also of other monuments”.¹⁰² To judge from the preserved catalogue the important shrines of Artemis, located in the ancient town, and of Athena Skiras (on the

⁹⁷ As recorded in Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 1.24.3 (the sophist Marcus of Byzantium, and therefore an ancient kinsman of the Megarans); on this incident, see Jones (note 10) 117, as representative of kinship diplomacy in the 2nd century A.D., when “quarrels over rights and titles... often could be settled only by the emperor or senate”.

⁹⁸ Thus, for example, the millionaire Herodes-Eukles family of Marathon claimed descent from the Aiakidai, the descendants of Ajax, through the Philaid family of Kimon and Miltiades (according to Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 2.1.545-546).

⁹⁹ On the island's corporate landholdings, including sacred properties and their financial interests, see Taylor (note 96) 180-188; largely under the administration of the Salaminian archon.

¹⁰⁰ On the cult-life of the island in the 2nd century B.C., see Mikalson (note 5) 183-184; the cult of Demokratia, for example, was likely introduced soon after the city's recovery of the island in the 229 B.C. A revised analysis of Salamis' experience of Macedonian rule is offered in Taylor (note 96) 215-233, with a substantial continuity in the population of the island.

¹⁰¹ The *demos* of Salamis last appears in the record of the *ephebeia* of 107/6 B.C. (*IG II² 1011 l. 16*).

¹⁰² Thus R. Bradley, *Altering the Earth: The Origins of Monuments in Britain and Continental Europe* (Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph Series 8, Edinburgh 1993) 129; also, cf. Alcock (note 4) 54 and 82-83 (for the concept of monumental “constellations”).

Skiradion headland north of the town) were not included in the restoration program.¹⁰³

The Salamis catalogue begins with the fragmentary reference to a subject, perhaps the island itself as an Athenian entitlement, that “has belonged (pertained) to the city, (as) previously sanctified by the founder of the island”.¹⁰⁴ The founder in question should probably be the island’s eponymous hero Skiros, who (in the Attic tradition) first unified Salamis as a heroic kingdom. There was also the earlier figure of Kychreus, son of Poseidon and the divine personification of Salamis. The island’s ancient town, which was situated on a hill overlooking the bay of Ambelakia (close to the modern town of the same name), was therefore known as both Kychreia and Skiras, with the former name adopted in the decree.¹⁰⁵ Kychreus remained significant to Athens for his storied intervention at the Battle of Salamis, where he fulfilled a Delphic prophecy by assisting the Athenians in his native form as a snake-figure. Athens subsequently founded a cult on Salamis in the hero’s honor.¹⁰⁶ The shrine of Kychreus could then possibly be the subject of the sentence, as located (in the following line) “where the ancient city called Kychreia lies”.¹⁰⁷ Yet Skiros would then have to be identified as the original “sanctifier” of the cult, and this is unlikely since the two ancient heroes evidently had very little relationship with each other, at least in the Attic tradition.

In any event, it is probably incorrect to construe the text here as a notice of any particular work of restoration on the island, for that record would appear to begin only in the following line, in reference to the sites of Kychreia (“Salamis-town”). A broader, more symbolic kind of foundation or entitlement appears to be at issue, so that the initial sentence of the Salamis catalogue likely serves instead as a prefatory declaration of the city’s reassertion of its ancestral claim to the island. The same proprietary formula is attested in other restoration decrees, particularly those related to the revival of civic prerogatives and religious festivals.¹⁰⁸ If the statement is implicitly grounded in the

¹⁰³ For these two shrines, see Goette (note 54) 299 and 300; the Artemis sanctuary is known from Pausanias and inscriptions from the area of the ancient town, while architectural remains of the Athena temple survive on location.

¹⁰⁴ In *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 31: [ca. 28 letters -]ων ἀνῆκε τῇ πό[λε]ι καθ[η]ρ[ε]ι φθὲν πρότερον ὑπ' [αύτοῦ το]ῦ κτίσαντος τὴν νῆσον; with the principal verb in its frequent intransitive sense, and the fragmentary plural noun preceding in the form of the possessive genitive (e.g., τῶν θε[ι]ῶν / τῶν ἡρώ[ι]ῶν, or τῶν Σαλαμινί[ων] / τῶν Αθηνα[ι]ῶν). Culley restores the indirect object as (Athena) Polias (Πολ[ιάδ]ι); but she has no attested relationship with Salamis, even though the extent of her sacred properties in Attica is well recorded. The imperfect verb ἀνῆκε could also be rendered as “has returned to”: LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀνήκω (II).

¹⁰⁵ The double name of the town (with Kychreia in l. 32 of the decree) is recorded by Strabo (9.1.9); see Taylor (note 96) 105-110 (esp. 108-109, in reference to the restoration decree). Culley (note 2) 292 argues that Ambelaki is the location for both Strabo’s “ancient town” and “present-day” town; for the ancient town’s location, see also Goette (note 54) 329. For Skiros as the synoicist of Salamis, see the Suda s.v. Σκῖρος. In the corpus edition, Kychreus is tentatively restored as the founder: [Κυχρέως?] (at the beginning of l. 32); not accepted by Culley in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121.

¹⁰⁶ Pausanias 1.35.2 and 36.1, with legend of Kychreus’ prophetic intervention; his shrine is also recorded in Plutarch, *Solon* 10.2.

¹⁰⁷ As suggested in Culley (note 2) 292-293, with the word *temenos* tentatively restored as the subject in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 31; essayed in Taylor (note 96) 109.

¹⁰⁸ See for example the civic claims famously made in the 3rd c. B.C. by Magnesia on the Maeander in its attempts to upgrade its ancient festival of Artemis Leukophryne to “Panhellenic” status and the cult’s right of asylum: e.g., in *I.Magnesia* 53 l. 65, ἀποστήσεται τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῇ πόλει τῇ Μαγνήτων (as cited in LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀνήκω III); cf. also 98 l. 93, customary rites and ritual officials ἀ ἀνήκει εἰς τὴν τροφήν.

heroic past of Salamis, then it could perhaps signify the principal Athenian charter for Salamis, in the claim that the island had been granted to Athens by Eurysakes, the son of Ajax, in exchange for Athenian citizenship. It was this legendary benefaction that famously persuaded a panel of Spartan arbiters to award Salamis to Athens, which resolved the city's long conflict with Megara over the island.¹⁰⁹ It is possible that the possessive assertion also had an immediate and practical intent, if the restoration program on Salamis entailed, as elsewhere, the systematic reclamation of properties that had been illegally possessed or encroached upon by unscrupulous landowners.

The introductory sentence of the Salamis catalogue has previously been interpreted in a very different fashion, as the record of the past action of a heroic or historical figure that first brought the island into the possession of Athens. Thus the restorations of “[Sol]on” and “[Skir]on” have been proposed, although they are most unlikely on their own merits.¹¹⁰ Solon's Salamis campaign is referenced independently near the end of the catalogue (see below); more importantly, Athenian tradition attributes to Solon only one foundation on the island, in the cult of Enyalios, on the Skiradion headland. The Salaminians themselves, however, evidently associated the famed general with their cult of the Twelve Gods.¹¹¹ As for Skiron, that figure should not be conflated with Skiros.¹¹² At least in the fully developed tradition of the Classical period the Athenians regarded the two as distinct and antithetical figures. Skiros appears to have originally been a rather generic mythological figure common to the region; in Attica he became identified as the heroic counterpart of Athena Skiras in her cult at Phaleron.¹¹³ In the propaganda wars over Salamis, which endured into the 4th century

¹⁰⁹ Plutarch, *Solon* 10.3, with a second son, Philaios, who was probably introduced into the tradition by the Philaid Kimon (cf. Herodotus 6.35); the Kimonian tradition would appear to be preserved in Pausanias (1.35.2), where Philaios is credited with the benefaction, while Eurysakes is demoted to the status of Ajax's grandson. The famous arbitration, which (if historical) could date to the late 6th century B.C. though it remains difficult to place within the attested history of the period, is most thoroughly studied in L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* (Pisa 1973) 46-56 no. 10 (with date of ca. 519 B.C. based on the identification of the arbiter Kleomenes with the Spartan king of that period); further analysis and more recent scholarship is provided in Taylor (note 96) 42-47, with appreciation of the fact that the literary tradition leaves in question the precise status of the island subsequent to its award to Athens.

¹¹⁰ With the transitive sense of the verb ἀνήκω assumed, with the meaning “returned”; preceded by a personal name ending in the nominative *]-ων*. In *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 l. 31, Culley restores Solon as the subject, in a relative clause: [--- τέμενος? τοῦ δεῖνα ὁ Σόλων]; the restoration [Σκίρ]ων is posited in von Freeden (note 22) 6, in connection with the homonymous wind-personification on the Tower of the Winds (as noted in *SEG* 33 [1983] no. 136).

¹¹¹ To judge from *CIG* I 452: Σαλαμίνιοι τεῖχ[ο]ς Δωδεκαθεοῖς Σόλωνος; as evidence for the otherwise attested Salaminian cult, see Taylor (note 96) 184-185. Solon's cult of Enyalios is solely attested in Plutarch, *Solon* 9.4 (presumably a 4th-century attribution, like so much of the Solonian tradition); cf. Vollgraff (note 67) 151, in the context of Enyalios cults in Greece.

¹¹² For the distinction, see *RE* 2.III (1929) *s.v.v.* Skiron (cols. 537-545, van der Kolf) and Skiros 2 (cols. 547-550, Honigmann); with the following references. Most recently, see the catalogue entry in Kearns (note 8) 197-198 *s.v.* Σκίρος, Σκῖρος, Σκίρων.

¹¹³ See Plutarch, *Theseus* 17.6 and Pausanias 1.1.4; on the shared harbor cult and its administration by the *genos* of the Salaminioi, see Fergusan (note 96) 18-19; generally on the Phaleron complex of cults, see Kearns (note 8) 38-41. The cult of Athena Skiras on Salamis, which was located on the Skiradion promontory (Herodotus 8.94), was probably instituted by the Athenians after gaining control of the island. This Skiros was also identified by some ancient writers as the founder of the Attic Skira festival (the Skiraphoria), as given in the *Suda* *s.v.* Σκίρος; the festival concluded its rites at Skiron, which was located on

B.C., Athens appropriated Skiros as the synoicist and king of an independent Salamis who served as a loyal friend to Theseus, providing the Athenian hero with the skilled pilot and lookout required for his mission to Crete. This same tradition also placed a genealogical claim on Skiros: the Salaminian ruler gave his assistance because included among the Athenian youths held hostage by King Minos was his grandson, the product of the marriage between Skiros' daughter and an Athenian noble. This tradition sometimes formed part of the aetiology of the Theseia festival.¹¹⁴ The Athenians evidently created special cult-honors for Skiros, perhaps in a customary ritual footrace, after regaining Salamis toward the end of the 3rd century B.C.¹¹⁵ The restoration decree effectively invokes these ancient ancestral affiliations in its association of Athens with “the island’s founder”.

Skiron, on the other hand, was a Megarian figure (and common toponym) cast into the role of Kychreus’ son-in-law and heir to the Salaminian kingdom. The Athenian response to this mythographical claim on the island was to transform Skiron into a cruel Megarian brigand whom Theseus slew in personal combat, as part of his cycle of labors around the Saronic Gulf. This Skiron became an enduring literary symbol of tyrannical hubris. These traditions remained a lively cultural memory for the Athenians in the Roman period, as represented by Plutarch’s keen interest in the subject. Around the same time as the restoration decree the Roman poet Ovid even featured the brigand Skiron in his *Metamorphoses*.¹¹⁶

The city’s historical claim over Salamis is invoked toward the conclusion of the Salamis catalogue, where a certain monument or site retains a living association with “those who were offering propitiatory sacrifices in the war against M[egara] over the island”.¹¹⁷ Forever remembered by the Athenians as the most epochal event of their early history, this territorial conflict evidently persisted sporadically throughout much of the 6th century B.C. The war became so fraught with nationalist passion as to generate a considerable amount of invented literary tradition that ultimately expanded into ancestral claims on the rival states themselves; so that Megara was mythographically made into a former dependency of Athens. This assertion of tradition remained institutionally enshrined in the Kleisthenic tribe named after Pandion, whose Attic son

the Sacred Way to Eleusis, just after it crossed the Kephisos river (Pausanias 1.36.4). On the original nature of Skiros, perhaps as a personified toponym, see *OCD*³ *s.v.* Sciron: “Sciron or Sciros, names of several related heroic figures connected with Attica, Salamis, and Megara”.

¹¹⁴ These traditions are preserved in Plutarch, *Theseus* 17.6. Plutarch relies throughout on the *Atthis* of Philochoros, who also wrote a history of the heroic foundation of Salamis; see Philochoros in *FGrH* 328 F 111, with Jacoby’s extensive commentary on the points made above. For Skiros and the Theseia, see the Suda *s.v.* Θησεία.

¹¹⁵ See the ephebic decree of 214/3 B.C. in *SEG* 29 (1979) no. 116 ll. 18-19: [τὸν δρόμον] ἔδραμον τῶι ἐπωνύμωι τῆις [νήσου]; the eponymous should be Skiros, since cult-honors for Ajax are listed separately.

¹¹⁶ The rival traditions concerning the Megarian Skiron are preserved in Plutarch, *Theseus* 10.3 (with use of the Megarian historian Praxion [= *FGrH* 484 F 1]); with the Megarian tradition also in Pausanias 1.39.6, as the son-in-law of Pandion. See also Jacoby, as noted above. The brigand Skiron in Ovid, *Met.* 7.443-444.

¹¹⁷ *IG II²* 1035 l. 34; with Culley (note 2) 286 n. 8. The historic but historically obscure struggle over Salamis, which may have been initiated by Solon, is exhaustively analyzed in Taylor (note 96) 21-50, with conclusion that the “actual course of the ‘war’ ... in the sixth century may well be irrecoverable” (p. 42). See also references in note 119 following.

Nisos was the first to rule Megara. At the time of the restoration decree this view of an early Attic mega-state, which existed long before Megara's reputed foundation by the Herakleidai, was still sufficiently prevalent to inspire the principal treatment of Strabo's account of Attika.¹¹⁸ The monument in question may well be related to the lively tradition of Solon's victorious Salamis campaigns. For the historical reference in the decree appears as a remarkable echo of the directions that Solon was reputed to have received from the Delphic oracle before embarking on the territorial war: "With sacrifices propitiate the heroes who once ruled this land".¹¹⁹

The triumphant Salaminian memory of Solon, whose ashes were reputedly scattered across the island as a form of eternal heroic possession, is definitely invoked in reference to a (lost) item "named (or chosen) by Solon".¹²⁰ If this work of restoration should refer to a foundation made by Solon, then the subject could be the cult of the warrior deity Enyalios, which the general reputedly established to commemorate his final victory over the Megarians. Alternatively, the setting of the sanctuary could be referred to, in the headland of the Skiradion (north of the ancient town), which is where Solon inflicted his signal defeat on the island's Megarian garrison. The island's shrine of Athena Skiras also stood in this location. By the Classical period Athens commemorated this victory in the rite of the Skiradion, which featured a ritualized re-enactment of Solon's victory. According to Plutarch's description of the event, an Athenian ship would sail into Salamis harbor, and upon arrival its crew sang battle cries, while one of their number would run in full hoplite armor to the headland. It would be very appropriate for this rite to have been an ephebic occasion, likely then originating in the 4th century B.C., especially if it included an observance of Solon's cult of Enyalios.¹²¹ It is possible that the inscription makes an explicit reference to this "sailing-in" rite.¹²² The only other

¹¹⁸ Strabo 9.1.5-7. On the traditionalist claims invented by Athens in regard to Megara, see Kearns (note 8) 115-116; the Attidographer Philochoros took particular interest in proving this claim, as discussed by Jacoby in his commentary under *FGrH* 328 F 107.

¹¹⁹ As recorded in Plutarch, *Solon* 9.1; the literary traditions for this episode and Solon's other reputed attempts to gain Salamis for Athens are given detailed analysis in C. Higbie, "The Bones of a Hero, the Ashes of a Politician: Athens, Salamis, and the Usable Past", *Classical Antiquity* 16 (1997) 278-307 (pp. 301-303 for the Delphic oracle). On Solon's Salamis campaigns, see also L. Piccirilli, "Solone e la guerra per Salamis", *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* 8 (1978) 1-14; also, P. Oliva, *Solon - Legende und Wirklichkeit (Xenia* 20, Stuttgart and Constantia 1988) 40-45. The tradition of the Solonian oracle is also briefly treated in Taylor (note 96) 33-34. In Kearns (note 8) 46-47 Solon's sacrifice is characterized as a "political statement", in its demonstration to the Megarians that the island's heroes would henceforth side with Athens.

¹²⁰ *IG II²* 1035 l. 35: τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ Σόλωνο[ς]. The legend of Solon's ashes is recorded in Plutarch, *Solon* 32.4 (with skepticism) and Diogenes Laertius 1.62; also, see Higbie (note 119) 304 for its heroic function.

¹²¹ Enyalios was a rather universal martial god for ephebes in Greece, especially in commemoration of the Persian Wars: he was one of the divine witnesses, with his associate Ares, in the "Ephebic Oath" of the 4th-century; cf. C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'Éphébie Attique des Origines à 31 avant Jesus-Christ* (Paris 1962) esp. 75-78; also, R. Merkelbach, "Aglauros (Die Religion der Epheben)", *ZPE* 9 (1972) 277-283; for its Persian-Wars ideology, see N.D. Robertson, "False Documents at Athens: Fifth-Century History and Fourth-Century Publicists", *Historical Reflections* 1 (1976) 6-7 and 20-21.

¹²² If the problematic word ἐνπλευ[- - -] in *IG II²* 1035 l. 35 (left unresolved by Culley in *SEG* 26 [1976] no. 121) should be taken as a deliberate or mistaken rendering of ἐμπλευσα; cf. the sailing rite of the Munichia festival, as περιέπλευσα[ν] in *IG II²* 1011 l. 16. The rite, with its "sailing-in" event, is described in Plutarch, *Solon* 9.2; also, see L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1956) 218-219 for its possible connection with

attested monument on the island associated with Solon was a statue of the general himself, which was evidently erected in the agora of Salamis-town sometime in the early 4th century B.C. While the statue of Solon may well have disappeared by the time of the restoration decree, as late as the 2nd century A.D. the hero's ashes were still believed to protect the island as an Athenian possession.¹²³

In or just outside of Salamis-town the preserved text of the decree records the restoration of at least two sites. One is a “garden” or “sacred enclosure” that would appear to have served as a sacred theatrical space, where “dances and choruses were performed”.¹²⁴ This would have been an appropriate setting for the Salaminian Dionysia.¹²⁵ Historically, these properties would presumably have been owned by the *demos* of Salamis. The other site recorded was very much the property of the Athenian state. Indeed, from an Athenian perspective it was the most cherished and hallowed monument on the entire island: the *temenos* of Ajax, “which was reconsecrated” in the work of the decree.¹²⁶ The shrine stood in the town’s agora and featured a cult statue of precious ebony wood.¹²⁷

Athens may have established the cult of Ajax during the course of the 6th century B.C., before the Kleisthenic tribal reforms, when the hero became the eponymous of the tribe Aiantis. The city would certainly have appropriated the Homeric Ajax as an Athenian *xenos* by the time of the reputed Spartan arbitration over Salamis, when Athens asserted an ancient alliance with the hero in the Trojan War, while his son Euryaks was claimed to have ceded the island to the Athenians in order to become a naturalized Athenian.¹²⁸ In the Classical period, the cult-rites of Ajax were expanded into a grand

the Aiantesia. The shrine of Athena Skiras on the Skiradion headland is attested in Herodotus (8.94); cf. Fergusson (note 96) 18.

¹²³ According to Aelius Aristides (*Orations* 46.172); also, see Higbie (note 119) 304. The statue of Solon is attested in Demosthenes 19.251 (as a fifty-year old monument) and Aeschines 1.25 (with agora location and as a well known statue); see Taylor (note 96) 110. It would appear to have disappeared by the time of Pausanias’ visit to the island, since he does not mention it (in 1.35.2).

¹²⁴ As restored in *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 ll. 34-35: κῆπον ἐν κρ[- - | - - - - -] ὅπου ὀρχήσεις καὶ χορε[ῖ]αι ἐδρῶ[ντο...]. In Taylor (note 96) 110-111 the garden and theatrical space are taken together, and located in Salamis-town; but a nearby extra-urban space, situated “in Kr[- - -]”, would perhaps better suit the character of the site.

¹²⁵ For this festival, as a Salaminian celebration and therefore important evidence for the autonomous nature of the island’s community, see Taylor (96) 165-171.

¹²⁶ *IG* II² 1035 I. 32: [τέμεν]ος Αἴαντος ὁ καθιέρωσε; also, see the commentary in Culley (note 2) 294-297. Noted in Kearns (note 8) 141 (b), under Αἴας/Ajax; but with date of 2nd c. A.D. for the restoration decree.

¹²⁷ The cult statue is described by Pausanias (1.35.2).

¹²⁸ For the cult of Ajax on Salamis and its date, see E. Kearns, “Change and Continuity in Religious Structures after Cleisthenes”, in *Crux. Essays in Greek History Presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on His 75th Birthday*, eds. P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey (Duckworth 1985) 194; also, with the Aiakid tradition, the catalogue entries in *idem* (note 8) 141-142 s.v. Αἴας/Ajax and 164 s.v. Εύρυστακης/Euryaks. The most recent analysis of Ajax, as a political symbol of institutionalized “marginality”, is offered in F. de Polignac, “Ajax l’Athénien. Communautés cultuelles, représentations de l'espace et logique institutionnelle dans une tribu clisthénienne”, in *Athènes et le politique: dans le sillage de Claude Mosse*, eds. P. Schmitt Pantel and F. de Polignac (Paris 2007) 111-132 (esp. 129-132, with the “reterritorialisation” of Salamis under the Cleisthenic tribe Aiantis). For the city’s ancestral claims on Ajax and the Aiakidai, which included the famous interpolation of the *Iliad* (as most fully recorded Plutarch, *Solon* 10.2-3), see also D.J. Bradshaw, “The Ajax Myth and the Polis”, in *Myth and the Polis*, eds. C. Pozzi Dora and J.M. Wickersham (Ithaca NY, 1991) esp. 114-115; the

tribal festival, probably as inspired by the hero's miraculous intercession at the Battle of Salamis. The new Aiantesia festival featured the adornment of Ajax's altar with a panoply of armor, while the hero was honored with a banquet rite.¹²⁹ The ritual banqueting of martial heroes was a common type of thank-offering for heroic champions associated with victorious battles. This feasting rite, a form of *theoxenia* in which gods and heroes were invited to partake, suggests that the Aiantesia also included an animal sacrifice for an associated divinity, perhaps Zeus Tropaios (as in the Hellenistic period).¹³⁰ The state Aiantesia apparently did not survive the city's loss of the island at the end of the 4th century B.C. For in the late Hellenistic period the Aiantesia is attested only as an ephebic festival, likely to have been created to celebrate the Athenian recovery of Salamis in 229 B.C., and perhaps in substitution of the equally likely demise of the Skiradion rite. Suitably martial in nature, these ephebic rites featured the famous "contest of boats", a procession to the altar of the hero and sacrificial rites to Zeus Tropaios; at the end of the day the people of Salamis awarded golden crowns to the ephebic marshal and the victorious tribe of ephebes.¹³¹ The ephebic Aiantesia lasted little more than a century before Athens fell victim to war for the final time in its history, as a result of the city's ill advised support of the Mithridatic revolt against Rome and Sulla's consequent conquest of Attica.¹³² For the rest of the 1st century B.C., evidently including the Augustan era, the city's ephebic corps restricted its religious commemorations to traditional rites in Attica, particularly participation in the chief civic festivals.¹³³ Since the ephebic Aiantesia is not attested again until the late 1st century A.D., when it may have been revived,¹³⁴ the

interpolation and Eurysakes' grant are also given extensive treatment in Higbie (note 119) 283-287 and 292-293, within the context of Solon's reputed efforts to win Salamis for Athens.

¹²⁹ See Deubner (note 122) 228; with evidence in the scholion to Pindar (*Nem.* 2.19): διὰ τιμῆς ἥγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Αἴαντα, ὡς μὴ μόνον φυλὴν Αἰαντίδα ἀποδεῖξαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ κλίνην αὐτῷ μετὰ πανοπλίας κοσμεῖν. Cf. also Hesychius *s.v.* Αἰάντια: ἔορτὴ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι. In Kearns (note 8) 141 Athens is suggested as a possible alternate location for the banqueting rite (presumably at the Eurysakeion in Melite); cf. also de Polignac (note 128) 121.

¹³⁰ For the ritual combination of divine sacrifice and heroic banqueting, see M.H. Jameson, "Theoxenia", in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, ed. R. Hägg (Stockholm 1994) 39-41. See B. Neutsch, "Der Heros auf der Kline", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 69 (1961) 150-163, on the banqueting of military heroes, such as Herakles and the Dioskouroi. Zeus Tropaios is certainly honored with sacrificial offerings in *IG II²* 1032 l. 8 (from the beginning of the 1st century B.C.).

¹³¹ See Pélekidis (note 121) 247-248; perhaps with some conflation with what would appear to be the non-ephebic aspects of the festival. The ephebic events are recorded for the late 2nd century B.C. in *IG II²* 1008 (ll. 17-18), 1011 (ll. 16 and 53), and 1028 (ll. 27 and 76). On the date of the ephebic Aiantesia, see Mikalson (note 5) 183-184, with proposed Classical antecedents; the ephebic festival is now first attested for 214/3 B.C. (in *SEG* 29 [1979] no. 116).

¹³² The last celebrations of the festival occurred in the 90s B.C. (as attested in *IG II²* 1029 ll. 14-16, 1030 ll. 24-26, and 1032 l. 8); Athens then later tried to appease Sulla's wrath by establishing an ephebic festival for the Roman dictator (*IG II²* 1039 l. 57).

¹³³ Even in the case of the grand ephebic commemorations that attended the residence of Marcus Antonius (as recorded in *IG II²* 1043; cf. also *IG II²* 1042). Now dated to the Augustan period is the similar ephebic record in *IG II²* 1040 (+ 1051 = *SEG* 22 [1967] no. 111), from the archonship of Apolexis (II) *Apellikontos* of Oion (ca. 20 B.C.); see Kallet-Marx and Stroud (note 23) 178-181; also Geagan (note 50) 66-67.

¹³⁴ Thus S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle. Études Chronologiques et Prosopographique* (Collection d'Études Anciennes, Paris 1976) 339-343; with the "contest of boats" restored in *IG II²* 1996 l. 9 (ca. A.D. 84/85).

restoration of Ajax's shrine may have functioned as a revival of the hero's older state rite.

Ajax and the inventive process of Athenian history are made still more prominent in the context of the celebrated Persian-Wars battle of Salamis in 480 B.C., before which the island's hero had been supplicated. According to the Salamis catalogue, two monuments closely associated with that most famous victory over the Persians were restored within the sacred area of the "akroterion" (the promontory of the Kynosoura), which looks out onto the site of the naval battle and beyond towards Athens. These monuments were the trophy of Themistokles and an adjoining *polyandreion* (a mass grave for fallen warriors); the latter is otherwise unattested in the sources (there is only the island's Corinthian war-grave), and so may represent an earlier invention of tradition.¹³⁵

Here the restoration decree clearly reflects the popular imagination of the day. For one, by the late Hellenistic period Athens had again come to embrace the memory of Themistokles as the city's ancient savior. Indeed, among contemporary Greeks in general there was a romantic yearning to translate his newly resuscitated fame into a proper civic monument. A Greek poet of the 1st century A.D. gave voice to this shared desire in proposing the construction of a grand cenotaph for the symbolic repatriation of Themistokles' remains:¹³⁶

“Put Hellas in place of my humble tomb; then put ships' timbers on her,
tokens of a barbarian fleet destroyed.
And paint the Persian army and Xerxes as a base for the tomb all around;
with these for company, bury Themistokles.
And, for a headstone, Salamis shall stand thereon proclaiming my deeds.
Why lay me, so great, among things so small?”

Apparently forgotten was the later Classical tradition in Athens that the memory of Themistokles had been sufficiently rehabilitated to allow for the creation of a tomb-cult in the Piraeus, the "altar-like" *Themistokleion*.¹³⁷ All that is known of the significance of the shrine, which may have been merely a popular attribution, is that in the early 4th century B.C. it was customary for merchants to hail it as their ships sailed into the Piraeus.¹³⁸ By the Roman period the shrine had come to be identified with a tomb

¹³⁵ Monuments: *IG II²* 1035 ll. 33-34; with Culley (note 2) 296-297; also, see Goette (note 54) 329-330. For the trophy, cf. also M.B. Wallace, "Psyttaleia and the Trophies of the Battle of Salamis", *AJA* 73 (1969) 300-301. For the Athenian *polyandreion* as "invented", see N. Robertson, "The Collective Burial of Fallen Soldiers at Athens, Sparta and Elsewhere: 'Ancestral Custom' and Modern Misunderstanding", *EMC* 27(1983) 84; the silence of the ancient sources is believed to militate against the reality of the monument, but allows for the possibility of one belonging to the Corinthians (based on the epitaph in *GHI²* no. 24). On the other hand, a burial mound was excavated at the nearby village of Magoula (reported in *ArchDelt* 22 [1967] B 146), which W.K. Pritchett identifies as the monument in question; see *SEG* 33 (1983) no. 136.

¹³⁶ Geminus, *Anth. Pal.* 7.73; Geminus no. 1 in A.F.S. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: the Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams* (London 1968).

¹³⁷ A tomb-shrine reputedly built to hold the mortal remains of Themistokles, returned to Athens by his descendants: thus Diodoros the Periegete, as βωμοειδές τάφος (in *FGrH* 372 F35; preserved in Plutarch, *Themistokles* 32.4); known to Aristotle (*HA* 6.15 569b) as the *Themistokleion*; located by Pausanias (1.1.2) "near the largest harbor" (i.e., the Great Kantharos Harbor).

¹³⁸ Thus in Plato *Comicus* (fr. 183; also preserved in Plutarch, *Themistokles* 32.4); on which see J. Rusten, "Τείτων Ἡρῷς: Pindar's Prayer to Heracles (N. 7.86-101) and Greek Popular Religion", *HSCP* 87 (1983) 292-293 note 15. Cf. also Kearn (note 8) 41, briefly, on the question of the cult's significance.

structure on the Akte headland.¹³⁹ If the restoration decree gave any attention to the *Themistokleion*, as part of its work in the Piraeus (see below), that record is lost from the catalogue.

The restoration decree had the deliberate effect of implicitly reifying the old rhetorical tradition of Athenian history that had successfully transformed the Panhellenic battle of Salamis into an ideologically “ideal battle”, and one that was essentially “Athenian” in ethos and virtue.¹⁴⁰ The Persian-Wars tradition had become such a universal (and unifying) historical theme in the Greco-Roman world, that in the same years as the Athenian restoration program the emperor Augustus staged (in 2 B.C.) a gladiatorial “re-enactment” of Salamis. So effective was the Athenian rhetorical tradition that in the event of Augustus’ *naumachia* the ancient naval battle was turned into a contest between the Persians and the Athenians alone. This historicizing spectacle served as a popular promotion of the new eastern command (*Orienti praepositus*) assigned by the princeps to his grandson and heir-apparent, Gaius Caesar, which “advertised Rome as the champion of Hellas against the Orient” and cast the prince into the role of Mars the “Avenger”.¹⁴¹ While the ancient victory of Salamis had continued to hold a special historical significance at Rome since the battle of Actium in 31 B.C.,¹⁴² the *naumachia* of 2 B.C. was designed to help fashion Gaius’ anticipated campaign against the kingdom of Parthia as a sequel to the famous Parthian accord that Augustus had reached in 20 B.C. The Athenians fully appreciated the imperial theme of Gaius’ “avenging” appearance in the East, for upon the prince’s arrival in Athens the following year he was honored with a statue that proclaimed him the “New Ares”.¹⁴³ Given the fortunate coincidence between the Persian-Wars theme in the restoration program and the renewed imperial propaganda against the “Barbarian East”, scholars have often connected the two events,

¹³⁹ On the possible physical remains on the shrine (which inspired the opening lines of Byron’s “The Giaour”), in a rectangular enclosure situated on the Acte headland, see Goette (note 54) 144, with fig. 42 (site #4); as identified by the late inscription for Themistokles inscribed on its west wall (with misspelled patronymic). Both the literary and archaeological evidence, including the remains of another possible site for the tomb, are thoroughly analyzed in M.B. Wallace, “The Tomb of Themistocles in the Peiraieus”, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 451-462 (archaeological evidence in pp. 452-458, literary in pp. 458-460); with appeal to the suggestion (in A.W. Gomme, *Commentary on Thucydides I* [Oxford 1956] 446) that the Akte promontory was first associated with Themistokles, due to its proximity to the site of the Salamis battle, and subsequently conflated with an existing tomb there.

¹⁴⁰ As “Athenian”, see Loraux (note 15) 13-42; also, *idem*, *The Invention of Athens* (Cambridge Mass. 1986) 155-171. On the source-mechanics involved in this rhetorical tradition, see N. Robertson, “False Documents at Athens: Fifth-Century History and Fourth-Century Publicists”, *Historical Reflections* 1 (1976) esp. 10-14.

¹⁴¹ Thus R. Syme, “The Crisis of 2 B.C.”, reprinted in *Roman Papers* 3, ed. A.R. Birley (Oxford 1984) 912-936 (p. 922). Recorded in Dio 55.10.7; and Augustus’ *Res Gestae* (23) highlights the construction of the pool (*stagnum*) used for the *naumachia*. The occasion was the *praefectio* of Gaius Caesar; with the prince stylized as Mars the “Avenger” in Ovid *Ars Amat.* 1.171-172. For a cultural appreciation of this spectacle, see K.M. Coleman, “Launching into History: Aquatic Displays in the Early Empire”, *JRS* 83 (1993) 51-54. The close chronology between the restoration decree and the Roman *naumachia* has often inspired scholars to see a direct link between the two; such as in Bowersock (note 66) 174-175.

¹⁴² See T. Hölscher, “Actium und Salamis”, *JDAI* 99 (1984) 187-214.

¹⁴³ In *IG II²* 3250; with improved transcription in *SEG* 21 (1965) no. 702. For Gaius’ visit to Athens, see originally Grainger (note 29) 51; with date of 1 A.D. in F.E. Romer, “A Numismatic Date for the Departure of C. Caesar?”, *TAPA* 108 (1978) 201-202.

particularly in arguing that the Temple of Ares in the Agora was rededicated to Gaius Caesar.¹⁴⁴

The Salamis *naumachia* at Rome is sometimes viewed as having been inspired by the ancient Athenian regatta of the “sacred ships” that was established in honor of Artemis to commemorate the Battle of Salamis.¹⁴⁵ This popular naval rite, which was held at the Munichia festival, is referenced in the restoration decree in a nicely symbolic transition in the catalogue of works from Salamis to the Piraeus. Thus were somehow rehabilitated the facilities at Eetioneia, on the northwest side of the *Kanthalos* or Great Harbor (and famous for having served as the refuge for the ousted regime of the 400), which served as the starting-point for “the *paraplous* of the sacred ships”.¹⁴⁶ From the Eetioneia the sacred ships would sail together around the Akte headland to the small Munichia harbor, where a procession would then proceed up the acropolis of the same name to the shrine of Artemis Munichia. The same or a similar sailing rite to Artemis would appear to be the subject of the preceding line in the catalogue, with the restoration of a shrine or monument “in the Elaphydron”.¹⁴⁷ That site is otherwise unknown, but the “deer” prefix of the toponym very likely indicates a cultic association with Artemis. Of comparable historical import is the decree’s restoration of the obscure oath-shrine of Artemis *Herkanes*, “which Themistocles founded before the sea-battle at Salamis”.¹⁴⁸

The shrines and public monuments of the Piraeus serve as the geographic center of the record of restoration work. Such a focus was a natural effect of the harbor’s large population and its unusual status as a planned town, where a great number of important areas had been designated as public property in the 5th century B.C.¹⁴⁹ The depredations of Sulla in 86 B.C., and subsequent neglect, must have also contributed to this priority.¹⁵⁰ Included in the Piraeus restoration were the ancient privileges and

¹⁴⁴ Thus Bowersock (note 66) 175-179, as orchestrated by G. Julius Nikanor; a reconstruction inspired by the supposition in R.E. Raubitschek, “The New Homer”, *Hesperia* 23 (1954) 319 that the *naumachia* of 2 B.C. refers to the traditional Athenian sailing regatta in the Munichia festival (see following note), and that Nikanor achieved his epithet as the ‘New Themistokles’ by winning the contest.

¹⁴⁵ Thus Graindor (note 29) 128-129 (whence Raubitschek, as cited in the previous note).

¹⁴⁶ *IG II²* 1035 ll. 37: <Η>τ<ι>δ>νειαν ἐξ ἡς αἱ ιεραι ναῦ[ς ...]; also, see previous line, as quoted in the following note. The Eetioneia is the spit of land along the NW side of the Great Harbor, where the double-towered gate of the Kononian era still stands; see Goette (note 54) 144. For the “sacred ships” of the Munichia (held on 16 Munichion), see *IG II²* 1011 l. 16 (of 107/6 B.C.); for the festival, see Deubner (note 122) 204-205. Contra Culley (note 2) 286, this sailing rite of “ships” should not be conflated with the famous ephebic “contest of the boats” (ἀμιλλατῶν πλοίων) that took place on the following day (17 Munichion) at Salamis as part of the Aiantea (cf. *IG II²* 1006 ll. 30-31); for which, see Pélékidis (note 121) 247-248.

¹⁴⁷ *IG II²* 1035 l. 36-37: -]ν τὸ ἐν Ἐλαφυδρίοις ... τὸ παρὰ τὸν παράπλουν τῶν ιερῶν | [νεῶν ...]. As a point of speculation, this site might be identified with the circular columned structure preserved on the Kavos Krakari headland that dominates the NW entrance into the Great Harbor; cf. Wallace (note 139) 455-458, with fig. 4 (p. 456).

¹⁴⁸ *IG II²* 1035 l. 45, with Artemis restored in *SEG* 37 (1987) under no. 96: as suggested in R. Garland, *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century B.C.* (Ithaca 1987) 163. In *SEG* 26 (1976) no. 121 Culley restores Athena.

¹⁴⁹ See D.M. Lewis, “Public Property in the City”, in *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murry and S. Price (Oxford 1990) 250-251, where he notes that the greatest amount of evidence for public property (such as *horoi*) in 5th-century Athens concerns the Piraeus.

¹⁵⁰ According to Appian, *Mithr.* (6) 41, Sulla “burned the Piraeus ... not sparing the arsenal, or the navy yard, or any other of its famous belongings”; also, cf. Strabo 9.1.15. The Piraeus was once described to

properties belonging to a number of local sanctuaries: the Asklepieion in Zea, the sanctuaries of Dionysos and Aphrodite, and the precinct of Agatha Tyche (“Good Fortune”). The Asklepieion was attended to in some manner along with its collection of votive dedications. This healing sanctuary is historically very significant since it housed the initial Attic cult of Asklepios, upon its introduction from Epidauros in 421 B.C. during the first year of the Peace of Nikias.¹⁵¹ In its reference to the Peloponnesian War, the restoration record even alludes to the circumstances of the healing-god’s introduction to Attica, as a thank-offering to the city’s recovery from the terrible plague-years of the early 420s B.C. Various harbor works and related mercantile structures were also repaired, including the Great Harbor’s well-known dry-docks and the so-called Deigma, the great quay-side market, which may have been built or expanded by Pompey the Great in 62 B.C.¹⁵² It is impossible to know what immediate or lasting effect the program had on the condition and prosperity of the Piraeus as a whole. On the other hand, it is likely that the decree encouraged the private sponsorship of subsequent work, such as the cult-fund established in the Piraeus a couple of decades later by a religious association of women.¹⁵³

Athens and its immediate environs are the setting for the final catalogue of restoration work, which addressed the smaller number of shrines and public spaces in and around the city. Thus a shrine of Hera’s handmaiden Hebe, either the city-based one or the better-known sanctuary in the deme of Aixone, was somehow revived in the final stages of the restoration program. Under Lykourgos in the 4th century B.C. the shrine at Aixone was probably integrated into the state’s religious structure, which may have provided for the popular all-night rite (*pannychis*) attested for the cult.¹⁵⁴ The sanctuary most distant from the city of Athens was evidently the so-called Dorykleion of

Cicero (*ad Fam.* 4.5.4) as “ruined and wrecked”; but note the caution over such evidence in S. Alcock, “Roman Imperialism in the Greek Landscape”, *JRA* 2 (1989) 5-6 and *idem* (note 62) 13-14.

¹⁵¹ In *IG II²* 1035 ll. 40-41: *Ἰον καὶ ψιλὰ τὰ προσόντα τῷ Ασκληπιεῖῳ τὰ ἀνεθέντα*; if the conjunction “and” should refer to other work carried out at the Asklepieion lost from the inscription. On the cult see Garland (note 148) 160; also S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, Their Dedications, and Their Inventories* (Amsterdam 1989) 35-36. The so-called City Asklepieion in Athens, on the south slope of the Akropolis, was evidently founded in the following year (420 B.C.).

¹⁵² *IG II²* 1035 ll. 42-47. On the identification of the “dry-docks” (*psyktrai* in l. 43), see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (2nd ed., Munich 1931) 440 and 450; the identification of Pompey as the donor of the Deigma is not at all certain, but see M. Hoff, “The Early History of the Roman Agora at Athens”, in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron (*BICS Suppl.* 55, London 1989) 2-3.

¹⁵³ Recorded in *IG II²* 2337, with a possible total donation of 173 *denarii* (a good sum for a single shrine); for the date, see Aleshire (note 23) 232 under no. 10. Participants included Kleopatra, member of a great healing-cult family from Sounion; and Phila of Phlya, probably the daughter of the early Augustan archon Menneas. Note also the number of Roman *nomina* in the subscription, as might be expected from the Piraeus.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. the references in *LIMC* IV.1, *s.v.* “Hebe I” (A.-F. Laurens), where the restoration decree is mistakenly thought to attest to a shrine near Hymettos (presumably by geographic association with some of the other entries in the decree’s addendum). Priestesses of a state-cult of Hebe were given *proedria* in the Theater of Dionysos (in *IG II²* 5150 and 5154). Hebe at Aixone: the *pannychis* is attested in *IG II²* 1199 (note the improved date of 320/319 B.C. in D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7 - ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study* [Princeton 1986] 37-38); for the possible Lykourgan state-connection, see Humphreys (note 20) 208.

Athena in the twin demes of Lamptrai, just to the southeast of Mt. Hymettos.¹⁵⁵ Although nothing is known about the history of the Dorykleion, its location can be tentatively identified with a 5th-century sanctuary found near the modern church of the Panagia at Thiti. The Dorykleion would then have effectively divided the deme territories of Upper and Lower Lamptrai, and so may have been constituted as a state-cult.¹⁵⁶ Also in Lamptrai were some marginal public lands, probably on the lower slopes of Hymettos, which in the addendum to the decree were officially set aside “to all for pasturing and wood-gathering”. The decree created a similar pastoral preserve on the city-side of Hymettos. Rupestrial markers of the Roman period have now been found on one of the hills (the Fuchsberg), which may be connected with this effort, perhaps (given the mountain’s fame for honey) serving to define an apiary.¹⁵⁷

Several of the town-based cults whose restorations are catalogued in the final two sections of the decree share a particular historical gravity. The clearest instances involve the shrine of Agathe Tyche (“Good Fortune”), the Hyakinthion, and the temple of (Artemis) Eukleia and Eunomia (the divine personification of “Good Order”).¹⁵⁸ All of three of these sacred sites appear to have been located on the range of small hills immediately to the west of the Acropolis. In an important sense they were all types of “safety shrines”, traditionally connected in one way or another with the preservation of the city’s independence and the wellbeing of its statehood. The principal Athenian shrine for the cult of Agathe Tyche was evidently situated in the city-deme of Kollytos, just south of the Areopagos Hill. The shrine was probably last restored in 335/334 B.C., during the administration of Lykourgos, which held the relatively new cult in especially high esteem.¹⁵⁹ As for the actual site of the sanctuary, epigraphical evidence now points to the Hill of the Muses, which formed the southwest boundary of the city (and is visited today for the splendid funerary monument of Philoppapos). On at least one occasion, in the late 4th century B.C., Agathe Tyche received an unusually large and lavish state sacrifice there “to ensure the safety of the Demos of the Athenians”; this, probably in response to some extraordinary emergency for the city.¹⁶⁰ The ideological connection is

¹⁵⁵ *IG II²* 1035 l. 51.

¹⁵⁶ The site identification is suggested in J.S. Traill, “Rock-Cut Inscriptions in the Attic Demes of Lamptrai”, in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography (Hesperia Suppl.* 19, Princeton 1982) 168 note 22; the evidence consists of a half-dozen rock-cut boundary markers of the 5th century B.C., as well as a reported 5th-century Doric capital (now lost).

¹⁵⁷ Thus M.K. Langdon, “Hymettiana I”, *Hesperia* 54 (1985) 259, with the evidence of four rock-cut *horoi* of Roman date; arguing further from Culley (note 2) 290, note 27. The addendum reference occurs in *IG II²* 1035 ll. 58-59. On the meaning of *eschatia* here, see LSJ⁹, s.v. ἐσχάτια I, 2; with discussion in Walbank (note 92) 117. For a somewhat different meaning, as newly cultivated land, in inscriptions of the later Roman period, see S.G. Miller, “A Roman Monument in the Athenian Agora”, *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 82.

¹⁵⁸ *IG II²* 1035 ll. 48 (temenos of Agatha Tyche), 52 (Hyakinthion), and 53 (hieron of Eukleia and Eunomia).

¹⁵⁹ See S.V. Tracy, “*IG II²* 1195 and Agatha Tyche in Attica”, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 242-243; with evidence in *IG II²* 333c (ll. 19-20), a decree proposed by Lykourgos in 335/4 for the regulation of various cults in Attica. On the location of the deme of Kollytos, see J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica. A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and their Representation in the Athenian Council (Hesperia Suppl.* 14, Princeton 1975) 40; also, cf. following note.

¹⁶⁰ Walbank (note 92) 236-238; with evidence in the composite *lex sacra* of the city and deme in *IG II²* 1195 (ll. 5-6 and 28-30). According to Walbank (p. 236), “The main interest lies in the appearance of Good Fortune ... as the first recipient of sacrifices in order to ensure the safety of the Demos of the Athenians”;

explained, at least in part, by the highly strategic value of the hill, which dominates the center of Athens. Under the Macedonian regime of the 3rd century B.C. the Mouseion was heavily fortified and garrisoned; and it was the heroic storming of that garrison in 286 B.C. that brought the city a short-lived freedom from foreign control. As a result, the Hill of the Muses (presumably with its shrine of Agathe Tyche) became a lasting symbol of an independent Athenian statehood, and was celebrated as such in its subsequent use as a training-ground by Athenian ephebes.¹⁶¹ In Pausanias' day (the 2nd century A.D.) the public graves of the thirteen Athenians killed in the battle for the Mouseion were still pointed out to the city's visitors (1.29.13).

The restoration of the Hyakinthion clearly illustrates the decree's special concern for the preservation of the city's "savior-shrines". According to perhaps the most dominant Athenian legend, as reflected in Euripides' *Erechtheus*, the princesses Hyakinthides were the three daughters (*parthenoi*) of Erechtheus, who were willingly sacrificed by their father to bring victory to Athens in the Eleusinian War. In another tradition these courageous maidens were the daughters of the Spartan hero Hyakinthos, sacrificed to save the city from the siege of King Minos of Crete. Further, in the Attidographic tradition the *parthenoi* were slaughtered by a Boeotian army on a city-hill called Hyakinthos, hence their name.¹⁶² In historical times the Hyakinthides received an annual sacrifice and a ritual choral dance by young girls; they were also propitiated with a wine-less offering by the Athenian army before any defensive campaign.¹⁶³ Hence the Hyakinthion traditionally held a great deal of significance for the protection of the city. Like so many cults and religious traditions that inform the implicit cultural discourse of the restoration decree, the legend of the brave Hyakinthides assumed further significance in the Lykourgan era, when the maidens could be upheld as a shining example of a "nobility worthy of Athens".¹⁶⁴ Unfortunately the location of the shrine remains to be identified, although one scholar has associated it with the civic cults on the

with an unusually large financial outlay of 2,000 drachmai. Walbank also suggests an identification with the sanctuary mentioned in *IG II²* 1035; however, Tracy (note 159) 241-244 expresses skepticism.

¹⁶¹ See T.L. Shear Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (*Hesperia Suppl.* 17, Princeton 1978) 15-16 and esp. 61-73 for a detailed discussion of the "Revolution of 286 B.C.;" with full accounts in Pausanias 1.26.1-3 and the contemporary "Decree for Kallias" (in *SEG* 28 [1978] no. 60 [from Shear]; cf. also *Agora* XVI no. 255D). The Mouseion's practical and symbolic role in 3rd-century Athens is discussed in S.V. Tracy, "A Fragmentary Inscription from the Agora Praising Ephebes", *Hesperia* 59 (1990) 545-546.

¹⁶² See Kearns (note 8) 59; with references conveniently collected in the catalogue entry (pp. 201-202) for 'Υακινθίδες/Hyakinthides. Euripides, *Erechtheus* frags. 47, 60.27, 65.67-87 (Austin); as daughters of Hyakinthos, in the Suda, s.v. Υακινθίδες (Harpokration); as sacrificed in defense against the Boeotians, Suda, s.v. Παρθένοι (Photios); from Phanodemos (*FGrH* 325 F4) and Phrynicos (frag. 30 Kick).

¹⁶³ On such preliminary "maiden-sacrifices", see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing (Berkeley 1983) 65-66, with note 33 for references to the Athenian custom. On the Hyakinthides, there is now the convenient entrance in *OCD³*, s.v. "Hyakinthides" (E. Kearns); for the most recent discussion, cf. also D.D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London 1991) 73 and 75.

¹⁶⁴ As reflected in Lykourgos, *Against Leokrates* (1) 98-101 (at 101); and adopting the tradition in Euripides' *Erechtheus*. In Kearns (note 8) 59 the Hyakinthides are presented as the "clearest example" of the maiden-type of σωτείραι, who "after death ... still act ... as nurses and protectors of the city's potential fighting force".

Hill of the Nymphs.¹⁶⁵

A similar significance obtains for the temple of Eukleia (and Eunomia). Originally dedicated after the Persian wars to a popular Boiotian form of Artemis as a warrior goddess, in a commemorative allusion to the battle of Plataia and the famous victory festival held there, this temple shares a clear historicizing relationship with the “savior-shrines” of Agathe Tyche and the Hyakinthides.¹⁶⁶ Although the location of the Eukleia temple remains uncertain, with a setting on or by the Kolonos Agoraios more likely than not (and with one suggestion that it is the great Hephaisteion temple), the cult’s honorary seat in the Theater of Dionysos was re-inscribed in the imperial period to include Eunomia. Since the only references to the combined cult of Eukleia and Eunomia date to the Roman period, the restoration decree may reflect a recent addition of the worship of “Good Order” to the original cult of Artemis Eukleia. By the late 1st century A.D. the lifelong priesthood of Eukleia and Eunomia was considered prestigious enough for the city to award it to Quintus Trebellius Rufus, the great foreign-born benefactor and naturalized Athenian.¹⁶⁷

The restoration decree also concerned itself with the preservation or reclamation of revenue-producing properties belonging to certain state-cults. This aspect of the program is most evident in connection with the prominent cults of Athena Polias and the great Attic hero Theseus, both of which owned substantial *temene* or sacred properties just outside of the city.¹⁶⁸ The “*temenos* of Athena Polias beside the Long Walls” is impossible to identify for certain. The old land-walls that led down to the Piraeus cover a long distance, while the city’s chief goddess was, naturally enough, a considerable landowner, especially around the outskirts of the city, with residential properties, cultivated wetlands and even gardens held in her name. Nonetheless, this particular *temenos* may have something to do with the sacred olive-groves located near the Academy, famous as the source of the olive oil that was customarily awarded in the prize-amphorae of the Panathenaic festival. These venerable, and vulnerable, groves had been plundered for siege-timber by Sulla’s army in 86 B.C.¹⁶⁹ Although the Athenian state was

¹⁶⁵ Thus M. Ervin, “Geraistai Nymphai Genethliai and the Hill of the Nymphs: a Problem of Athenian Mythology and Topography”, *Platon* 11 (1959) 151 and 155-159. The association is not accepted in Kearns (note 8) 201, under ‘Υακινθίδες/Hyakinthides; nor in U. Kron, “Demos, Pnyx und Nymphenhügel. Zu Demos-Darstellungen und zum ältesten Kultort des Demos in Athen”, *AthMitt* 94 (1979) esp. 63- 66 and 72-74.

¹⁶⁶ See Pausanias 1.14.5. The cult is best known from the 4th century B.C.; see W.C. West, “Hellenic Homonoia and the New Decree from Plataea”, *GRBS* 18 (1977) 308; also, H.A. Shapiro, “*Ponos* and *Aponia*”, *GRBS* 25 (1984) esp. 109-110, for the cultic significance.

¹⁶⁷ Recorded in Trebellius’ career-inscription *IG II²* 4193 ll. 13-14 and 34-35. See M. Maass, *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen* (Vestigia 15, Munich 1972) 127 for the re-inscription of the theater-seat (*IG II²* 5059). Further references for the cult in the Roman period are *IG II²* 3738 and 4874, the latter being the only known dedication to Eukleia and Eunomia. That the Hephaisteion could in fact be the Temple of Eukleia is an idea kindly shared with the author by Evelyn Harrison.

¹⁶⁸ *IG II²* 1035 ll. 47-48; as originally discerned in R. Schlaifer, “Notes on Athenian Public Cults”, *HSCP* 51 (1940) 238-239 note 6. For *temene* here in its primary (and Homeric) meaning as a sacred property rather than a sanctuary, see also LSJ⁹, s.v. τέμενος I, “a piece of land cut off and assigned as an official domain”; in Walbank (note 92) 116 the term is taken in its later and more common meaning, with the decree’s *temenos* of Athena identified as an otherwise unattested sanctuary of the goddess outside of the city.

¹⁶⁹ For the incident, see Plutarch, *Sulla* 12; with discussion in J. Jordan and B. Perlin, “On the Protection of Sacred Groves”, in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow* (Durham, N.C. 1984) 158. Various *temene* of

a traditional leasing-authority for Athena, in the Augustan period it may have become necessary in this matter to receive the cooperation of the *genos* of the Eteoboutadai, the controlling clan of the cult of Athena Polias. Such a view is suggested by that clan's production of a new series of boundary stones (inscribed in suitably archaic lettering) for at least one property owned by the goddess. Almost certainly belonging to the Augustan period, the surviving inscriptions read "(I am) the *horos* of the field of Athena Polias, belonging to the *genos* of the Eteoboutadai (and measuring) 100 feet along to [each side?]."¹⁷⁰

More problematic are the properties that were restored to Theseus. This item in the catalogue is usually thought to refer to a combination of the four shrines that belonged to the hero: the three lesser sanctuaries in the Piraeus, at Eleusis, and on the Hippios Kolonus; and the famous Theseion built by Kimon in the 5th century B.C., which was probably located on the northeastern slope of the Acropolis, near the Gymnasium of Ptolemy.¹⁷¹ However, the properties catalogued collectively in the restoration decree were clearly situated somewhere else, west and south of the city near the old Long Walls and the shrine of Agathe Tyche. These *temene* are therefore probably better interpreted as income-bearing properties, perhaps more olive groves, that belonged to the civic cult of Theseus, which the Athenian state had the authority to lease.

"Hope for a real future creates the need for a real past".¹⁷² The recovery and preservation of a glorious and storied Athenian past represents the great cultural import of the restoration decree. In its embedded narrative of a civic tradition that echoes through the centuries, in ritualized fashion the decree literally inscribes the entire epic scope of the city's cultural memory. Collapsed into an eternal Athenian present are the Age of Heroes, the city's development and expansion in the Archaic age, the Persian Wars and other Athenian adversities, and even the various struggles against Macedonian rule. Unfortunately, it remains unknown whether the restoration decree was successful in achieving any lasting welfare for the cults, sacred properties, and historical monuments with which it so carefully concerned itself. Although a few of the sites restored are heard of again in the antiquarian testimonies of Pausanias and others, the

Athena Polias were listed among the goddess' property in the 340s B.C. (*IG II²* 1590 and 1591). At least one of these *temene* appears to have been located just on the outskirts of the city, perhaps to the southeast; see M.H. Jameson, "The Leasing of Land in Rhamnous", in *Studies in Attic History, Epigraphy and Topography* (*Hesperia Suppl.* 19, Princeton 1982) 69. Athena Polias also possessed at least two *telmata* (cultivated "pond areas" or "moats") near the Dipylon and Diochares Gates: Walbank (note 92) 123 note 57 and 197 (with evidence in *IG II²* 2495 ll. 6-7); also, in J. Travlos, *A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York 1971) 158.

¹⁷⁰ *Agora XIX* (G.V. Lalonde, M.K. Langdon, and M.B. Walbank, *The Athenian Agora XIX. Inscriptions: Horoi, Poletai Records, and Leases of Public Lands* [Princeton 1991]) nos. H23: *ὁρός γύου Ἀθε[ναίας Πολιάδος] | προσήκον Ἐτεο[βουταδῶν γένει] | πόδες Η ἐπὶ [- - -] lacuna?)* and H24 (Pl. 1); *ed. pr.* in *Hesp.* 37 (1968) 292-294 nos. 35 and 36, *ed.* B.D. Meritt (= *SEG* 25 [1971] nos. 200 and 201). Meritt associates these *horoi* with *IG II²* 1035; but assigns them to the 2nd century A.D., which at that time was the prevailing date for the restoration decree.

¹⁷¹ As enumerated in Plutarch, *Theseus* 35.2 and 36.2; with discussion in S.N. Koumanoudes, "Θησέως σηκός", *ArchEphem* (1976) 212-214 nos. 1-2. Most recently, see also S.G. Miller, "Architecture as Evidence for the Identity of the Early *Polis*", in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, *ed.* M.H. Hansen (Copenhagen 1995) 234 note 70. The various shrines are also recorded independently: Piraeus, in *IG II²* 2498; Eleusis, in *IG II²* 1672; Hippios Kolonus, in Pausanias 1.30.4; Athens, in *SEG* 21 (1965) no. 674.

¹⁷² Thus G.S. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* (Montreal and Kingston 1997) 178.

majority are not witnessed again in the surviving sources. However, the proud ancestral heritage and grand civic themes that are so reverently embraced within the work of the decree would remain a vibrant cultural resource for Athens, particularly in the period of the so-called Second Sophistic, whose intellectual ethos is significantly anticipated by the restoration program. Athens would again assume its ancient role as the “School of Hellas”, to become an important university-town for the likes of Plutarch, while under the emperor Hadrian the city would become the new “Capital of Hellenism”, as the seat of the culturally exclusive league of the Panhellenion.

Geoffrey C.R. Schmalz

Simon Fraser University

gcs1@sfu.ca