

Tekmeria

Vol 15 (2020)

(2019-2020)

γεγεννησθαι. μνησεται ουν απο μετοικων τε τινων και ακο-
 λουθων περι μεν των Ερμων ουδεν, άλλων δε αγαλμάτων
 περικοπαί τινες προίτερον υπό νεωτέρων μετά παιδιās και
ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
 ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
 NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY
 οίνου γεγεννησθαι. μνησεται ουν απο μετοικων τε τινων και
ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
 ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
 NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY
 αϊτά ύπολαμβάνοντες οι μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἔμποδῶν οὔτι σφίσι μῆ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προιστάται,
 και νομισαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρώτοι ἀν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον και ἐβόων. Ἐπὶ δὲ δήμου καταλείπει τὰ τε μυστικά και
 ἡ τῶν Ερμων περικοπαί τινες προίτερον υπό νεωτέρων μετά παιδιās και
ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
 ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
 NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπισηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὃ δ' ἐν τε
ΣΥΜΒΟΛΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΟΥ
 ΚΟΣΜΟΥ • CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK
 AND ROMAN WORLD • CONTRIBUTIONS A L'HISTOIRE DU
 MONDE GREC ET ROMAIN • BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE
 DER GRIECHISCHEN UND RÖMISCHEN WELT • CONTRIBUTI
 PER LA STORIA DEL MONDO GRECO E ROMANO
 τῷ παρόντι πρό-
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν κρ-
 γὰρ και τὰ τῆς πα-
 τι εἰργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ὀπολιθείη, ἄρχειν. και
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μῆ ἀπόντος πέρι αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ ἀδ-
 15
 (2019-2020)
 μη μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτῳ στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ δεδιότες τὸ τε στρατεύμα
 μῆ εὐνοῦν ἔχειν, ἢν ἤδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὃ τε δήμος μῆ μαλα-
 κίζηται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνου οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ζυνεστράτεον
 και τῶν Μαντινέων τιμές, ἀπέτρεπον και ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνέεντες οἱ ἔλεγον νῦν μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν και μῆ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγῆς κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
ΑΘΗΝΑ • 2021 • ATHENS
 ῥηταῖς. βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἢν ἐμελλον ῥῆον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μετάπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. και ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγή ἐγίνετο

Inscriptions from Abdera and Maroneia

Peter Thonemann

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.23347](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.23347)

Copyright © 2020, Peter Thonemann



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Thonemann, P. (2020). Inscriptions from Abdera and Maroneia. *Tekmeria*, 15, 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.23347>

PETER THONEMANN

Inscriptions from Abdera and Maroneia*

1. A fifth-century law from Abdera (fig. 1)

In their 2004 corpus of the inscriptions of Aegean Thrace (*I.Thrac.Aeg.*), Louisa Loukopoulou and her colleagues offer the *editio princeps* of what remains the only known public document from fifth-century BC Abdera (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E1: now in the Abdera Museum, MA 5524). The text is inscribed *stoichedon* on one of the narrower faces of a large block of local sandstone (H. 1.24 m, W. 0.235 m, Th. 0.555 m), discovered out of context in the wall of a house in the modern village of Abdera. The block is described in the corpus as follows: ‘The careful working of the left surface and the hemicylindrical shaping of the back face are probably owing to later re-use. On the side faces can be discerned the traces of at least two tenons for connecting it to neighbouring blocks. The inscription was perhaps originally inscribed on the wall of a monumental building.’

The editors date the inscription to the end of the first quarter of the fifth century BC, and this seems broadly consistent with the style of the lettering, although we are hampered by the absence of contemporary epigraphic parallels from Abdera. The text is inscribed *stoichedon* in the Ionic alphabet, with no interpuncts; the letters are notably large (0.030-0.040 m). The cross bar of the *alpha* generally slants downwards slightly to the right. The horizontal strokes of the *epsilon* are usually horizontal (although they slant sharply downwards in line 14), and there is no ‘tail’ at the bottom of the vertical stroke. The right and left strokes of the *nu* slant sharply upwards to the right, and the lower part of the right-hand stroke typically begins around half-way up the letter-space.

* I am indebted to Mrs Chryssa Karadima (Ephorate of Antiquities of Rhodope) and to Dr Naya Dalakoura (Maroneia Archaeological Museum) for their generous and enthusiastic support in the publication of inscriptions 2 and 3 below; the photograph of inscriptions 1 and 2 were kindly provided by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Xanthi and Gabriella Parissaki at the Institute of Historical Research (National Hellenic Research Foundation) respectively. I am also grateful to Charles Crowther, Leah Lazar, Martin Hallmannsecker, and Sally Humphreys for their help with the reading and interpretation of inscription 2, and to two anonymous referees for helpful comments and corrections.

The *sigma* is narrow, and the outer strokes splay outwards widely. The two lower strokes of the *omega* slant downwards at an angle. Perhaps the most surprising feature of the lettering is the form of the *rho*, with a short tail below a rounded loop; tailed *rho* is not found on the late sixth- and fifth- century BC coinage of Abdera, and is very rare in inscriptions from Ionia.¹ I would cautiously date the text ca. 480-450 BC, with a preference for earlier in the period.²

The text is presented in the corpus as follows:

[- - -]ΕΟΣΝ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΟΤΕΡ[- - -]
 [- - -] . ΚΑΙ[- - -]
 4 [- - -]ΑΡΑΙΟ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΕΡΟΣΤ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΟΝΤΕΙ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΑΙΔΕΙ[- - -]
 8 [- - -] . ΤΕΟ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΟΤΙΑΝ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΣΠΙΑΝ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΣΤΑΣΙ[- - -]
 12 [- - -] . ΓΙΝΕ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΤΑΙΗ . [- - -]
 [- - -]ΝΕΩΝΑ[- - -]
 [- - -]ΠΙΟΒΑΣ[- - -]
 16 [- - -] . ΣΟΣ[- - -]

The first editors assumed that the stone had been cut down neatly on both the left and right sides, leaving only a maximum of five letters in the centre of

1. Jeffery 1990, 325; though note that the tailed *rho* does appear in late sixth-century inscriptions of nearby Thasos (Jeffery 1990, 301). Tailed *rho* is of course very common in Attic inscriptions of the early 5th century BC, and it may not be fanciful to see possible Athenian influence on this stone-cutter: another text from Abdera, the very fragmentary epitaph *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E36 (which I would date to the early 5th century BC), shows marked similarities to early fifth-century Athenian lettering (Thonemann 2006: 459).

2. The ‘slanted’ *nu* should point to a date in the first half of the 5th century BC: Jeffery 1990, 325.

each line visible. I would prefer to assume that the block survives to its original width, and suggest that the text should be read and restored as follows:

Stoichedon 5

[. . .-έτ]-
 1 εος ν[ε]-
 ωτερ[ο]-
 [ε] καὶ [γ]-
 εραιτ-
 5 ερος π-
 εντεχ-
 αιδεκ-
 έτεο[ς]-
 ότι ἀν
 10 ἐπανά-
 στασι-
 ς γίνη-
 ται ἢ [κ]
 νεῶν ἀ-
 15 πρόβασ-
 [ι]ς ΟΣ[.]
 - - -

‘...younger than [- -] years old and older than fifteen years old. That if an uprising occurs or a naval incursion...’

In lines 1-8, we have a definition of an age-range with a lower limit of fifteen years (the upper limit is unknown: the letters ΕΟΣ in line 1 must be the end of the relevant adjective). The forms ν[ε]ωτερ[ο][ε] and [γ]εραιτερος could either be nominative singular (ν[ε]ώτερ[ος]) or accusative plural (ν[ε]ωτέρ[ους], i.e. νεωτέρους); I see no way of telling which is correct.³ When an age-range of this

3. A similar problem in lines A2-3 of the fragment of the Teian *dirae* published by Herrmann 1981 (see also SEG 31, 985; Koerner 1993, 301-307, no. 79; Effenterre, Ruzé 1994-1995, I 370-375, no. 105; Osborne, Rhodes, 2017, 4-15, no. 102C), where ποιομε[ν]ος could represent either ποιοίμε[ν]ος or ποιομέ[ν]ος.

kind is given in Greek inscriptions, the upper and lower limits are normally given in a 'negative' form ('no older than x and no younger than y): I can find no close parallels for this 'positive' formulation ('younger than x and older than y ').⁴

Given the two 'emergency' scenarios envisaged in lines 9-16 (revolution or naval attack), it seems most likely that we are dealing here with upper and lower ages of eligibility for military service. If this is correct, the lower age of eligibility (fifteen) is startlingly young. At all periods, the lower age-limit for army-service in the Greek world was normally twenty; the upper age-limit was normally either fifty or sixty.⁵ Adolescents below the age of twenty were only called up under exceptional circumstances; Livy tells us that in Akarnania, in 211 BC, the prospect of an Aitolian invasion led them to call up men between the ages of fifteen and sixty (Livy 26.25.11), and in 197 BC Philip V conscripted boys as young as sixteen (Livy 33.3.1-5). However, an important parallel for the age of fifteen as a 'regular' lower cut-off point is found in the Macedonian royal *diagramma* on military service from the later Antigonid period.⁶ Here we read that recruits for the Macedonian army are to come 'from those registered in the citizen-lists, in each 'fire' (*pyrokausis*), those who seem suitable to go on campaign, from the age of fifteen to the age of fifty' (λαμβάνε[τωσαν δὲ ἐκ τῶν κατακεχωρισμένων ἐν τοῖς πολιτεύμασιν] καθ' ἑκάστην πυρόκαυσιν τοὺς

4. Contrast e.g. the gymnasiarchic law from Beroia (II BC), where the gymnasiarch is to be *μη νεώτερον ἐτῶν τριάκοντα* *μηδὲ πρεσβύτερον ἐξήκοντα* (*I.Beroia* 1, lines A23-24, with Gauthier, Hatzopoulos 1993, 51-52); similarly *IG IX 1² 4, 797* (Kerkyra, II BC), where men administering a foundation are to be *μη νεωτέρους ἐτῶν τριάκοντα πέντε μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα* (lines 46-48), and *Syll.³ 641B* (Delphi, 160/59 BC), lines 14-15, where *sitōnai* are to be *μη νεωτέρους ἐτέων τριάκοντα μηδ[ὲ] πρεσβυτέρους ἐτέων ἐξήκοντα*.

5. Busolt, Swoboda 1920-1926, I 577-578. To take only a single example: in the so-called 'Themistokles decree' from Troizen (Meiggs, Lewis 1969, no. 23, inscribed in the early 3rd century BC, but perhaps reflecting the situation at Athens in 480 BC), trierarchs are to be 'no older than fifty years' (l. 22, [*μη πρεσβυτέρο*] *υς πενήκοντα ἐτῶν*), and marines are to be between twenty and thirty years old (ll. 24-25, *ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ εἴκοσιν ἔτη* [*γ*] *εἰγονότω* [*ν*] *μέχρι τριάκοντα ἐτῶν*).

6. Hatzopoulos 2001, Appendix no. 2 I (*SEG* 49, 855), ll. 27-31 and no. 2 II (*SEG* 49, 722), ll. 13-14, 26-27.

δοκοῦντας ἐπ[ιτηδείους εἶναι μένειν ἐν τῶι ὑπαίθρῳι ἀπὸ πεντε]καιδεκαετοῦς ἕως πεντηκονθέτους).⁷ As the *diagramma* goes on to specify, in fact boys of fifteen only ended up being conscripted when a household consisted of a married couple and a single son, and the father was over fifty years of age and the son was over fifteen.⁸ Nonetheless, the age of fifteen was a significant ‘liminal’ age for military service in Hellenistic Macedonia: in 167 BC, after the defeat of Perseus, all members of the Macedonian political elite were exiled along with their sons aged fifteen and above (Livy 45.32.3).

Our text from Abdera appears to show that fifteen was also the lower age-limit for some form of military service at Abdera in the early fifth century BC (not necessarily hoplite service). We do not know whether the clause that finished with lines 1-8 of our text was concerned with the upper and lower limits of the *entire* class of men eligible for military service (e.g. fifteen to sixty), or whether it was defining an age-class of sub-adults who would only be called up *in extremis* (e.g. fifteen to nineteen). It is in fact possible (as lines 9-16 may suggest) that our text is concerned precisely with *extending* the normal ages of military service in a context of political and military crisis.

Lines 9-16 are the beginning of a new clause, stating what is to happen in the event of a revolution or a naval assault on Abdera. The clause is introduced with ὅτι ἄν; ἄν is presumably equivalent to ἐάν, but the precise force of ὅτι is not clear to me.⁹ Concerns about ‘revolution’ (ἐπανάστασις, lines 10-12) are very prominent in the near-contemporary Teian *dirae* (perhaps of the second quarter of the fifth century BC).¹⁰ In the fragment published by Peter Herrmann in 1981 (curses and magistrates’ oaths, valid at both Teos and Abdera), magistrates at both Teos and Abdera are to swear an oath that begins ἐπανάστα[σ]ιν : οὐ βολεύσω : οὐδὲ ποιήσω : οὐδὲ λυ[ή]σω (lines A10-13, ‘I will not plot a

7. SEG 49, 722, ll. 11-13, with Hatzopoulos 2001, 99-100; the restoration [πεντε]καιδεκαετοῦς is guaranteed by SEG 49, 722, l. 30 (νεώτερος τῶν πεντεκαίδεκα ἐτῶν).

8. SEG 49, 722, ll. 25-27 = SEG 49, 855, ll. 19-22, with Hatzopoulos 2001, 109-111.

9. An anonymous referee suggests that ὅτι ἄν could be a mason’s error for ὅτε ἄν, i.e. ‘whenever’.

10. Herrmann 1981; Koerner 1993, 294-307, nos 78 and 79; Effenterre, Ruzé 1994-1995, I 366-375, nos 104 and 105; Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 4-15, no. 102. I will republish the extant fragments of the Teian *dirae* in a forthcoming book on the history of relations between Teos and Abdera.

revolution or take part in one, nor will I engage in civil strife').¹¹ Similarly, one of the older fragments of the *dirae* (apparently in force only at Teos) includes a clause which invokes curses on anyone who either sets up an *aisymnētēs* or initiates a revolution with the aim of establishing an *aisymnētēs* (B3-6, ὅστις... ἢ αἰσυ[μ]νήτη(ν) [ἰσταί]η ἢ ἐπανισταῖτο (ἐπ') αἰ[συμ]νήτη).¹² In the late fifth century BC, the Thasians passed a law (most probably under the oligarchy of 411-407 BC) laying down rewards for informers who provide information about a revolution being plotted against Thasos (ὅς ἂν ἐπανάστασιν βολευομένην ἐπὶ Θάσῳι κατείπηι, κτλ.).¹³ Much later, perhaps in the early third century BC, the Abderites inscribed a similar law stipulating rewards for informers who denounce a planned revolution at Abdera.¹⁴ A lost passage of Pindar's fragmentary second *Paeon* seems to have been concerned with *stasis* at Abdera, at an uncertain date (but certainly in the late sixth or early fifth century BC).¹⁵

The phrase ἐκ νεῶν ἀπόβασις (lines 13-16) signifies 'a (hostile) landing from ships', as in e.g. Thuc. 3.115.1 (winter 426/5 BC), οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ Ἀθηναῖοι... ἔς τε τὴν Ἰμερναίαν ἀπόβασιν ἐποιήσαντο ἐκ τῶν νεῶν.¹⁶ In line 13, I have assumed that we have aphaeresis of (ἐ)κ after a preceding vowel, a phenomenon which is perfectly common in East Ionic: cf. e.g. μῆ ᾽ποδιδοίη in the Teian *dirae* (line C2).¹⁷ The urban centre of Abdera was situated on the coast of Thrace,

11. λυ[ή]σω is the future of λυάω = στασιάζω, 'engage in civil strife': Herrmann 1981, 15-16.

12. As restored by Herrmann 1981, 18-21 (SEG 31, 984). The phraseology is very similar to *IG II/III*³ 1,2, 320 (Athenian law against tyranny, 337/6 BC), ll. 7-8, ἐάν τις ἐπαναστῆι τῶι δήμῳ ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἢ τὴν τυραννίδα συνκαταστήσῃ.

13. Osborne, Rhodes 2017, no. 176. The law is concerned with revolutionary activity both at Thasos and in the Thasian *apoikia* on the mainland.

14. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E2: [ὅς ἂν ἐπανάστασιν] ἐπιβουλευομένη[ν] ἐπὶ Ἄβδηρα κατείπηι κτλ. On informers, see further Rubinstein 2016.

15. The relevant passage of the *Paeon* is lost, but the difficult ancient scholion on line 48 refers to τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει στασιάζοντας and ἐπήλυδας: Rutherford 2001, 260 (text), 270 (commentary).

16. Similarly Arr. *Anab.* 1.19.5 (Alexander at Miletos), κατὰ τὰ ἀπότομα τῆς νήσου, καθάπερ πρὸς τεῖχος, ἐκ τῶν νεῶν τὴν ἀπόβασιν ποιησόμενος.

17. For other examples, see e.g. Matthaiou 2011, 13-34 (Dophytis inscription, Chios, ca. 480-450 BC), lines A2 and B24-4 (ἡ ᾽ς; μῆ ᾽λάσσονες); Meiggs, Lewis 1969, no. 8 (Chios,

east of the mouth of the river Nestos, and hence was potentially vulnerable to naval assault. The Classical city was laid out on a large scale, some 600 m to the north of the current shoreline, with an impressive wall-circuit enclosing an area of around 107.5 hectares (the ‘North Enclosure’); a deep embayment (now silted up) immediately to the west of the North Enclosure provided access to the sea, as indicated by the remains of a later ship-shed at the north-west corner of the North Enclosure and a breakwater at its south-west corner.¹⁸ There is some reason to think that Abdera may have been a Persian naval base in the late 490s BC.¹⁹ The city was captured from the sea at least once in her history, in 170 BC, when Abdera was sacked by the Roman *praetor* and fleet-commander L. Hortensius, with the support of Eumenes II of Pergamon.²⁰ It is not clear whether the primary concern here is the protection of Abdera against naval assault by enemy states (above all Persia?), or attacks by pirate-ships: the Teian *dirae* include curses both against those who commit piracy or receive pirates, and against those who plot evil against Teos in association with Greeks or barbarians (i.e. the Persians).²¹ Plutarch claims that Kimon’s capture of Skyros in 476/5 BC was directed against pirates, and it is possible that the suppression of piracy in the Aegean was one of the major achievements of the early Athenian empire.²²

As we have seen, the lettering of our text seems to point to a date around 475 BC, a broadly similar date to the Teian *dirae*. This date is also plausible for historical reasons. Abdera was presumably liberated from the Persians and joined the Athenian alliance in 476/5 BC, at the time of Kimon’s campaign against Eion (Hdt. 7.107; Thuc. 1.98.1), and shortly before Kimon’s capture of

ca. 575-550 BC), line B1 (ἤκκλητος: either ἡ (ἔ)κκλητος or ἡ (ἔ)κκληήτος); SEG 61, 700 (Chios, ca. 400 BC), A24, [μῆ] ᾿χφέρην.

18. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 2004. The wall-circuit was rebuilt in the last quarter of the 6th century BC: Kallintzi 2012, 132-136.

19. Hdt. 6.46.1, 6.47.2 (with Vasilev 2015, 159): Darius orders that the Thasian fleet be sent to Abdera.

20. Livy 43.4.8-13; Diod. Sic. 30.6.1.

21. Osborne, Rhodes 2017, no. 102B, ll. 20-27: ἡ ληίζοιτο ἡ ληιστὰς ὑποδέχοιτο εἰδῶς ἐκ γῆς τῆς Τηέης ἡ [θ]αλάττης φέροντας ἡ [τι κ]ακὸν βολεῖοι περι Τ[ηέ]ων τῶ ξυνῶ εἰδῶς ἡ π[ρὸς] ᾿Ελλήνας ἡ πρὸς βαρβάρους.

22. Plut. *Cim.* 8.3-4 (cf. Thuc. 1.98.2); but for scepticism, see de Souza 1999, 27-30.

the pirate base at Skyros.²³ Abdera no doubt changed at this point from an oligarchic or tyrannical (or at least pro-Persian) regime to a new democratic form of government; the city seems clearly to have had a democratic constitution at the time the Teian *dirae* were inscribed, probably at some point in the second quarter of the fifth century BC.²⁴ At the time our text was inscribed, the Abderites were evidently concerned about the possibilities of revolution (*ἐπανόστασις*) and a naval assault (*ἐκ νεῶν ἀπόβασις*), and it is tempting to read our inscription as an attempt to protect a newly democratic (and anti-Persian) regime from an oligarchic or tyrannical counter-revolution, perhaps through extension of the normal maximum and minimum ages of compulsory military service. It is likely enough that Abdera was very sharply divided between pro- and anti-Persian factions in the 470s BC: the city had been a loyal subject of the Persian king as late as autumn 480 BC, when Xerxes singled out the Abderites for their loyalty and made a treaty of friendship with them, accompanied by lavish gifts.²⁵ It is even possible that Abdera had a Persian governor before 476 BC: Herodotos tells us that Persian governors (*ὑπαρχοί*) were appointed throughout Thrace and the Hellespontine region before Xerxes' campaign, all of whom (except Maskames at Doriskos) were later expelled by the Greeks.²⁶ It is worth noting in this context that a coin-magistrate at Abdera whose tenure of office must date precisely around 475 BC carried the name ΑΣΠΙΑ(-).²⁷ This is usually taken to represent the Greek name Ἀσπιά(σιος), but the element Ἀσπια- is also extremely common in Persian onomastics (e.g. Aspathines, Aspamitres); it is conceivable that this man was in fact a Persian (or a Greek with a Persian name), in control at Abdera immediately before the capture of the city by Kimon in 476/5 BC.

Finally, it is worth revisiting the tentative suggestion by the first editors of the inscription that this text might be part of an Abderite equivalent to

23. Chryssanthaki 2001, 391.

24. Abdera appears to have had a democratic constitution at the time the Teian *dirae* were inscribed: Lewis 1982, 72; Graham 1991, Robinson 2011, 140-145.

25. Hdt. 8.120, with Lenfant 2002. Note also the lavish Abderite entertainment of Xerxes during his advance: Hdt. 7.120.

26. Hdt. 7.106-7 (Maskames at Doriskos; Boges at Eion).

27. May 1966, 96, Group XXX, 60 (misreading the legend as ΑΣΠΑ); for the correct reading, see Masson 1984, 49 ('sans doute Ἀσπιά(σιος)'). For the date of this issue (ca. 475 BC), see Chryssanthaki-Nagle 2007, 107-110.

the Teian curses inscribed on stone at roughly the same period. This has an obvious *a priori* plausibility, strengthened by the thematic link with the Teian curses (concern with preventing revolution), but the surviving passage of text does not obviously form part of a sequence of curses or oaths. It is perhaps preferable to see the text as a decree or law concerned with military service and protection against revolution or naval assault, driven by similar concerns to the contemporary Teian curses, but framed as a law rather than a series of curses.

2. A decree concerning adoption from Maroneia (fig. 2)

The inscription re-edited here was first published by Louisa Loukopoulou and her colleagues in their 2004 corpus of the inscriptions of Aegean Thrace (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E181α; now in the collection of the Archaeological Museum of Maroneia, inventory AKM 10486). The inscription was a chance find, discovered by a farmer in 1995 in the area known as Παράθύρα, in the south-eastern corner of the urban site of Maroneia, close to the city's harbour.²⁸ The text is inscribed on a *stēlē* of white, coarse-grained crystalline marble, with a plain damaged moulding at the top; the *stēlē* does not taper, and there is no reason to think that there was originally a pediment at the top. The dimensions of the stone (apparently complete) are H. 0.98 m, W. 0.46 m, Th. 0.13 m; the letter-height is around 0.010 m. The stone is damaged at the top right-hand corner, resulting in the loss of the final parts of lines 1-16. A deep gash across the upper right-hand part of the face of the stone may date to the moment of discovery (a farmer's spade?).

The inscribed face of the stone is extremely worn, in a manner which makes the text quite exceptionally difficult to read. The first editors were only able to make out the remains of the first three lines, as follows:

ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι· ἐπειδὴ [. .] ἐξέε;[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]THNE[- - -]
 [- - - -]μον ἀπεδε[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]

I here offer a fuller reading of the text, following autopsy of the stone in October 2019, and subsequent work from photographs.

28. The location is marked on the site-plan of Maroneia published in *I.Thrac.Aeg.*, p. 337.

- ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι· ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἐξε[ταστῆς Προ]-
 κλήης Προκλήους ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν β[ουλὴν καὶ τὸν]
 [δ]ῆμον ANE[- c.4 -]ET[. . .]ΣAN[.Λ[. .]Λ[- c.12 - -]
 ὄρφανοῦ [Προκ]λήους τοῦ Χαρμάδο[υ - - c.12 - -]
 5 [-----]
 [------]ΣAMENOY[------]
 [. .]A TH[------]AISYNT[------]
 [.JEMΩN[------]PI[------]
 [. .]Σ[.A]IN[.ΣAI[. . .]Σ[- - -]OY[- - - -]ΔIEN[- c.6 -]
 10 [.JE[. . .]ΣTEPON[- c.7 - -]NOCT[- c.8 - -]YSE[- c.8 - -]
 κατ' ἀ[χ]ριστήαν κληρο[ν]όμον π[αιδ]ο[π]οήσασθαι β[ο]ύλε]-
 ται μετὰ τῆς τοῦ δήμου [- c.6-7 -]HΣ ἀσφαλίσασθαι [τά]
 τε περὶ τὸν ἴδιον βίον καὶ [- c.6 -] δοῦναι τὴν ἐπιβάλλ[ου]-
 σαν τῶι νηπίωι· καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ὄρφανόν, ὅπως ἤ α[ὐ]-
 15 τῶ τοῖς [νό]μοις καὶ τῆι τοῦ δήμου κρίσει διησφαλισμ[έ]-
 να περὶ τῆς παιδοποιίας· δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμωι· ἐ[ξ]-
 εἶναι Προκλή Προκλήους, καθότι καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις
 συνκεχώρηται, παιδοποήσασθαι τὸν θυγατριδοῦν
 Προκλήν [X]αρμάδου, καὶ το[ύς] ἐπὶ τούτ[ων] ἄρ[χ]οντας, δο-
 20 θέντων τῶν τ[ῆ]ς παιδο[π]οίας ἀν[- c.7 - -]ων, ἀναγράψαι
 αὐτούς εἰς τὰ κύρια· τὸν δὲ παιδ[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]E Χαρμάδου καὶ ἐπι[. . .]MONEΣ[. .]
 [- - - - -]ON ἐπὶ ταύτης [- c.7 - -]ΑΣΕΙΣΠ[- - - - -]
 [----- 24 lines -----]

Translation

‘Resolved by the council: since the *exe[tastēs Prok]*les son of Prokles has made an approach to the c[ouncil and the] people... [concerning] the orphan [Prok]les son of Charmades... (six lines illegible)... to adopt him as his heir by dint of kin-proximity, he wishes, with the [?approval] of the people, both to make secure [the matters] concerning his own livelihood, and also to give the fitting [?upbringing/support] to the infant; and as for the matters concerning the orphan himself, in order that the things concerning the adoption might be ratified for him by the laws and by the decision of the people, be it resolved by the people that it be permitted to Prokles son of Prokles, just as is also granted by the laws, to adopt his daughter’s son Prokles son of Charmades, and let

the magistrates in charge of these matters, once the [- -] of the adoption have been given, register them among the validated decisions (?); and the ?child... of Charmades... (twenty-four lines illegible)

Commentary

Lines 1-3: the enactment formula ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι is standard at Maroneia: cf. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E175 (III/II BC), ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι· ἐπειδὴ κτλ.; *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E180 (ca. AD 41-54), line A3, [ἔ]δοξεν τῆι βουλῆι· ἐπεὶ κτλ.²⁹ In *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E180 this is followed by the motion formula δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ: the combination in our text (ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι... δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμῳ) is standard at Hellenistic Samothrake, and is also attested at Kyme and elsewhere.³⁰ The parasitic *iota* of ἐπειδὴ is clear on the stone (cf. π[αιδ]ο[π]ορήσασθαι in line 11), and points to a date in the first century BC or first century AD: note the abundant examples of both medial and terminal parasitic *iota* in e.g. *I.Knidos* 34 (6 BC: letter of Augustus to the Knidians); *SEG* 55, 838 (Chersonesos, early Imperial period, with Kantor 2013, 71-72); *OGIS* 669 (AD 68: edict of Tiberius Iulius Alexander, with ἐπειδὴ in line 15).

At the end of line 1, ὁ ἐξε[- -] is clearly a magistrate's title; the only possibility seems to be the office of ἐξε[ταστήρ]. An ἐξεταστήρ is attested at Maroneia in a decree of an association of *therapeutai* of Sarapis (second or first century BC), with responsibility for the financing and implementation of honours for a priest of the association; however, this *exetastēs* is clearly an official of the cult-association, not of the *polis* of Maroneia.³¹ A civic *exetastēs* is attested as an annual magistrate at Abdera in the Roman Imperial period, although his functions there are unknown.³² In the Hellenistic period, boards of *exetastai* are widely attested in Greek cities of the mainland and (above all) Asia Minor, fulfilling a wide variety of functions; their primary role in most cities seems to have been to oversee public documents (archival records, inscribed decrees, citizen-lists and accounts).³³ In virtually all Hellenistic instances, the

29. Apparently [ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ] τῶι δήμῳ· ἐπειδὴ κτλ. in *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E181 (I/II AD).

30. Rhodes, Lewis 1997, 286-288, 405-407, 485-487.

31. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E183, ll. 10-12, προνοεῖσθαι δὲ τῶν προγεγραμμένων τὸν ἀεὶ γεινόμενον ἐξεταστήν.

32. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E21.

33. Fröhlich 2004, 117-167.

exetastai serve as a board of magistrates, rather than as a single magistrate; however, a single civic *exetastēs* is attested in a handful of cities in the Roman Imperial period.³⁴ The wording of our text is, I think, compatible with either scenario (Prokles a member of a board of *exetastai*, or a solitary *exetastēs*). The restoration [Προ]κλήης Προκλήους is guaranteed by line 17 below; for the orthography -κλήους for -κλείους (genitive), compare *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E269 (Maroneia, II/I BC), [Κ]αλλίστ[ρα]τος Μενεκλήους.³⁵ The name Προκλήης is also attested at Maroneia in *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E251 and E254 (both Hellenistic).

Lines 3-4: I am unable to make out the remainder of line 3; the general sense is presumably that Prokles has made a request to the civic authorities concerning the orphan Prokles son of Charmades (perhaps [περι τοῦ] ὄρφανοῦ [Προκ]λήους τοῦ Χαρμάδο[υ]), the details of which would have been spelled out in the following lines (very little can be read in lines 5-10). The name of the orphan is guaranteed by line 19 (Προκλήν [Χ]αρμάδου), and his deceased father's name also appears in line 22. The name Χαρμάδης is extremely rare: it seems otherwise only to be attested as the name of a Ptolemaic *stratēgos* in the mid-third century BC (Frontin. *Str.* 3.2.11) and at Deir el-Bahari in the Roman Imperial period (Łajtar 2006, 314-315, no. 227). However, the related names Χαρμάδας and Χαρμίδης are widespread, and the form Χαρμάδης is a perfectly regular derivation from Χάρμος.

Lines 11-14: The syntax of these four lines is not wholly clear. We appear to have a verb in the indicative (ἕρ[ύλε]ται) at the end of line 11 and the start of line 12. This verb must go closely with the following phrase μετὰ τῆς τοῦ δήμου [- c.6-7 -]ἩΣ, indicating that Prokles wishes to act 'with the [agreement/approval] of the *dēmos*': apparently the proposed adoption had to be authorized by the *dēmos* of Maroneia. The two infinitives that follow (ἀσφαλίσασθαί... δοῦναι) must be syntactically dependent on the verb ἕρ[ύλε]ται. The elder Prokles is described as having two separate aims in making the adoption:

34. Thus apparently at Hierapolis (*AvH* 32), Laodikeia on the Lykos (*I.Laodikeia* 47), and Abdera (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E21); single *exetastai* also appear as magistrates of private associations at Thessalonike in the Roman Imperial period (*IG X 2*, 1 Suppl., 1048, 1320, 1339, 1354, 1363).

35. Elsewhere in the north Aegean, Ἀριστοκλήους in *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E62 (Abdera, II/I BC) and *SEG* 31, 800 (Thasos); Ἀνδροκλήους in *IG X 2*, 1, 844 (Thessalonike); Ἰσοδοκλήου[ς] in *IG XII 8*, 212 (Samothrake); for the form, cf. G. Petzl's note on *I.Smyrna* 521.

(a) to ‘make secure’ (ἀσφαλίσασθαι) his own livelihood ([τά] τε περὶ τὸν ἴδιον βίον), i.e. to ensure that he will receive appropriate support in his old age,³⁶ and (b) to provide the appropriate support/care for his infant grandson (καὶ [e.g. τροφήν] δοῦναι τὴν ἐπιβάλλ[ου]σαν τῶι νηπίωι).³⁷ If this is correct, then the phrase κατ’ ἀγ[χ]ιστήαν κληρο[ν]όμον π[αιδ]ο[π]οήσασθαι in line 11 cannot be dependent on the indicative ἔσ[υ]λεται at the end of the line, but must instead depend on a participle or preposition in line 10. The phrase κατ’ ἀγ[χ]ιστήαν κληρο[ν]όμον probably forms a single idea, ‘heir by dint of kin-proximity’: as a result of the adoption, the younger Prokles will become presumptive heir to the elder Prokles’ estate. I take the sense to be something like ‘[having resolved] to adopt [the younger Prokles] as his heir by dint of kin-proximity, he wishes, with the [approval] of the *dēmos*, both to make secure [the matters] concerning his own livelihood, and also to give the fitting [support] to the infant’.

For the form π[αιδ]ο[π]οήσασθαι, with parasitic *iota*, see on lines 1-3 above. The term ἀγχιστεία is an abstract noun denoting the relationship of ‘kin-closeness’.³⁸ At Athens, kin were ranked in order of their degree of proximity to an individual, enabling (at least in principle) disputes over inheritance to be settled ‘according to closeness’; the phrase κατ’ ἀγχιστείας is common in Athenian lawcourt speeches concerned with inheritance.³⁹

Lines 14-16: The structure of these lines (assuming I have read and punctuated them correctly) has no close parallels. In line 14 we appear to have a

36. Compare the reasons for adoption given in Isaios 2.10: ‘Menekles began to consider how he might avoid being childless, but might instead have someone who would look after him in his old age and bury him after his death and subsequently perform the appropriate rites for him’.

37. The term *νήπιος* is common in verse inscriptions, but rare in epigraphic prose: cf. *IG XII 7*, 396 (Amorgos, AD 153/4), ll. 24-27, a difficult passage apparently describing a pair of orphaned sons, of whom one is already of age, ‘and the other is still a complete infant’, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον ἔτι δὲ νήπιον παντελῶς.

38. For the orthography ἀγχιστήαν, compare the near-contemporary Maroneian decree *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E180, where we find ἀπολήας (A10), ἡ πρεσβήα (A27, and often), συνεδρήαν (A22).

39. E.g. *Isae.* 1.4, 5.14, 5.16, 11.19, 11.22, 11.33; *Dem.* 43.4, 44.6. On ἀγχιστεία, see Todd 1993, 217-221; Humphreys 2018, 37-45.

phrase *καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ὀρφανόν*, which I take to mean ‘and as for the matters concerning the orphan himself’, as opposed to the elder Prokles’ motives and intentions, discussed in the preceding lines. We then seem to have a purpose clause, *ὅπως ᾗ... διησφαλισμ[έ]να*, ‘in order that (these matters) should be secured/ratified’. For the verb *διασφαλίζεσθαι* (‘ratify’) in this context, compare e.g. *I.Kaunos* 35 (ca. AD 117-138), A lines 7-8, *κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα [πάν]τα περὶ τούτων κεκυρωμένα καὶ διησφαλισμένα*.⁴⁰ The closest parallel for its use here comes in a Maroneian decree which must be reasonably close in date to the present inscription, *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E180 (AD 41/2 or AD 46), lines A29-31, *δεδοχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ γεγράφθαι καὶ κεκυρωῖσθαι ψήφισμα ὑπὲρ τῆς τοιαύτης πρεσβείας... καὶ εἶναι προησφαλισμένον εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον*, ‘be it resolved by the council and the people that a decree concerning an embassy of this kind should be written and approved... and that it should be ratified in advance for all time’ (compare *ὅπως ᾗ... διησφαλισμ[έ]να* with *εἶναι προησφαλισμένον*). In line 15 the ratification is said to occur ‘by/according to the laws and by the decision of the *dēmos*’, apparently indicating that the decision to permit the adoption *both* has to conform to what is legally permissible (cf. lines 17-18 below) *and* has to be ratified by a specific vote of the *dēmos* of Maroneia.

Lines 16-21: For the phrase *καθότι καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις συνεχωρήται* (lines 17-18), ‘just as is also permitted by the laws’, cf. e.g. *IG XII 4, 1, 131* (Samos, late IV BC), lines 16-17, *ὅπως ὁ δῆμος διαψηφίσει καθότι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται*; *IG XII Suppl. 365* (Thasos, II BC), *καθότι καὶ ἐκεῖνοις προστέ[τα]χται ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; *Milet I 3 147* (205/4 BC), lines 20-21, *καθότι καὶ... ἐν τῷ νόμῳ συντέταχται* (cf. lines 46-48). In line 19, *το[ύς] ἐπὶ τούτ[ων] ἄρ[χ]οντας* is a vague way of referring to ‘civic magistrates responsible for issues of this kind’; cf. e.g. *I.Iasos* 219, line 8, *τοὺς ἐπὶ τούτων τεταγμένους ἄρχοντας*. The relevant magistrates are required to ‘register them’ (that is, both adopter and adopted) ‘among the validated decisions (?)’, *ἀναγράψαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰ κύρια* (lines 20-21), but only once certain documents or guarantees (?) have been handed over (*δοθέντων τῶν τ[ῆ]ς παιδο[π]ορίας ἀν[- c.7 - -]ων*, lines 19-20). I know of no parallels for the phraseology *ἀναγράψαι... εἰς τὰ κύρια*, but the reading seems certain.

40. Also *I.Kaunos* 34 (AD 111), l. 16, *ὑποκείσθω τοῖς... προδιησφαλισμένοις προστείμοις*; *IGR IV 1703* (Chios, I BC), l. 6, *ἐὰν δέ τις πράξη παρὰ τὰ πρὸ τοῦ διησφαλισμένα ἢ τὰ νῦν ἐγνωσμένα*. For the simple *ἀσφαλίζεσθαι* in similar contexts, see *I.Kaunos* p. 191 n. 402; Marek, Zingg 2018, 154-157, no. 12, ll. 6 and 12-13.

As Christina Kokkinia suggests to me, the sense is presumably that the relevant magistrates are to register the names of adopter and adoptee ‘among the valid/validated (decisions)’; compare the common ratification formula *ταῦτα κύρια ἔστω* and similar. In lines 20-21, the gemination *ἀναγράφψαι* is unusual; the only other example known to me appears in a fourth-century decree of the Ionian *koinon* from the Panionion (*I.Priene*² 398: *ἀναγράφψαι εἰς στήλην*).

Discussion

Prokles –a serving magistrate at Maroneia– has approached the *boulē* and the *dēmos* and requested that he be granted permission to adopt his own infant orphaned grandson (his daughter’s son); the infant would then become Prokles’ heir as his next of kin (line 11). Individual approaches to the *boulē* and the *dēmos* are very widely attested in the Hellenistic Greek world, and in a few cases, as here, the proposer requests that a decree be passed on his own behalf.⁴¹ A reasonably close analogy for this kind of *ad hominem* decree passed at the beneficiary’s own request can be found in a decree from Hellenistic Kalymna (ca. 280 BC), in which an individual (apparently himself a recently naturalised citizen of Kalymna) requests that his step-son also be granted citizenship at Kalymna: *ἐπειδὴ Ἀγοράναξ Ἀγορακλεῦς ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τε τὰν βουλὰν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον ἀξιῶν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν | πρόγονον Ἀγορακλῆ ποιήσασθαι πολίταν, δεδόχθαι τᾷ βουλᾶ[ι | κ] καὶ τῷ δάμωι, Ἀγορακλῆ τὸν υἱ[ὸν] τὸν πρόγονον τὸν Ἀγοράνα[κ]τος πολίταν ἤμεν Καλυμνί[ων] καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους, φυλὰν δὲ αὐτῷ ὑπάρχειν καὶ | συγγένειαν, ἃν καὶ τῷ πατρὶ | μέτεστι Ἀγοράνακτι*, ‘since Agoranax son of Agorakles has made an approach to the council and the people and requests that his step-son Agorakles be made a citizen, be it resolved by the council and the people, that Agorakles, step-son of Agoranax, should be a citizen of Kalymna, both him and his descendants, and that he be assigned to the tribe and *syngeneia* to which his father Agoranax belongs’.⁴²

41. E.g. *SEG* 26, 1223 (Halikarnassos): a foreigner, probably a *proxenos*, approaches the *boulē* and *dēmos* and asks to be granted the right of *enktesis*.

42. *Tit. Calymnii* 21. It is striking that the step-son Agorakles carries the same name as Agoranax’s own father: Agoranax’s wife was therefore presumably a close kinswoman, perhaps his niece. For a closely parallel case, see *SEG* 55, 1502, with Thonemann 2017, 154: a member of the civic elite at Xanthos in the 1st century BC marries his brother’s daughter after the death of her first husband. (In my 2017 discussion of this inscription, correct ‘his brother’s young widow’ to ‘his brother’s young widowed daughter’.)

Adoption *inter vivos* was no doubt perfectly normal at Maroneia, as everywhere in the ancient Greek world. An adoption at Hellenistic Maroneia is clearly attested in the epitaph of a woman named Glykera daughter of Prokles, who is described as the ‘wife of Diogenes, (adoptive) son of Prokles, natural son of Hegesippos’.⁴³ It seems very likely that we are dealing here with a man who was adopted by his wife’s father at marriage, a phenomenon which is widely attested in the ancient Hellenistic world.⁴⁴ In two further Hellenistic epitaphs from Maroneia, we find married couples who share a patronym, and it is likely enough that in both instances we are dealing with the same phenomenon.⁴⁵ However, I know of no even remotely close generic parallels for a civic decree authorising an adoption *inter vivos*, which makes the poor state of preservation of our inscription all the more frustrating.

The key question is why such a decree needed to be passed and inscribed on stone at all. Adoption was extremely widespread in the ancient Greek world at all periods, and it is very difficult to believe that an ordinary adoption *inter vivos* would have required a specific *ad hominem* decree to be passed by the *boulē* and *dēmos* of Maroneia (let alone one that occupies forty-seven reasonably long lines). Moreover, the form of adoption envisaged here – a man presumed to be without male heirs adopting his daughter’s son – is in fact one of the most common forms of adoption in Classical Athens (five clear attestations).⁴⁶ It therefore seems reasonable to assume that there was something highly unusual or controversial about the situation – presumably connected to the younger Prokles’ status as an orphan – which required the elder Prokles to seek the express permission of the civic authorities for the adoption. The strikingly elaborate justification of his intentions in lines 12-14 (providing personal security for himself in his old age; providing a suitable upbringing for the young orphan) may well point in the same direction.

43. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E251: Γλυκέρα Προκλέους, γυνή δὲ Διογένους τοῦ [Προ]κλέους, φύσει δὲ Ἡγησίππου.

44. Huebner 2007; Huebner 2013, 187-196; Thonemann 2017, 155-156.

45. *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E254 ([Π]ροκλῆς Πατροκλέους, [Ἀρ]τεμισία Πατροκλέους γυνή, assuming that the second Πατροκλέους is Artemisia’s patronym); E259 (Διογένης [Σω]τηρίχου, Στρατονίκη Σ[ω]τηρίχου, γυνή δ[ὲ] Διογέ[ν]ου).

46. Rubinstein 1993, 97-104. For later periods, see e.g. *SEG* 48, 1457 (Olbasa, II/III AD): Νεικάτωρ Αἰσχρίωνος ἑαυτῶ καὶ τῆ γυναικὶ καὶ τῆ θυγατρὶ καὶ τῶ ἐγγόνῳ ὄν καὶ υἱοποησάμην. Neikator presumably had no male offspring, and so adopted his daughter’s son.

We are here hampered by complete uncertainty as to how closely the legal norms of inheritance and adoption –and the status of orphans– at late Hellenistic or early Imperial Maroneia resembled those of Classical Athens (from where most of our relevant evidence derives). The likelihood must surely be that the adoption of the younger Prokles by his maternal grandfather was resisted by other interested parties, and hence the elder Prokles decided to appeal to the civic authorities to have his projected adoption ratified. Perhaps the most plausible scenario is that the adoption was contested by the younger Prokles' *kyrios*, who would normally (at least in Classical Athens) have come from the father's side of the family. It is easy to imagine that the elder Prokles could have exploited his privileged status as a civic magistrate to steamroller objections to the adoption from Charmades' family. But positive evidence for this scenario is completely lacking, and other possible circumstances are legion.

I see no way of establishing a firm date for the decree; as indicated above (my note on lines 1-3), the use of parasitic *iota* suggests a date in the first century BC or first century AD.

3. A verse inscription from Maroneia (fig. 3)

The inscription published here was discovered in 1986 in a field belonging to D. Skondras, in the area known as Παράθυρα, the same location where several inscriptions relating to the cult of Isis were found (including *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E205, the famous aretology of Isis); the stone is now in the storeroom of the Archaeological Museum of Komotini (inventory number AFK 4688). The text is inscribed on a marble block; the inscribed face is complete at left, right, below, and above. The lower face of the block was subsequently recut in antiquity in order to form part of a moulded architrave; probably as a result of this secondary use, the inscribed face –which would thus have been turned to face upwards– has been heavily weathered. With the exception of the final line, only a few letters are legible at the start (and occasionally at the end) of each line.

The text consists of six elegiac couplets, with each pentameter deeply indented (by between two to three letters); the first letters of each pentameter are vertically aligned with one another. Until recently, the conventional view has been that indentation of pentameters in inscribed Greek elegiac verse first appeared only in the Roman Imperial period, but Julia Lougovaya has recently shown that this is incorrect: in an important 2012 paper, she collected eight Greek verse epigrams dating between 300 and 100 BC which show

marked indentation of the pentameter.⁴⁷ The date of the present text is difficult to judge with certainty. The letters typically have small serifs at the apices, sometimes more pronounced (as at the base of the *tau* in line 12). The *alpha* has a deep broken cross-bar; the diagonals of *zeta*, *mu*, *nu*, and *sigma* generally begin some distance from the end of the horizontal or vertical hastae. The *zeta* is shaped like an English Z, with a small horizontal stroke across the middle of the diagonal (lines 1, 9 and 12). The first letter of line 4 resembles an *eta* on its side (central vertical, with horizontal strokes above and below); I have tentatively assumed that this is a *xi* rather than an idiosyncratic *zeta*. I would tentatively suggest dating the text to the first century BC.⁴⁸

H. 0.33 m, W. 0.60 m, Th. 0.22 m; letters 0.018-0.020 m.

ζάθεος [- - - - -]Σ
 ΑΕΣ[- - - - -]
 θήκαμξ[ν- - - - -]ΔΡΑ
 ΞΗ[- - - - -]ΗΝ
 5 ὄσον Ε[- - - - -]ΟΥΔΕ
 ΜΝ[- - - - -]
 οὔτος[- - - - -]
 ΜΕ[- - - - -]
 σφζο[- - - - -]
 10 Σ[- - - - -]
 ἀλλὰ θε[- - - - -]
 σῶζετε σὺν τέκνοις γῆγ[- - - -]

It is difficult to judge the quality and accuracy of the verse from the scanty letters surviving. The hexameters in lines 1 and 5 appear to begin with an unmetrical short syllable (ζάθεος; ὄσον ε[- -]). The adjective ζάθεος, ‘sacred’ (line 1) is most frequently used of places, but can also be used of persons or

47. Lougovaya 2012; for the older view, see Anderson, Parsons, Nisbet 1979, 130 (thus also Hanink 2010, 22). The earliest example noted by Lougovaya is *I.Kalchedon* 31 (SGO II 09/07/10: 3rd century BC). See also Garulli 2014, 140-145, who adds *I.Kallatis* 135 (II/I BC) to Lougovaya’s list of Hellenistic examples.

48. The closest Maroneian parallel for the style of lettering is *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E207 (I BC – I AD).

deities.⁴⁹ The verb *θήκαμε[ν]* (line 2), often used of the dedication of statues or buildings, indicates that the poem was couched in the first person plural. Towards the end of the poem, two verses (lines 9 and 12) begin with a form of the verb *σώζειν*, ‘save’, and in line 12, the verb is in the imperative (‘save, along with the children, the land’). It therefore seems likely that the poem took the form of a hymn or prayer, directed to a plurality of deities, asking them to protect the city of Maroneia: compare the Epidaurian hymn to all the gods, *χαίρετε ἀθάνατοι πάντες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔόντες / ἀθάναταί τε θεαί, καὶ σώζετε τὸνδ’ Ἐπιδαύρου / ναὸν ἐν εὐνομίαι πολυάνορι Ἑλλάνων*.⁵⁰ This is supported by the opening words of line 11, which look very much as though they might be an invocation of gods or goddesses, *ἀλλὰ θε[οί]* or *ἀλλὰ θε[αί]*; *ἀλλὰ* often appears at the end of a prayer followed by the name or title of the god or gods invoked.⁵¹ I see no way of telling whether the inscription is a private prayer (in which case the *τέκνα* of line 12 would be the children of the dedicators) or a public dedication (in which case *τέκνα* would be a poetic way of referring to the inhabitants of Maroneia).

Peter Thonemann
Wadham College, Oxford
peter.thonemann@wadham.ox.ac.uk

49. Furley, Bremer 2001, II 327 (‘a standard word in hymn-writers’ vocabulary’). Places: e.g. *IG IV* 1² 1, 128 (Epidaurus), ll. 37-38, *ζαθέας ἐναέται τᾶσδ’ Ἐπιδαύρου*; *I.Beroia* 399, ll. 9-10, *ζαθέη μητροπόλει Βεροία*; *I.Magnesia* 181, l. 12, *Σπάρτη ἐνὶ ζαθέη*. Persons and gods: e.g. *I.Eleusis* 516, l. 6, *Κελεῶ ζαθέω*; *SEG* 26, 891 (Mytilene), [*ζαθέω Ἄρτέμιδι Θε[ρμ]ίᾳ Ὀμονοία*].

50. *IG IV* 2¹ 129 (Furley, Bremer 2001, II 202-205, no. 6.7), ll. 11-13. For the imperative of *σώζειν* in prayers and hymns, cf. Furley, Bremer 2001, II 92-100, no. 2.6.2 (Delphi, paeon to Apollo), ll. 34-36, [*ἀλλ, ὦ Φοῖβε*], *σῶιζε θεόκτιστον Παλλάδος [ἄστυ]*; *Sardis VII* 1, 50, *Ἄρτεμι, Σάρδεις σώζε διηνε[κῆ]ς εἰς ὁμόν[οιαν]*; *I.Ephesos* 1253 (hymn to Asklepios), *σύν τε φίλω πατρὶ σῶζ[ε πόλιν]*, *Παιηόνιες παῖ*; in prose, *I.Ephesos* 1068 (prayer to Hestia Boulaia and Artemis Ephesia to save the *prytanis* Ploutarchos and his family).

51. Furley and Bremer 2001, II 16; cf. also e.g. *IG IV* 2¹ 590 (Epidaurus), [*ἀλλὰ φύλασσε, Ζεῦ, τὸν ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐ[σθλὸν ἔχοντα] κλέος*].

Summary

The present article is concerned with three inscriptions from the Greek cities of Abdera and Maroneia in coastal Thrace. Nos. 1 (Abdera) and 2 (Maroneia) were first published in the 2004 corpus of the inscriptions of Aegean Thrace (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E1 and E181α), and improved texts of both are offered here; no. 3 (Maroneia) is new. The first text is a fragmentary early-fifth century law from Abdera, concerned with upper and lower ages of eligibility for military service, and with what will happen in the event of a revolution or naval incursion at Abdera. The inscription is tentatively dated to the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars, perhaps around 475 BC. The second text is an *ad hominem* decree of the city of Maroneia, probably of the first century BC or the first century AD, granting permission to a civic magistrate named Prokles to adopt his own infant orphaned grandson; the content of the decree has no close parallels elsewhere in the Greek world. The third text is a poorly preserved twelve-line epigram in the form of a hymn or prayer to several deities, asking them to protect the city of Maroneia; its letter-forms suggest a date in the later Hellenistic period.

Abbreviations-Bibliography

- Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J., Nisbet, R.G.M. 1979. “Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrîm”, *JRS* 69, 125-155.
- AvH. Humann C. et al. 1898. *Altertümer von Hierapolis*. Berlin.
- Busolt, G., Swoboda, H. 1920-1926. *Griechische Staatskunde*³. 3 vols. Munich.
- Chryssanthaki, K. 2001. “Les trois fondations d’Abdère”, *REG* 114, 383-406.
- Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. 2007. *L’histoire monétaire d’Abdère en Thrace (VI^e s. av. J.-C. – II^e s. ap. J.-C.)* (Μελετήματα 51). Athens.
- de Souza, P. 1999. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Fröhlich, P. 2004. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)*. Geneva.
- Furley, W.D., Bremer, J.M. 2001. *Greek Hymns*. 2 vols. Tuebingen.
- Garulli, V. 2014. “Stones as Books: The Layout of Hellenistic Inscribed Poems”, in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*. Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, 125-169.
- Gauthier, Ph., Hatzopoulos, M. 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (Μελετήματα 16). Athens.
- Graham, A.J. 1991. “‘Adopted Teians’: A Passage in the New Inscription of Public Imprecations from Teos”, *JHS* 111, 176-178.
- Hanink, J. 2010. “The Epitaph for Atthis: A Late Hellenistic Poem on Stone”, *JHS* 130, 15-34.
- Hatzopoulos, M. 2001. *L’organisation de l’armée macedonienne sous les Antigonides: problems anciens et documents nouveaux* (Μελετήματα 30). Athens.
- Herrmann, P. 1981. “Teos und Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae”, *Chiron* 11, 1-30.
- Huebner, S. 2007. “‘Brother-Sister’ Marriage in Roman Egypt: a Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy?”, *JRS* 97, 21-49.
- Huebner, S. 2013. *The Family in Roman Egypt*. Cambridge.
- Humphreys, S.C. 2018. *Kinship in Ancient Athens: An Anthropological Analysis*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- I.Beroia. Gounaropoulou, L., Hatzopoulos, M. 1998. *Ἐπιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Α΄ Ἐπιγραφές Βεροίας*. Athens.
- I.Eleusis. Clinton, K. 2005-2008. *Eleusis: The Inscriptions on Stone*. 2 vols. Athens.
- I.Ephesos. Wankel, H., Merkelbach, R. et al. 1979-1981. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. 7 vols. IGSK 11-17. Bonn.
- I.Iasos. Blümel, W. 1985. *Die Inschriften von Iasos*. 2 vols. IGSK 28. Bonn.
- I.Kalchedon. Merkelbach, R. 1980. *Die Inschriften von Kalchedon*. IGSK 20. Bonn.

- I.Kallatis.* Avram, A. 1999. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure III. Callatis et son territoire.* Bucharest – Paris.
- I.Kaunos.* Marek, Chr. 2006. *Die Inschriften von Kaunos.* Munich.
- I.Knidos.* Blümel, W. 1992. *Die Inschriften von Knidos I.* IGSK 41. Bonn.
- I.Laodikeia.* Corsten, T. 1997. *Die Inschriften von Laodikeia am Lykos. I.* IGSK 49. Bonn.
- I.Magnesia.* Kern, O. 1900. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander.* Berlin.
- I.Priene².* Blümel, W., Merkelbach, R. 2014. *Die Inschriften von Priene.* IGSK 69. Bonn.
- I.Smyrna.* Petzl, G. 1982-1990. *Die Inschriften von Smyrna.* 2 vols in 3. IGSK 23-24. Bonn.
- I.Thrac.Aeg.* Loukopoulou, L.D., Parissaki, M.G., Psoma, S., Zournatzi, A. 2005. *Ἐπιγραφὴς τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (Νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ῥοδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου).* Athens.
- IG. Inscriptiones Graecae*
- IGR.* Cagnat, R. 1906-1927. *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes.* 3 vols. Paris.
- Jeffery, L.H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece,* Revised Edition with a Supplement by A.W. Johnston. Oxford.
- Kallintzi, K. 2012. “Ἐπίθεση καὶ ἀμύνα στὴν πόλη των Αβδήρων”, in P. Adam-Veleni, K. Tzanavari (eds.), *ΔΙΝΗΕΣΣΑ. Τιμητικός τόμος για τὴν Κατερίνα Ρωμιπούλου.* Thessaloniki, 131-140.
- Kantor, G. 2013. “Local Courts of Chersonesus Taurica in the Roman Age”, in P. Martzavou, N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis.* Oxford, 69-86.
- Koerner, R. 1993. *Inschriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis.* Köln.
- Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, C. 2004. “The Archaic City of Abdera”, in A. Moustaka, E. Skarlatidou, M.C. Tzannes, Y. Ersoy (eds.), *Klazomenai, Teos and Abdera: Metropoleis and Colony.* Thessaloniki, 235-248.
- Łajtar, A. 2006. *Deir el-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (Journal of Juristic Papyrology, Supplement IV).* Warsaw.
- Lenfant, D. 2002. “Pourquoi Xerxès détacha sa ceinture (Hérodote, VIII.120)”, *ARTA* 2002.004, 1-7.
- Lewis, D.M. 1982. “On the New Text of Teos”, *ZPE* 47, 71-72 (repr. in *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History.* Cambridge, 1997, 7-8).
- Lougovaya, J. 2012. “Indented Pentameters in Papyri and Inscriptions”, in P. Schubert (ed.), *Actes du 26^e Congrès international de papyrology, Genève, 16-21 août 2010.* Geneva, 437-441.
- Marek, Chr., Zingg, E. 2018. *Die Versinschrift des Hyssaldomos und die Inschriften von Uzunyuva (Milas/Mylasa) (Asia Minor Studien 90).* Bonn.

- Masson, O. 1984. “Quelques noms de magistrats monétaires grecs, IV: Noms de monétaires à Abdère et Maronée”, *Rev. Num.* 26, 48-60.
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2011. *Τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεγραμμένα: Six Greek Historical Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.* Athens.
- May, J.M.F. 1966. *The Coinage of Abdera (540-345 B.C.)*. London.
- Meiggs, R., Lewis, D. 1969. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
- Milet I 3. Kawerau G., Rehm, A. 1914. *Milet I 3: Das Delphinion in Milet*. Berlin.
- OGIS. Dittenberger, W. 1903-1905. *Orientalis Graeci inscriptiones selectae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Osborne, R., Rhodes, P.J. 2017. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478-404 BC*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J., Lewis, D.M. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Robinson, E.W. 2011. *Democracy Beyond Athens: Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*. Cambridge.
- Rubinstein, L. 1993. *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*. Copenhagen.
- Rubinstein, L. 2016. “Reward and Deterrence in Classical and Hellenistic Enactments”, in D.F. Leão, G. Thür (eds.) *Symposion 2015*. Vienna, 419-449.
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar’s Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- Sardis VII 1. Buckler, W.H., Robinson, D.M. 1932. *Sardis*. Vol. VII: *Greek and Latin Inscriptions. Part 1*. Leiden.
- SEG. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
- SGO II. Merkelbach, R., Stauber, J. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, Band 2: Die Nordküste Kleinasiens*. Leipzig.
- Syll.³. Dittenberger, W. 1915-1924. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, third edition. 4 vols. Leipzig.
- Thonemann, P. 2006. Rev. of *I. Thrac. Aeg.*, CR 56/2, 458-459.
- Thonemann, P. 2017. “Close-kin Marriage in Roman Anatolia”, *CCJ* 63, 143-166.
- Tit. Calymnii. Segre, M. 1944-1945. “Tituli Calymnii”, *ASAtene* 22-23 (n.s. 6-7), 1-248.
- Todd, S.C. 2003. *The Shape of Athenian Law*. Oxford.
- van Effenterre, H., Ruzé, F. 1994-1995. *Nomima: Recueil d’inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l’archaïsme grec*. Rome.
- Vasilev, M.I. 2015. *The Policy of Darius and Xerxes towards Thrace and Macedonia*. Leiden – Boston.



Fig. 1. Fifth-century law from Abdera (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E1; MA 5524). The copyright of the image belongs to the Greek Ministry of Culture and Sport; the monument is under the authority of the Greek Ministry of Culture and Sports/Ephorate of Antiquities of Xanthi.




Fig. 2. Decree concerning adoption from Maroneia (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E181α; AKM 10486) (Courtesy of the archive of the Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation).




Fig. 3. Verse inscription from Maroneia (ATK 4688). The copyright of the image belongs to the Greek Ministry of Culture and Sport; the monument is under the authority of the Greek Ministry of Culture and Sports/Ephorate of Antiquities of Rhodope.