

Tekmeria

Vol 9 (2008)

γεγεννησθαι. μνηύεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τιων καὶ ἀκο-
 λούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων
 περικοπαί τινας πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ
 οἴνου γεγενησθαι. ὧν καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐπητιώοντο. καὶ
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἐμποδῶν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
 καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόουσαν ἐπὶ δήμῳ ἀταλῦσαι τὰ τε μυστικὰ καὶ
 ἢ τῶν Ἑρμῶν τριῶν ἐπιπέφυκτον εἶη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἔν τε
 τῷ παρόντι πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἐτοῖμος ἦν
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν ἡσασμένος ἦν (ἤδη
 γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς παρὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ (τοῦ), καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων
 τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχει. καὶ
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μὴ ἀπόντος περὶ αὐτοῦ διαβολὴς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ ἀπολείπει, καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἶη
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτ' ἰσχυροῦ στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἔχθροὶ δεδιότες τό τε στρατεύμα
 μὴ εὖνον ἔχρη, ἦν ἤδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὅ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
 κίζηται θεραπέων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνον οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτευον
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τινές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεγον, μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, ἐλθόντα δὲ κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἔμελλον βῆρον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μετάπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. καὶ ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγγίγνεται

A New Inscription from Chaironeia and the Chronology of Slave-Dedication

E. A. MEYER

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.215](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.215)

To cite this article:

MEYER, E. A. (2008). A New Inscription from Chaironeia and the Chronology of Slave-Dedication. *Tekmeria*, 9, 53–89. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.215>

ELIZABETH A. MEYER

A New Inscription from Chaironeia and the Chronology of Slave-Dedication*

Here I publish or re-publish seven inscriptions on a base once in the courtyard of the Chaironeia Museum. The first inscription is the (unpublished) dedication of the base itself, while the next six are (published) slave-dedications added subsequently.¹ When placed within the entire corpus of Chaironeian slave-dedications the complete publication of this stone (Part I) suggests the down-dating of that whole body by as much as fifty years (Part II), a down-dating also suggested by the historical context (Part III). This down-dating, in turn, suggests a new conclusion about the relationship of Boiotian cities and sanctuaries to Delphi in the second and first centuries BC (Part IV).

* I offer my thanks to J. Dillery, J. E. Lendon, and V. Panoussi for some suggested readings in Part I, and A. Chaniotis and J. E. Lendon for reading and commenting on the entire paper. None should be held responsible for any failures in Boiotian dialect, or in argumentation. This paper was revised in 2007 when I was at the Universität Heidelberg courtesy of a fellowship from the Gerda Henkel Stiftung; to both institutions I also offer my thanks.

1. I surmise that the six slave-dedications were included in L. Darmezín's unpublished Lyon dissertation, *Les Affranchissements par consécration: consécration réelles et consécration fictives*, (1982) [which I have never been able to consult] since readings of these inscriptions were subsequently included in L. Darmezín, *Les Affranchissements par consécration en Béotie et dans le monde grec hellénistique*, (Nancy and Paris 1999) 73-76 nos. 103-8 (*SEG XLIX* 506-11; *Bull. Épigr.* 2000.2). There she cites, as their first publication, an article by John Fossey and herself that has never appeared; she does not publish the dedication of the base itself. Her readings depend at least in part on notations made by Paul Roesch on the squeezes kept in the Institut Fernand-Courby; mine are based on examination of the stones made in the summers of 1995 and 1997, and I thank the Boiotian ephor, Mr. V. Aravantinos, for extending to me permission to publish my texts and photographs. I have been able to improve my initial readings (which were complete in 1998) by using Darmezín's texts, but there are still appreciable differences, which will be noted in the discussion of each inscription.

I. The Inscriptions

The stone was found in the excavations of G. Sotiriadis at Hagia Paraskevi in 1902 or 1903, in the foundations of a ?tenth-century basilica with other inscriptions and fragments of classical architecture.² I saw it in 1995, studied and photographed it in 1997.

DESCRIPTION: it is a base, much chipped and worn, inscribed on three sides. There were moldings at top and bottom, which are now preserved only on the left side (the one wide inscribed side is considered «the front»). The back of the base is unworked and uninscribed. The top has a large (17.3 cm in diameter) circular cutting in it, set back 9 cm from the front; there may be a channel that runs between this circular depression and the back of the stone. The stone is sufficiently damaged that this «channel» may be purely accidental. Blue-gray stone; guidelines for inscribing on all three inscribed faces. Dimensions: 47 cm (greatest height), 38.5 cm in height between the moldings; width 38 cm; depth 28 cm. Inventory no. 106.

LITERATURE: G. Sotiriadis refers to several «manumissions» excavated in 1902 or 1903 from the ruins of the Hagia Paraskevi chapel, but these were never published; a phrase from this stone is also referred to (as being from an unpublished inscription) by N. Pappadakis.³ Sotiriadis's and Pappadakis's observations (and the transcripts of [a] and [d] found in the museum's inventory book) have been used to reconstruct some segments of inscriptions no longer readable. Sotiriadis wrote, of the finds from Hagia Paraskevi, «Die Inschriften, die auf Basen und auf anderen Steinen angebracht waren, gehören dem III. oder II. Jahrhundert v. Chr. an. Sie sind Proxeniedekrete, leider sehr verstümmelt, und vollständige Befreiungsakte oder Militärlisten der dienstpflichtigen Jugend von Chaironeia. Die Form der Befreiungsakte, in der κοινή oder im boiotischen Dialekt abgefasst, ist folgende: Ἄρχοντος (z. B. Πάτρωνος, Μνασίου, Καλλιτίμου, Φιλοξένου, Φαναδώρου) oder ἰαρείαιδδοντος (z. B. Φιλοξένου Ξένωνος) μηνὸς δεῖνος ὁ δεῖνα ἀνατίθησι τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπελεύθερον (θεράπηναν oder δούλην) ἰεράν τῷ Σεράπει oder τοῦ Σαράπιδος oder τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ oder τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ τῇ Οὐγίῃ.»⁴ Several of these archon-

2. G. Sotiriadis, «Untersuchungen in Boiotien und Phokis», *AM* 30 (1905) 113-40 at 117.

3. Sotiriadis (n. 2) 118; N. Pappadakis, «Περὶ τὸ Χαρόπειον τῆς Κορωνείας», *Arch-Delt* 2 (1916) 217-72 at 261.

4. Sotiriadis (n. 2) 118.

names, and formulae, are found on this base, and the slave dedications are made to Asklepios, and to Asklepios and Hygeia.

Front face (FIGURES 1-5).

This face is very worn, so four close-up views have been provided (FIGS. 2-5).

(a) letter height 1.2-1.8 cm, broadly spaced. The inscription starts at least 5 cm from the top of the stone, and, including bottom guideline, takes up 5 cm of stone. Alphas have straight or curving bars; omegas are large and on the line; kappas have a long vertical hasta; the horizontal of pi stretches to left and right of its two vertical strokes, and the second vertical does not reach the baseline.

Ἄριστιῶν Κράτωνος
δαμάττας Ἄσκληπιῦ.

«Aristion son of Kraton, having been victorious, to Asklepios.»

Notes

The reading Ἄριστιῶν Κράτωνος | ΑΜΑΤΤΑΣ Ἄσκληπιῦ is (also) provided by the museum inventory book.

¹ Ἄριστιῶν Κράτωνος: the name Ἄριστιῶν is well known in Chaironeia, and is also «common in most of Boiotia but with a preponderance in the North and West Kopais.»⁵ A man with the same name, but without patronymic, is listed as archon for a slave-dedication (to Artemis Eileithuia) in *SEG* XXVIII 450 (but not 452), from Chaironeia; in *IG* VII 3410 an Ἄριστιῶν (no patronymic) makes a dedication to Artemis Eileithuia; an Ἄριστιῶν (no patronymic) appears in the epitaph *IG* VII 3447; and in *SGDI* 2191 an Ἄριστιῶν Κρ[άτων]ος, specifically a Chaironeian, manumits Ἐρμῶϊος in Delphi. This last is dated 140-100 BC (*SGDI*) or 137-136 (Albrecht);⁶ if the same man, which I think likely (see below), the Delphic inscription provides a *terminus post quem* for the rest of these dedications

5. J. M. Fossey, *Epigraphica Boeotica*, (Amsterdam 1991) 138, a distribution now also confirmed by *LGNP* IIIB (Oxford 2000), where thirty of fifty-one occurrences are from north and west. The distribution of the name Kraton follows this pattern even more strongly, with fourteen of seventeen occurrences in northern and western Boiotia in the Hellenistic period.

6. K. D. Albrecht, *Rechtsprobleme in den Freilassungen der Bötier, Phoker, Dorier, Ost- und Westlokrer*, (Paderborn 1978) 41.



Fig. 1. New stone, front view. (Photo E. Meyer).

to Asklepios. Since this Ἄριστιων Κράτωνος was an adult in 137 BC, then the Κράτων Ἄριστίωνος of *SEG XI 414*, a Chaironeian listed in a catalogue of honors for Epidaurian *theorodokoi* between 225 and 200 BC, would have been his great-grandfather.⁷

2 δαμάττας: this would be an aorist participle from δαμάζω; in Attic the participle would be δαμάσας (and as such it appears in *I.Prusa 60*, second century BC). Boiotian would be more likely to generate δαμάσας (as in Pindar *P.* 8.80, ἀγῶνα δαμάσσαι ἔργω), but δαμάττας is not an impossible form, cf. C. Buck on -ττ for -σσ in aorist stems ending in -ς.⁸ Another possibility is that this is a variant of the name Δαμάστας or Δαμάσστας (*SEG XXXII 594* and *XXXV 540* [both Atrax]). Nowhere is Δαμάστας attested as any kind of ethnic or geographic name (city-names as adjectives are found in Chaironeia only when a dedicator is a foreigner, like a Phanatean in *IG VII 3376*), nor can it be a nickname (these are not found at Chaironeia), and other Chaironeian dedications are made either by individuals with no patronymics (*IG VII 3408, 3410, 3411*) or by a man with a name and a patronymic (3375), but not by a combination of the two ways of naming. So although a victory-dedication to Asklepios has its implausible aspects, I still think it is the best explanation of the clear reading of the stone. At Epidauros, a cured athlete was grateful to Asklepios (*IG IV² 1, 122.50-55*), and statues of athletes were erected in his precinct (*IG IV² 1, 618, 629*).

(b) letter height .5-.9 cm (1.1 cm from guideline to guideline), takes up 10 cm of stone. Alphas have straight or curving bars; omegas are smaller than the other letters, and can be on or above the line; sigmas rest on the baseline. There is some seriphing, especially of epsilon and sigma.

[θίος· τιούχαν ἀγαθ]άν. Φανοδώρω ἄρχοντος μειν-
 [ός ca. 10 letters - -]ηδεκάτη ἀντίθειπι Τιμογίτα Φει-
 [δίαο? τὸν φίδιον δοῦλον..]κλε[ι]δαγ ἰαρόν τῷ Ἄσσκλα-
 [πιῦ παριόντων αὐτῇ τῶν ο]ύιῶν Ἐρμαῖσκω κή Φε-
 5 [ιδίαο? ----- φίσ]τ[ο]ρες [Φ]ανοκλεῖς

7. This list of honors is discussed and dated by P. Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*, («*Hypomnemata*» 121; Göttingen 2000) 87-91; she suggested (266) that the Aristion of the Delphic inscription should be this Kraton's grandson, but this stretches the generations and also does not permit for the alternation of names between generations.

8. C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, (Chicago 1955²) 65-67 and 108 no. 143.



Fig. 2. New stone, front view, detail of top lefthand quadrant. (Photo E. Meyer).

[-----]δ[.]ρω Ἰσμεινίᾱς
 Ἄριστ[-----]ΞΕ[...]. *vacat*

1 Θε[ός]: τ[ούχα ἀγα]θά. Ἄθανοδώρω Roesch and Darmezín; 2 init. [Θ]ουί[ω] πε[ντε-
 κ]ηδέκατη Roesch and Darmezín; 2 fin. Τιμογίτα Φερ[ε-] Darmezín; 3 [γ]ικ[ω --]χιον τ[ὸ
 γ]ένος Ἡρ[α]κλειῶταν Roesch and Darmezín; 4 [π]ιῦ, π[αρι]όντων α[ύτῃ] τῶν Roesch;
 4 fin. κή ἴε- Darmezín; 5 ροκ[λείος κή -- μά]ρτ[υ]ρες; Roesch and Darmezín; 6 init. Πα[--
]οκλείς, Roesch and Darmezín; 7 Ἄριστο[--] Roesch.

«God. Good fortune. When Phanodoros was archon, on the [--] of the month [of --], Timogita, daughter of Phei[dias?], dedicates [her own slave –]kleidas as sacred to Asskl[epios, accompanied by (her) sons] Hermaiskos and Phe[idias? –. Witnes]ses: [Ph]anokleis, [son of unknown; unknown, son of unknown –]d[o]ros, Ismeinias, son of Arist[–,]» and perhaps one more.

Notes

My restorations are *exempli gratia* only, but where letters survive on the righthand side of the stone I am reading what I think is there, despite the apparent certainty with which Darmezín (no. 103; *SEG XLIX 506*) prints other readings.

1 note the form Ψ for X in ἄρχοντος. I read the archon-name as Phanodoros, one of the archon-names reported by Sotiriadis, because the initial letter is circular but in the middle of the letter-space rather than crowding the top guideline, as the only theta in this inscription does, and there may be the trace of a lower horizontal ‘foot’ to the letter, as phi at the end of line 4 also has.

2 the name at the end of this line might also be Τιμῶ Ἐπαφεῖ-, since the circular letter O or Ω appears to have a small tail to the right; what is identified as Γ looks like it also has a strong bottom hasta (i.e., E); and what is identified as I runs into the upper guideline and thereby connects up with T, which means that the two together could also be Π. Τιμογίτα does not exist in *LGNP IIIB* and Τιμῶ is common; but Τιμῶ would have to be followed by the unknown adjectival patronymic starting Ἐπαφε-, when virtually every name starting with the first four of these letters continues Ἐπαφρ-.

3 a very short patronymic must be supplied here; a Delphic version of the genitive of this name is Φειδία (*SGDI 1992*). The name of a male slave ending in -κλείδαν is to be supplied in the second half of the lacuna. I do not see Darmezín’s letters in the middle of the line, and find her reading/restoration unlikely: if correct, this would be the only slave-dedication from Boeotia in which the origin of the slave is noted.

4 the next letters on the stone appear to read ΕΡΜΑΙΣΚΩΚΗΦΕ, with an I



Fig. 3. New stone, front view, detail of top righthand quadrant. (Photo E. Meyer).

that looks as if it has a ligatured O attached to it (Ϟ), as also in the preserved names in lines 5 and 6. It would also be possible to restore κῆ Φε[- -] as, rather, Κηφε[- -], that is, a patronymic, but I have deemed this less likely since what are elsewhere Κη- names in Boeotia tend to be spelled Κα-.

5 Darmezin's reading of [μᾶ]ρτ[υ]ρες is also unlikely; when witnesses are listed in Chaironeian slave-dedications, they are called *ρίστορες*, not *μάρτυρες*, except in *IG VII 3376*, which is itself unusual because its dedicator is a Phanatean, and because the dedicated slave must pay back an *eranos*-loan as well as complete some transaction involving a house, all requirements otherwise not seen in Chaironeia.

5-6 these last lines are difficult to decipher. They are probably names, that is, a list of *ρίστορες* starting in line 5: [- -]ρες [Φ]ανοκλεῖς. The reading of the next name is difficult, for the interior consonants are quite scratched and uncertain. Witnesses to dedications at the sanctuary of Asklepios in Thespieae, and of Herakles Charops in Coroneia, come in sets of between one and six, but mostly three or four.⁹

6 ΡΩ could also be ΝΩ, although from the letter traces I consider this less likely.

7 Darmezin read nothing at the very end of this line.

(c) letter height .5-1 cm, takes up 7 cm of stone. Superscript letter is noted with parentheses. Alphas with straight and curved bars; omegas are square-ish and above the line; pi has a little upward flourish at the end of the second vertical, or can have a straight second vertical that goes all the way down to the baseline; sigma is small, with a bottom horizontal parallel to, but often not on, the baseline. Kappa, rho, iota, and upsilon can all have horizontal «feet» on which the letter rests. Some seriphing, especially of epsilon.

Θιός· τούχα[ν ἀγαθ]άν. Νι[κο]δάμ[ω] ἀρχῶ μεινός
 Προστατ[ειρίω date, - - ᾶ]ντί[θ]ειπι Καράϊς
 Ἐμπέδ[ωνος - -]ρο[ν] ἰαρόν τῦ Ἄσκληπιῦ
 παρμείναντα ᾶ[ς] κᾶ[.] δῶει σουνεπινε[ν]-
 5 ε[υ]κόντων αὐτ[ῆ] τῶ] οὐίῶ Ξενοτίμω Φιλίππω
 Λε[β]αδειή[ω κῆ - -]λιδαο κῆ Ἰκεσίω Ἄθ[...]
 .ΑΝ[- - - · ρίστορες· male name - - Κᾶ]φισίνω, Καλλύκριτο[ς]

9. Thespieae, *IG VII 1780* and W. Vollgraf, «Inscriptions de Béotie», *BCH 25* (1901) 359-63 nos. 1-2; Coroneia, Pappadakis (n. 3) 217-35 A-D.



Fig. 4. New stone, front view, detail of bottom lefthand quadrant. (Photo E. Meyer).

[Εὐα]γορίδαο Εὐ[....]ος Διογίτονος Τ(ι)μοκρά[τ]-
vocat [------]ω[νο]ς. ες.

1 Νικοδάμω Roesch and Darmezín; 2 Προστατει[ρ]ίω τριακά[δι], Darmezín; 3 Ἐμπέδω[νος Ζώ]πυρο[ν] Roesch and Darmezín; 4 αὐ[τ]ῆ ἄς κα Καραῖς δώσει Roesch and Darmezín; 5 [[οντος]]όντων αὐτῆ τῶ Darmezín; 6 Λεβαδειήω κῆ φίλ[ω]ν Τιμοκλῖδαο κῆ Αἰσκ.Ω.Σ Ἄ Roesch and Darmezín; 7 κἀνθω, Εὐ[----]ος Καφισίνω Roesch and Darmezín; 8 Θι[ο]δωρίδαο, Ἐμπέδω[ν]ος Φιογίτονος Roesch and Darmezín; 9 [τεος Φίλο]νίκωνος Darmezín.

«God. [Goo]d fortune. When Ni[ko]dam[os] was a[rch]on, on the [-] day of the month of Prostat[eirios], Karais, daughter of Emped[on d]edicates as sacred to Asklepios [-]ros, remaining [as long as sh]e lives, being in a[gr]reement with her her son Xenotimos, son of Philippos, of Lebadeia, [and -, son of -]lidas, and Hikesios, son of Ath[-]. [Witnesses: --, son of Ka]phisinos, Kallukritos, son of [Euan]oridas, Eu[-,] son of Diogiton, Timokrat[es, son of --]on.»

Notes

Roesch (and Darmezín no. 104; *SEG XLIX 507*) is considerably more confident in reading this stone than I am, even though Darmezín could not read crucial letters even on Roesch's squeezes.

1 A Ζενότιμος Φιλίππου from Lebadeia is known from *Syll.*³ 585.171 of 186 BC, where he is listed as a Delphic *proxenos*. I suggest that he is the grandfather of the son here in (c), a grandfather appointed *proxenos* at a fairly young age, with a mature grandson assisting his (possibly widowed) mother ca. 100 BC.

4 I see no trace of the name of the manumittor here, and Darmezín has restored the line too long (39 letters, when the lines of this inscription otherwise run between 31 and 35). There are two deep intersecting scratches before the Δ of δώσει, and even by the generous spacing of this line there should be a letter here; but I cannot see what it is. There may simply be a gap.

5 Darmezín thought she saw erased letters at the beginning of this line.

6 The letters at the end of this line are very uncertain. I think I can see ἰκῆσιῶ, but there is much damage, and deep scratches sow confusion as to what was inscribed and what was later gouged; the name is otherwise found at *IG VII 540* (100-70 BC, a Theban) and 1813 (Thespiiai). Darmezín read Αἰσκ.Ω.Σ, perhaps traces of the name Αἰσκριώνος, which I cannot quite talk myself into: as the photograph shows, the reading of the end of this line of the text is very problematic. At the very end of the line, Darmezín thinks that the A is the beginning of a new name. I think this is unlikely, since this inscription observes either word- or syllable-



Fig. 5. New stone, front view, detail of bottom righthand quadrant. (Photo E. Meyer).

division; it is more likely the sixth (or so) letter in a name that continues (possibly, if this is not a stray, straight gouge) into one more space at the end of this line (I can see an upright hasta, but no more) and then on to the next line.

7 Darmezín's Καφισίνω is likely to be correct, since the only name ending in -φισίνος currently known in Boeotia is Καφισίνος (*LGPN* III B: *IG* VII 2422 and 2431).

Καλλύκριτο[ς], since it is not in the genitive (which would be Καλλυκρίτω), must show that we are out of the genitive absolute of those in agreement with Karais and into a kind of different list, which therefore must be witnesses.

8 at the beginning of the line there are at most three spaces before -γορίδαο; I restore [Εύα]γορίδαο, a name that also occurs at *IG* VII 2426, 2537, and 2781 (all Hellenistic in date), not least because all other compound names ending in -ορίδας are longer.

I think I can see a delta before -ιογίτωνος, thus read the name Διογίτωνος, which also occurs in Boiotia (*IG* VII 3081 and 3210, both Hellenistic), rather than Θιογίτωνος (Darmezín).

8-9 the name Τ(ι)μοκρά[τ] has an iota so high it looks superscript; the name itself continues, I think, not at the beginning of the next line, but right under the M of the name itself (not read by Darmezín). The man's patronymic seems to have been crammed in in the middle of line 9 – traces of letters, very small, can be seen towards the middle of this line. Such cramming is only possible because the lines of the inscription drifted up to the right as it was inscribed.

Left face (FIGURE 6).

(d) letter height .8-1.5 cm, takes up 9.5 cm of stone. Alpha with curved bar; omega is large and a little above the line; omicron is smaller, but also above the line; sigma is large, with a horizontal bottom hasta resting on the baseline. Some mild seriphing, of kappa, nu, epsilon, and tau.

Καλλιτίμω ἀρχῶ
 Θοίνων κῆ Μελίτων
 [Χ]αρώνδαο ἀντίθεντι
 [ἰα]ρόν Κρατῖνον Ἀσκλ-
 5 [α]πιῦ.

«When Kallitimos was archon, Thoinon and Meliton, sons of Charondas, dedicate Kratinos as sacred to Asklepios.»



Fig. 6. New stone, left face. (Photo E. Meyer).

Notes

This is clearly readable; a full transcription is given by the museum inventory book, and the same text is given by Darmezine no. 105 (*SEG XLIX 508*). Καλλιτίμω is one of the archon names mentioned by Sotiriadis.

(e) letter height .5-1.4 cm, takes up 11.3 cm of stone. Starts immediately below preceding. The letters do not run all the way to the right edge, leaving especially notable vacats at the ends of lines 3 and 4. Straight-barred alpha; wide, shallow omega above the line; large omicron; the second vertical of pi does not reach the baseline and can have an upward flip at the end; sigma is very shallow and the bottom hasta is not horizontal; second vertical of nu often goes no more than half the distance towards the baseline. Seriphing of most letters.

Φιλοξένω ἄρχοντος
 μείνός Προστατειρίω
 τριακάδι. Ἄθανόδωρος
 Πουθίνας ἀντίθειπι
 5 τὸν φιδίον φεικέταν Ἀρμέ-
 νιον{ιον} ἱερὸν εἶμεν τῶ
 Ἀσκληπιῶ παραμείναντα
 Ἄθανοδώρει κῆ Τιμῶι ἀνεγ-
 κλείτως ἄως κα ζώωνθι.

«When Philoxenos was archon, on the thirtieth of the month of Prostaterion, Athanodoros son of Pouthinas dedicates his own slave Harmenios{ios} to be sacred to Asklepios, remaining with Athanodoros and Timo without complaint as long as they live.»

Notes

This text is also clearly readable, and the same text is given by Darmezine no. 106 (*SEG XLIX 509*).

¹ Φιλοξένω ἄρχοντος is another name/formula mentioned by Sotiriadis. The ξ of his name is carved into a gouge in the stone. He is almost certainly not the same man as the archon Philoxenos of the slave-dedication *IG VII 3324*, whose inscription (in *koinē*) is inscribed under that of the archon Patron, one of the latest archons in the sequence of slave dedications at Chaironeia.¹⁰

⁶ NIONION: a reduplicative error by the stone mason.

10. Albrecht (n. 6) 78. This makes the archon Philoxenos a rare exception to the

(f) letter height .5-.8 cm; takes up 7.5 cm of stone. Straight-barred alpha; omega medium-sized and above the line; second vertical of pi almost reaches the baseline, with some turn-up at the end of the second vertical; the bottom hasta of sigma can be horizontal or tilted. Seriphing of kappa, tau, eta, epsilon, chi, upsilon, nu, and iota.

Θιός· τιούχαν ἀγαθάν. ἱαρείάδδοντ[ος]
 Φιλοξένω Ξένωνος, Ἀντιγένις Ἴππίν[ω]
 κῆ Καλλίππα Ἄγρωνος ἀντίθενθι ἱαρά[ν]
 τὰν ριδίαν θεράπηγαν Νικῆαν τῷ Ἀ[σ-]
 5 κλαπιῦ κῆ τῆ Ούγιῆ ἱαράν εἴμεν κῆ
 μεῖ ποθίκεμεν ἀύσαυτῆς μειθέν.

«God. Good fortune. When Philoxenos son of Xenon was priest, Antigenis son of Hippinos and Kallippa daughter of Agron dedicate as sacred (their) own slave Nikea to Asklepios and Hygeia, to be sacred and not to belong to them in any way.»

Notes

This inscription appears to be one mentioned by Sotiriades (ἱαρείάδδοντος | Φιλοξένω Ξένωνος, τῷ Ἀ[σ]|κλαπιῦ κῆ τῆ Ούγιῆ) and (lines 5-6) Pappadakis. It is an easily readable inscription (Darmezine no. 107; *SEG* XLIX 510).

² Philoxenos, son of Xenon: a man by this name, called «the Boiotian,» is known twice from lists of victors in the games at Thespias; these lists are dated to the late third century (209 BC).¹¹ He could be the grandfather of the man serving as priest here. The restoration Ἴππίν[ω] connects Ἀντιγένις to a family already known in other Chaironeian dedication inscriptions: Μίλων Ἴππίνου appears in *IG* VII 3328, 3358, and 3359. Ἴππίο is also distantly possible; this name appears in 3356. *LGPN* IIIB knows only Ἀντιγενίς (female), but despite the spelling the name here is likely to be a male name (elsewhere Antigeneis), since other pairs of dedicators at Chaironeia are usually one male and one female (e.g., *IG* VII 3309, 3315, 3317, 3325, 3328, 3352, 3358, 3378).

³ ἱαράν is, curiously, repeated twice (line 3 and line 5): the act seems confused as to which formula it was following, and followed both.

generalization (see below p. 74) that the appearance of the same archon-name means the same man in Chaironeian slave-dedications.

11. P. Jamot, «Fouilles de Thespies», *BCH* 19 (1895) 311-85 at 323-24 no. 6 and 324-25 no. 7=*IG* VII 1762 (but Jamot's is the better text). Jamot (347) suggested a date before 234 or after 198 BC; *LGPN* IIIB dated to 209 BC.

6 Pappadakis quotes this line as κή μὲι ποθίκεμεν αὐσαυτῆς μείθενί.¹² There does not seem to be an -ι at the end of μείθεν. With my reading, this translates as «not to belong to them in any way,» rather than «not to belong to them to no one,» without a connective (otherwise not seen in these inscriptions).

6 ποθίκεμεν is an unusual form, but was suggested by L. Dubois (*Bull. Épigra.* 2000.2) without even seeing the stone; Darmezín had read ποθικ[ό]κεμεν, but there are traces of horizontal bars of a letter visible in both photograph and squeeze. Otherwise, in this position in the formula participles (ποθίκωσαν or ποθεικώσαν) are used.

Right face (FIGURE 7).

(g) letter height .7 cm; takes up 7 cm of stone. Superscript letters are noted with parentheses. Straight- and broken-barred alphas; medium-to-large omegas on or just a little above the line; second vertical of pi reaches the baseline; bottom hasta of sigma horizontal. Seriphing of most letters.

[-----]Φ[--]
 [ἀντ]ίθειγτι τὰν φιδίαν θεράπηνα
 [Ζάγ]ωραν ἰαράν τεῖ Ἀσκληπι(ο)εῖ *vac.*
 [σουμπ]αριόντων αὐτῆ φίλων Κρά-
 5 τω[ν]ος Ἀριστίωνος Ὀλυουμπίχω
 Ἄνδρ[ι]αο Εὐρουφάων(τος) Φαναξιδάμω.

(first two [probably] lines missing: one of the dedicators is female). «...they dedicate their own servant/slave [Ζαg]ora as sacred to Asklepios, she being accompanied by her friends Kraton son of Aristion, Olioumpichos son of Andrias, Eurouphaon son of Wanaxidamos.»

Notes

1 In addition to the clearly visible Φ, there are also traces of the very bottoms of letters earlier in the line, but not enough to make identification possible. There also appear to be very faint but unreadable traces in one line above this one.

2 Darmezín no. 108 (*SEG XLIX 511*) reads the first word as [ἀντ]ίθειπι, thus opting for a single female dedicator; perhaps she is diagnosing a gap in the word where I think I can read traces of a N that floats at an angle above the line. This inscription does allow gaps in the middle of words, as later in this same line (φιδία

12. Pappadakis (n. 3) 261.



Fig. 7. New stone, right face. (Photo E. Meyer).

ν) and in line 4 (φιλω ν Κρ ά). If my reading is correct, then there is more than one dedicator, although for only one (αὐτῆ, line 4) are friends present; this kind of attendance on only one party of a multi-party dedication is also seen in *IG VII 3330*. Stray marks and gouges create some confusions in this inscription. [ἀντ]ίθειντι almost looks like it was written [ἀν]τθειντι because a lunate gouge over the iota gives the impression of the continuation of the upright to the left (as in upsilon), while at the end of line two the two iotas of Ἀσκλαπιοεῖ are written Ὶ, with a little upper horizontal bar that gives the impression of a Γ or a Π; in line 6, Εὐρουφάων(τος) looks like it could have begun Ἐχρου-, for the second letter is written Υ, with a stray mark that looks like a superscript letter but is not one over the Υ.

3 Darmezín restores the name at the beginning of the line as [Ζωπο]ύραν, but the first readable letter in the line is, in both picture and squeeze, an Ω, not a Υ, so I have suggested restoration of a different name. There is a superscript O over the iota of Asklepios (not noted by Darmezín).

4-6 the names of the friends suggest that they are probably to be related to major Chaironeian families, such as that of the dedicator of this base (whose son this is likely to be); a Wanaxidamos was also archon for one of the dedications to Artemis, *SEG XXVIII 445*.

5 Darmezín restores the name at the end of the line as Ὀλουμπίχω{ς} and deduces an inscriber's error. The marks at the end of this line, if anything, resemble E more than Σ, and are sufficiently irregular and effaced that they may not be traces of a letter at all.

6 before Φαναξιδάμω, the -ΤΟΣ that ends the preceding name is written superscript; Darmezín notes ΟΣ, but not the Τ.

II. Cult and Date

For most, Chaironeia is the site only of famous battles, and it is true that relatively little is known about the city itself or its history.¹³ From various literary and epigraphic sources, however, it is clear that over the centuries of her existence Chaironeia was home to the cults of numerous divinities, and even to sacred objects like the scepter of Agamemnon, described by Pausanias, which had earned a table fully laden with meat and sweet-cakes, and received daily sacrifices (9.40.11-12). The base described above makes explicit the addition of Asklepios to the group of divinities already known: Artemis Eileithuia, Artemis Soöдина and Apollo Daph-

13. See E. Oberhummer, «Chaironeia», *RE* 6 (1899) col. 2033-36.

naphorios, the Mother of the Gods, and Sarapis, Isis, and Anubis, all known through inscriptions;¹⁴ Dionysos, who had a statue in the marketplace; Herakles, who had a sanctuary where the Greeks camped before the great battle of 338 BC; Leukothea; and the Muses, whose Mouseion lay between Chaironeia and Thurion.¹⁵ No sanctuaries of any deities have been found or excavated, although Fossey speculated that the sanctuary of Artemis – which likely came to be shared with the Mother of the Gods – may have been at the site of the Panaghia church in the village.¹⁶ Similarly, it seems possible to me that Asklepios and Sarapis may have shared physical space as well, perhaps at the site whence inscriptions to both were extracted, the basilica foundations underneath the Hagia Paraskevi chapel.¹⁷

These last four deities all had healing qualities: the Egyptian gods displayed this orientation early in Egypt,¹⁸ and the two goddesses were known for their oversight of childbirth. Even the very plants of Chaironeia's territory were thought to have soothing and benevolent qualities (Paus. 9.41.7), lending to Chaironeia an aspect of fragrant healing that contrasts pleasantly with the bloodshed on her great plain, and which, with these sanctuaries, may have been more significant for her ancient identity than can now be fully appreciated. The slave-dedications already known from Chaironeia, so far dated only in relationship to each other, certainly demonstrate that the city took an active interest in the continued healthy existence of these cults. In combining the possibilities for dating suggested by the new base with a closer look at the changes in dedicatory language and practice in the entire body of Chaironeian slave-dedications, a later and better historical context for all of these slave-dedications will be proposed (Part III) and its contribution (in Part IV) to the understanding of this body of inscriptions explored.

14. Conveniently summarized by A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia 1. Acheloos to Hera*, («BICS Supplement» 38.1; London 1981) 98, 43-44, and 200-1; A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia 2. Herakles to Poseidon*, («BICS Supplement» 38.2; London 1986) 126-27; and Fossey (n. 5) 153.

15. Dionysos, Plut. *Cimon* 2 and Schachter, *Cults I* (n. 14) 173-74; Herakles, Plut. *Dem.* 19 and Schachter, *Cults II* (n. 14) 2; Leukothea, Plut. *QRom.* 16=*Mor.* 267D; and the Muses, Plut. *Sulla* 17; Schachter *Cults II* (n. 14) 146.

16. Fossey (n. 5) 154.

17. See Sotiriadis (n. 2) 117; cf. H. Gallet de Santerre, «Chronique des fouilles en 1951», *BCH* 76 (1952) 201-88 at 224 for the report of a dedication of a garden to a deity, probably Asklepios, in an inscription now lost.

18. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, (Oxford 1972) 1.256-58.

DATE (1): ARCHON-DATING AND RELATIVE DATING. Slave-dedications at Chaironeia have a number of characteristics that both hinder and help in dating. First, slave-dedications to all divinities in Chaironeia, whether to Artemis, the Mother of the Gods, Sarapis, or Asklepios, are, with one exception and when fully preserved, dated by archon-date. These are purely internal dates, for the archon is the Chaironeian, rather than the Boiotian, archon (as *IG VII 3378* makes explicit), and there is no apparent connection of any one of these dedications with a known and dated event. Thus, although the inscriptions are «dated», they cannot be given any absolute date on the basis of their contents. As a consequence, although opinions on the dating of the published corpus have varied in minor ways,¹⁹ scholars generally follow Larfeld's (unargued) view that script and dialect point to the first half of the second century BC.²⁰ Yet dating by letter-form is never definitive, and the gradual infiltration of *koinē* into Boiotian dialect offers not a firm date (*contra* Roesch),²¹ but only the vaguest of general dating parameters. Indeed, as the recently discovered Sullan trophy now demonstrates,²² Albrecht's observation that mixed dialect forms survive until at least the end of the first century BC in «inscriptions with non-political content» must be rephrased as in «all inscriptions.» Moreover, Roesch's conviction that document styles and the use of dialect changed after 171 BC, when the Boiotian *koinon* was dissolved, is based on the assumption that this «dissolution» was a permanent rather than temporary disappearance, but in fact the *koinon* was in existence again by the end of the second century BC.²³ There is, therefore, reason to question the traditional dating of published Chaironeian slave-dedications, and therefore also reason to look for other ways to date this material.

In addition to the existence of these internal archon dates, the published

19. Albrecht (n. 6) 67-78 provides a survey.

20. W. Larfeld, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Boeoticarum Dialectum Popularem Exhibentium*, (Berlin 1883) 46-52 nos. 53b-57; W. Dittenberger, *Inscriptiones Graecae. Megaridis, Oropiae, Boeotiae*, (Berlin 1892, reprinted 1992) 615; cf. Albrecht (n. 6) 67-69 and, most recently, Fossey (n. 5) 154.

21. P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris 1965) 171.

22. Albrecht (n. 6) 65; Sullan trophy, J. Camp, M. Ierardi, J. McInerney, K. Morgan, and G. Umholtz, «A Trophy from the Battle of Chaironeia of 86 B.C.,» *AJA* 96 (1992) 443-55.

23. Permanent disappearance also endorsed by R. Etienne and D. Knoepfler, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.*, («*BCH* supplément» 3; Athènes and Paris 1976) 342-47, but see R. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, (Berkeley 1995) 78-80, who on p. 80 notes its reappearance.

Chaironeian slave-dedications have a second significant aspect: there are, as with the new base, multiple inscriptions on one stone. Moreover, the same name sometimes appears on more than one stone, constituting a link from one stone to another. As a consequence, even one securely moored archonship would help to date the other dedications, which otherwise stand in only a relative relationship to each other. An attempt to work out the relative sequence based on the shared names was first made by Albrecht, who made the reasonable assumption that every time the same archon-name appeared, this was a reference to the same man.²⁴ For the Chaironeian dedications do not use patronymics in the dating-formula (but do elsewhere), which suggests that no confusion was created by multiple sharers of the same name. (When homonymous members of the same family held the archonship, they signalled their filiation by adding τῶ δευτέρῳ or τῶ τρίτῳ to the formula, as Knoepfler pointed out.)²⁵ This kind of work, updated, produces a chart that looks like Table 1, which represents only a part of a very large corpus but gives some sense of how stones link to each other. Every stone is not linked to every other stone. But several principles of organization on individual stones can nonetheless be observed. First, after the initial dedication of the stone (e.g., «Aristion, son of Kraton...to Asklepios»), slave-dedications will first appear on the sides of the stone before they come to cover the front.²⁶ Moreover, slave-dedications on any face fill the top part of the stone before they move to the bottom, as the similarity of the sequence of archons Kallikon, Theodoros, Dexippos, Nikon, and Diokleides on the different stones *IG VII* 3301-3307, 3334-3346, 3347-3355, and 3360-3374 demonstrates (see Table 2). This similarity of sequence between stones also shows that one stone was not necessarily «filled» before another began to be employed; and the fact that the archon Alexikratos intervenes between Kallikon and Dexippos in 3303-3305, and that Theodoros is omitted on this stone, shows that the sequences constructed are chronologically correct but chronologically minimal sequences, with unknown numbers of archon-years between the chronologically ordered archon-years we have.

24. Albrecht (n. 6) 68-78; specific assumption at 70.

25. D. Knoepfler, «L'intitulé oublié d'un compte des naopes béotiens», *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de J. Tréhaux*, (Neuchâtel and Genève 1988) 263-94 at 270 n. 19, commenting on *SEG XXVIII* 449; he noted this again at D. Knoepfler, «Sept années de recherches sur l'épigraphie de la Béotie (1985-1991)», *Chiron* 22 (1992) 411-503 at 496.

26. For examples, see relative dating of the archons Epitimos and Ariston on the stone *IG VII* 3375-3377; that Epitimos is earlier we know from the top-to-bottom sequence on the stone *SEG XXVIII* 444-452 (table 1).

Five archons in sequence are five years in a chronological order, but only a minimum of five archon-years. Sequences therefore run on side-faces of stones before they run on their fronts, run from top to bottom on each face, can run on several faces of different stones simultaneously, and construct a relative and minimal rather than exact chronological relationship between archons.

The sequencing that the linkage between stones allows points to some overall conclusions, chronological and otherwise, that can be drawn from the corpus even when it cannot be absolutely dated. The order of the linked archon-names confirms that there was, over time, a shift from inscribing in Boiotian to inscribing in *koinē*, with innumerable mixed-dialect variants also present. The transition period from dialect to *koinē* was, at *minimum*, at least twelve or eighteen years long, for six archons (with six other named archons and six fragmentary acts, i.e. archon unknown, in the sequence between the first six) date nineteen acts in both Boiotian and *koinē*: for four of them, see Table 2. Thus there was a *minimum* of either six plus six (equals twelve) or six plus six plus six (equals eighteen) years in which there was real choice between dialect and *koinē*, with room for mixed-dialect forms on either side. Moreover, in the entire corpus, including the acts not yet published, there are thirty-four archons presiding over forty-one acts of dedication in dialect, with another twenty-four fragmentary acts (no archon-name preserved) in dialect, making a total of at least thirty-four and perhaps as many as fifty-eight archons, *minimum*, in dialect. Additionally, there are nineteen archons presiding over forty acts in *koinē*, with another eighteen fragmentary acts (no archon-name preserved) in *koinē*, making a total of at least nineteen and perhaps as many as thirty-seven archons, *minimum*, in *koinē*. There is, therefore, an absolute minimum of fifty-two years in which dedications were made in the sanctuaries of Chaironeia, but even this minimum could be as high as ninety-one years if the fragmentary inscriptions belong to new rather than known archons; and then there is always the possibility of further evidence that has not yet been found. Albrecht's attempt to follow Larfeld in shoehorning all the dedications into the first half of the second century BC,²⁷ even allowing him his spillover into the late third century BC to account for the undeniable fact that fifty-two years is longer than a half-century, is therefore unacceptably constrained: he is taking the absolute minimum number of years the corpus offers, when it is much more likely that slaves were dedicated at Chaironeia for a longer period of time – a hundred years is possible on the basis of the surviving evidence alone, and given that much may not survive, perhaps far longer. The relationship of

27. Albrecht (n. 6) 77-78 (summary chart).

the corpus to chronology is one of an accordion: only at its tightest, most closed position it is fifty-two years long. What its open position might have been, we cannot tell: perhaps a century or more.

DATE (2): THE ABSOLUTE DATING OF SLAVE-DEDICATIONS AT CHAIRONEIA. Is it possible to insert an absolute date anywhere in this sequence? The new inscription published here has «Aristion, son of Kraton» dedicating «to Asklepios.» He is likely to be the same man as the Chaironeian of the same name who manumitted a slave in Delphi in 137-136 BC.²⁸ And the previously published stones can be linked to this one in a relative chronology, for the dedication on the right face of this stone lists as one of the (female) dedicator's companions not only Kraton, the son of Aristion (almost certainly the son of the dedicator of the base, since the combination of these names in a family appears nowhere else in Boiotia), but also one Olioumpichos the son of Andrias, who also appears as the husband of that act's dedicator in *SEG XXVIII 444*, a slave-dedication to Artemis Eileithuia (see Table 1). This link between stones places the new base earliest, since *SEG XXVIII 444* is at the top of a new sequence of slave-dedications to Artemis Eileithuia, on a new stone, and these dedications to Artemis Eileithuia are in turn earlier than most of the rest of the corpus. The new base is therefore associated with the published inscriptions, but as the earliest of all (if we leave aside three pieces in dialect – *IG VII 3379*, *3385-3386*, and *3391* – which cannot be placed in the sequence). Thus, if the dedication to Asklepios is the earliest inscription on the earliest stone in a sequence lasting at least fifty years (but probably at least twice that) and is dated ca. 140, then the whole corpus of slave-dedications belongs not between ca. 200 and 150, but more likely between 135 and 40 BC.

III. Historical Context

There are, however, also historical arguments for the later date. If the body of

28. *SGDI 2191*; for dates, see above p. 55. Given Greek naming practices, Aristion the dedicator to Asklepios could also, in principle, be the Delphic manumittor's grandfather. But, given that the dedicator's son also appears on the same stone, and chronologically before an individual, Xenotimos, who seems to have been active in 186 BC (*Syll.*³ 585.171), that puts the hypothetical grandfather Aristion in ca. 215 BC or somewhat earlier. But at just that time the list of Epidaurian *theorodokoi* has not an Aristion son of Kraton, but a Kraton son of Aristion, as the important adult in the family (*SEG XI 414*). So it seems best to identify our Aristion as the Delphic manumittor of 137-6 BC, rather than his grandfather.

Chaironeian slave-dedications is moved down, shifted from 200-150 to 135-ca. 40 BC, then some of what little is known about the history of Chaironeia can contribute to making sense of this body of material. Chaironeia had supported the Romans in the Third Macedonian War,²⁹ and supported them again in 86 when Sulla fought Mithridates's general Archelaos on Chaironeia's doorstep (Plut. *Sulla* 16-19). In 87 BC, when the city was «in a sorry plight, neglected because of her smallness and poverty» (Plut. *Cimon* 1), a Roman cohort was stationed there, a cohort whose commander attacked a city youth by the name of Damon. This led to a series of murders, and brought the Roman general Lucullus to Chaironeia to investigate the incident; when later the Orchomenians maliciously prosecuted the Chaironeians in this matter, Lucullus testified on the Chaironeians' behalf, earning himself a statue in their agora (Plut. *Cimon* 1-2).³⁰ At this point, or possibly a little thereafter, Chaironeia was probably given the status of a *civitas libera* by Sulla and the Romans and freed from any compulsion to pay tribute, as nearby Elatea was, a reward for her support for Rome.³¹ The city then vanishes from the historical record again. So Chaironeia was chummy with the Romans by the mid-second century BC, distinctly poor in 87 but helpful to Sulla in 86, and thereafter probably rewarded in ways that can be expected to have improved her economic standing.

The economic prosperity, or lack thereof, of Boiotian cities is difficult to track. Survey archaeology suggests that the first century BC to the second century AD was a period of fragile prosperity in western Boiotia and sinking prosperity in eastern Boiotia, and has prompted the hypothesis of a correlation between prosperity and a pro-Roman attitude.³² Chaironeia seems to be the most prosperous of the Copaic cities, as judged also by the quantity of Roman-period remains and her population growth.³³ This picture corresponds to the apparent turn-around in Chaironeia's economic fortunes that a transition from «small» and «poor» to a «tax-free» city would imply, and might explain one aspect of the dedication-corpus mentioned above. The divide between dialect and *koinē* dedications, although crude, provides a significant statistic. 65 dedications in dialect were dated by some-

29. Pol. 27.1.4-5 and 5.2-3; Livy 42.43.6; with J. M. Fossey, «The Cities of the Kopais in the Roman Period», *ANRW* 2.7.1 (1979) 549-91 at 582.

30. See also Kallet-Marx (n. 23) 280-82 for date and discussion.

31. Kallet-Marx (n. 23) 60-61 and 64-65.

32. Fragile prosperity in western Boiotia, J. M. Fossey, *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia*, (Chicago 1986) 442-50; correlation with pro-Roman attitude, Fossey (n. 29) 559, on Akraiphia.

33. Fossey (n. 32) 447.

where between 34 and 58 archons (24 acts are lacking a name), while 58 dedications in *koinē* were dated by somewhere between 19 and 37 archons. There is, therefore, an appreciable difference in the rate of dedication between the two groups: in dialect, between 1.1 and 1.91 dedications per archon-year; in *koinē*, between 1.57 and 3.05 dedications per archon-year. If the rate of dedication of an expensive object, like a slave, rises, it could suggest greater disposable wealth on the part of the dedicator. Such wealth could be the result of the greater concentration of resources in the hands of the few,³⁴ a concentration also suggested by the recurrence of names, identified as families, in the slave-dedications to Artemis³⁵ and Sarapis (e.g. *IG VII* 3328, 3358-3359) and to both deities (*IG VII* 3317 and 3412). In either case, survey's verdict of a relatively prosperous countryside in western Boiotia (from which the rich would have drawn their rents) and the observation here of an increasing rate of dedication are exceptionally compatible with each other. This correlation might indeed help to stretch the accordion in the direction of one hundred years or more for the corpus, placing most of the *koinē* dedications after 80 BC (or so), and the dialect dedications mostly between 135 and 60 BC.

Another characteristic of the corpus of dedications is also better explained by placing the bulk of this corpus in the first rather than the second century BC. The series of Chaironeian slave-dedications for the most part notes the involvement of the *synhedrion* with the act of dedication, but the placement of the new base at the head of the sequence, and its link with the stone having nine dedications to Artemis Eileithuia (*SEG XXVIII* 444-452), highlight the fact that this involvement of the *synhedrion* in these acts of dedication was a development over time. This is the postulated sequence of formulae used in these dedications:

(new base, dedication)	
(new base, left face)	ἀρχῶν ἢ ἄρχοντος
(new base, left face)	Θιός· τιούχαν ἀγαθάν. ἱαρείάδδοντος
(<i>SEG XXVIII</i> 444)	ἀρχῶν ἢ ἄρχοντος, with <i>φίστορες</i>
(<i>IG VII</i> 3377)	ἀρχῶν. διὰ τῶν σουνεδρίων
(<i>SEG XXVIII</i> 445)	ἀρχῶν ἢ ἄρχοντος, with <i>φίστορες</i>

34. S. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The Landscapes of Roman Greece*, (Cambridge 1993) 33-92 suggests that this was characteristic of «Achaian» Greece in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods.

35. P. Roesch and J. Fossey, «Neuf actes d'affranchissement de Chéronée», *ZPE* 29 (1978) 123-37 at 133-34.

- (new base, front face) Θιός· τιούχαν ἀγαθάν. ἀρχῶ or ἄρχοντος; φίστορες restored.
- (SEG XXVIII 446) [archon-date and other possible formulae except for month omitted], διὰ τᾶς βωλᾶς κὰτ τὸν ν[όμον]; no φίστορες
- (SEG XXVIII 447-449) Θιός· τιούχαν ἀγαθάν. ἀρχῶ, διὰ τῶ σουνεδρίω κὰτ τὸν νόμον; no φίστορες
- (SEG XXVIII 450-452, IG VII 3334 and after) ἀρχῶ or ἄρχοντος, διὰ τῶ σουνεδρίω κὰτ τὸν νόμον; no φίστορες

Variation between ἀρχῶ or ἄρχοντος seems to be of no particular account, as has already been noted by Roesch and Fossey, and SEG XXVIII 446 may in fact belong in the same year as SEG XXVIII 445 right above it, which would explain its failure to use an archon-date.³⁶ What is, however, noticeable is that there is a period of experimentation in which a formula more common in headings of decrees or other official acts of any city (Θιός· τιούχαν ἀγαθάν) is introduced, and eventually another formula («through the *boulē*» [once] or «through the *synhedrion* according to the law») is added at the end of the act. With the addition of this second formula, the use of φίστορες definitively ceases. The second formula in particular announces the involvement of the institutions of the city – the *synhedrion* and the law – with the act of dedication, and demonstrates indirectly that one function the *synhedrion* and the law must have served was that of witness or guarantor, since independent or individual witnesses were no longer used thereafter.

This prominence of a city *synhedrion* would be a relatively isolated phenomenon in second-century BC Boiotia, but finds more and better company in the first century BC.³⁷ «*Synhedrion*» in Chaironeia is an approximate synonym for *boulē*, as the parallel placement of the two terms in the formulae of SEG XXVIII 446 and 447 (and the later appearance of *boulē*, in the same formula, in IG VII 3349) suggests. Other Chaironeian decrees and dedications only use the term *boulē* once in the second century BC (IG VII 3287, a proxy-decree) and in the third century AD and after (IG VII 3420, 3425-3426, 3430), but the use of *synhedrion* elsewhere in Boiotia does help to point to a date sometime after 146 BC and probably after 100

36. Variation, Roesch and Fossey (n. 35) 123; SEG XXVIII 446 same year as SEG XXVIII 445, Roesch and Fossey (n. 35) 124.

37. *Contra*, Roesch (n. 21) 129, but he is dating by the presence of dialect-forms.

BC. Dittenberger, a general supporter of early dates in Boiotia, dates four uses of *synhedrion* in inscriptions set up at the Ptoion to before 146 BC, but otherwise dates *synhedroi* and *synhedria* in cities mostly to the later second and first centuries BC.³⁸ *Synhedrion* also appears, especially in the centuries of Roman imperial rule, as a synonym for a larger provincial, or at least multiple-city, *koinon*.³⁹ In both its meanings, therefore, *synhedrion* in this area is a term roughly associated with the period of Roman hegemony, Roman land reallocation, and Roman taxation;⁴⁰ in the Peloponnese it might even correlate with oligarchies forcibly imposed after 146 BC.⁴¹ The use of the term *synhedrion* in Chaironeian slave-dedications therefore points to a later second-century BC date for the inscriptions in the corpus which use the term, and if the parallels to Megara and Oropos can be pressed strongly, to a post-100 BC date, which would be approximately the moment when it is seen here, if Aristion's son is active as a friend ca. 107 BC, about thirty years after his father's dedication, and the *synhedrion* starts to appear in formulae a minimum of four years later. If, moreover, a *synhedrion* were indeed more oligarchic than a mere *boulē*, then Chaironeia's open support for Rome, expressed in 146 and 86, is apparent on the internal, institutional level as well, and marks an inner transformation that may help to explain why the city's plea in its own defence, much buttressed by the enormous standing of Lucullus, received a favorable hearing at a Roman tribunal in the 70's BC.

There is one last way in which a late second- and first-century context fits the slave-dedications from Chaironeia better than an earlier context does. The dedications, which in the earlier inscriptions of the entire sequence are to Asklepios, Artemis Eileithuia, and the Mother of the Gods, link, with *IG VII 3377*, to the Egyptian god Sarapis.⁴² Public support for Sarapis in Boiotia at the end of the third

38. Dittenberger (n. 20) 753, *sv.* σύνεδροι and συνέδριον; in Argos, the *synhedrion* also emerged after 146 BC, C. Prêtre, «Une nouvelle mention des synédres dans une inscription argienne inédite», *Tekmeria* 8 (2003/4) 71-83 at 71.

39. See *IG VII 2711-2712*, 2878, and 2509, with J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, (München 1965) 88-96, which also includes a discussion of the *synhedrion* of Beroia in Macedonia.

40. Kallet-Marx (n. 23) 70-71.

41. A. Lintott, «The Roman Empire and its Problems in the Late Second Century», *Cambridge Ancient History IX*² (Cambridge 1994) 16-39 at 32-33; *contra*, Kallet-Marx (n. 23) 70-71.

42. Not to Sarapis and Isis: *IG VII 3319*, the only published slave-dedication to both at Chaironeia, has been incorrectly restored as Σαράπτι κ[ῆ τῆ Ἰσι, τὰν ἄνθεσιν ποιόμενος], but I have looked at the stone and it instead should read Σαράπτι τ[ᾶν ἄνθεσιν ποιόμενος].

century BC would be early compared to public support for the cult elsewhere in Greece.⁴³ In Athens, for example, although there are foreign Serapiastai attested in 216/5 BC, «unmistakable evidence of Athenians themselves participating in the Egyptian cult in Athens» does not appear until the third quarter of the second century.⁴⁴ Various mechanisms for the introduction of the Egyptian gods into Boiotia have been debated, including a kind of functional link through Athens and Eretria,⁴⁵ and a political link between «the interests of the Egyptian sovereigns» in Boiotia and the appearance of cult in Chaironeia and Orchomenos.⁴⁶ Even if the source of cult is agreed to be merchants, priests, and travellers,⁴⁷ who could be conveying knowledge of the cult any time after the middle of the third century BC, one would expect to find the kind of gap between first appearance of cult performed by foreigners and participation in it by locals that can be seen in Athens. That is, it seems much more likely that, no matter when first knowledge of the cult came to central Greece, committed support for the cult of the sort that the

All three Egyptian deities are, to be sure, present in the inscriptions dedicating the altars on which the slave-dedications were later carved, *IG VII* 3308, 3347, 3375, and 3380, but so far as is known only Sarapis received slave-dedications at Chaironeia.

43. Elsewhere, attested sanctuaries are second-century BC or later, see L. Bricault, *Atlas de la diffusion des cultes Isiaques, (IVe s. av. J.-C.-IVe s. apr. J.-C.)* («Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres» XXIII; Paris, 2001) 6 (Peloponnese) and 14 (Phokis and Thessaly); one dedication «by the city» in Gonnoi is dated by its editor to ca. 300 BC, which L. Bricault, *Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes Isiaques*, («Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres» 31; Paris 2005) 128 no. 112/0801 finds «assez suprenante.» Late fourth-century public support in Macedonia is deduced only from the way the Serapeion in Thessaloniki fits into the plan of the city (Bricault 2001, 22). Otherwise (and for Athens see next note) the evidence for sanctuaries of Sarapis does not antedate the second century BC.

44. J. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, (Berkeley 1998) 180-81 and 276 (quotation). Sarapiasts in 215/14, *IG II²* 1292=Bricault, *Recueil* (n. 43) 1:5 no. 101/0201, but the «priest in the city» is not attested until 144/3 BC, *SEG XXI* 584 = *id.* 1:7 no. 101/0203; *IG II²* 4692 = *id.* 1:7 no. 101/0202 can only be dated, stylistically, to the second century.

45. T. Brady, *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks*, («University of Missouri Studies» X:1; Columbia, MO 1939, reprinted 1978) 20-23; considered implausible by P. M. Fraser, «Two Studies on the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World», *Opuscula Atheniensi* 3 (1960) 1-54 at 42-49 and Knoepfler *Sept* (n.25) 437.

46. P. Roesch, «Les Cultes Égyptiennes en Béotie,» in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci, eds., *Egitto e storia antica dall'Ellenismo all'età Araba*, (Bologna 1989) 621-29; Bricault, *Atlas* (n. 43) 10.

47. Fraser (n. 45) and (n. 18) 1.275; Knoepfler, *Sept* (n. 25) 437.

Chaironeian slave-dedications attest would not occur much earlier in central Boiotia than it had in Athens.⁴⁸ Finally, the cult of the Egyptian gods may have physically replaced that of Asklepios or usurped some of its functions, as it did elsewhere in Boiotia,⁴⁹ and some time for the replacement of one by the other should be allowed. The flourishing of the Egyptian gods in Boiotia is not dependent on their endorsement by Athenians, but the timing of the parallel (and the timing of a potential takeover from Asklepios) should be taken into account.

These historical arguments, like the prosopographical ones, cannot be considered conclusive. But together, they strive to create a plausible, recognizable, and mutually reinforcing structure. The more concentrated wealth betokened by the increased rate of dedication in the second half of the corpus; the regular involvement of the *synhedrion* after the first nine dedications; the numerous dedications to Sarapis: all these fit well a context of the late second and first centuries BC, centuries when a city's relationship to Roman authority could have a marked effect on a city's economic survival and civic institutions. This context helps to explain how the citizens of Chaironeia could increasingly find themselves in a position to fund and implement the choice they had made. But why was the city overseeing the dedication of slaves to the gods of its sanctuaries?

IV. Consequences

The new date proposed for the body of Chaironeian slave-dedications opens up new possibilities for why these dedications were made and recorded. When dated in the third and second centuries BC, the «ancient» form of these dedications – a «religious mode» of slave manumission⁵⁰ – seemed to offer confirmation that this was an archaic way of freeing slaves, characteristic of backwaters of the Greek world before city-state involvement in the process of manumission, and before the «four freedoms» of freedman status had been delineated, most explicitly at

48. Bricault, *Recueil* (n. 43) 1:57-102 and *Atlas* (n. 43) 10-13, follows Roesch's dating, and also groups fourth-through-second-century evidence together, thus distorting the impression of how early the cult came to central Greece. My redating would also remove the gap between the Hellenistic and imperial evidence for the cult (Roesch [n. 46] 627-29) noted by Schachter *Cults I* (n. 14) 200.

49. P. Decharme, «Recueil d'inscriptions inédites de Béotie», *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 4 (1867) 483-539 at 485; cf. Fossey (n. 5) 154 for a similar «usurpation» of the cult of Artemis.

50. Y. Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece*, (trans. J. Lloyd; Ithaca, NY 1988²) 75.

Delphi.⁵¹ If, however, the Chaironeian slave-dedications are later, and begin after the great series of Delphic manumissions commenced (201 BC), and since, indeed, the city is routinely involved in the process of dedication, then both the «archaic» label and the relationship to Delphi must be re-examined. A closer look at what the dedications actually achieve, and whose interests they protect, will suggest that Chaironeia, which could not ignore or evade the force exerted by her close neighbor Delphi's immense regional prestige, was taking canny steps of her own to avoid being overwhelmed by that powerful sanctuary's influence. The city and her major families worked together to ensure that the local sanctuaries would never lack dedicated service, and these sanctuaries in turn must have contributed to the prestige and prosperity of the city.

Slave-dedications at Chaironeia only indirectly achieve the manumission of the slave. The slave is dedicated (ἀντίθειται) by master or mistress (or both) and becomes a ἱερός of the god, in which status such a slave can later be seen performing many actions of the free, like marrying, having children acknowledged as his own, and even dedicating his own slaves in Chaironeia's sanctuaries.⁵² In some cases, a slave is dedicated along with an obligation to stay and serve the former master (*paramonē*), and occasional inscriptions make clear that the obligation to stay is fulfilled first, after which the slave becomes *hiaros* (*SEG XXVIII 447*):⁵³ this in turn suggests that the dedication of the slave is, like *paramonē*, a legal obligation imposed at the time of manumission. The variety of possibilities does emphasize what all the inscriptions have in common: all record the dedication of the slave to the god, achieved (after the earliest exceptions discussed above) «through the *synhedrion*, according to the law.»

This focus on dedication achieved through the *synhedrion* according to the law («of the Chai[roneians]» restored in *IG VII 3307, 3376*) suggests what the point of at least these inscribed acts was, and the point of their inscription: to record or enact the dedication of this slave, given by this master, to this deity. The city oversaw the procedure, drew a fee from it (*IG VII 3303, 3307, 3339, 3344, 3354, 3406* – in the last five the phrase is partially restored), and acted as a type of *πίστορος* for it.

51. W. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, (Philadelphia 1955) 35.

52. Roesch and Fossey (n. 35) 135-36.

53. See also L. Darmezín, «Quelques problèmes relatifs à l'affranchissement en Béotie», *La Béotie antique. Colloques internationaux du CNRS, 16-20 Mai 1983* (Paris 1985) 325-31 at 326-27; 1999 (n. 1) 221-24.

For whose good did the city do this? Possibly for the slave, to protect the grant of freedom; but the inscriptions themselves are at best an indirect proof of manumission. Certainly for itself, since in addition to the fee received, the city would not have become involved at all had some form of her own interest not been at issue. But most of all, I would suggest, for the sanctuary, whose claim on these (former) slaves is both explicitly attested and explicitly guaranteed in these inscriptions. This is one good reason why the sanctuary would also allow, or even encourage, the inscription of these acts on the architecture, altars, and furniture of the sanctuary itself: whatever the sanctuary gained with these *hiaroi*, it became part of the sanctuary's wealth, property, and prestige as well,⁵⁴ and should be recorded, announced, and if need be enforced as such within the sanctuary.

What did these sanctuaries gain from the dedication of slaves? This has been much discussed for the other temples and sanctuaries of the Greek world that received dedicated slaves.⁵⁵ Extreme views hold that such slaves actually became temple-slaves, the full property of the god; given how free the *hiaroi* at Chaironeia can be, judged on the basis of what they can do, this seems highly unlikely here (as increasingly so too elsewhere and at other times).⁵⁶ More likely is some form of regular or intermittent service to the god, perhaps not as extreme as in Cos where a slave was freed and dedicated «to the goddess, so that he might care for the sanctuary and for all the attendants and assistants sacrificing together, as long as he is in the sanctuary» (*SEG XIV 529*), but closer to the religious duties specified at Lebadeia («let Andrikos serve in the sacrifices for these gods,» *IG VII 3083*). Laurence Darmezín concluded that the kinds of freedom enjoyed by the Chaironeian *hiaroi* corresponded well to the first two (of four) regularly specified in Delphic manumissions, that is, such *hiaroi* were free to be their own masters and free not to be seized or enslaved;⁵⁷ the kind of freedom they are never seen to enjoy, however, is the fourth one mentioned at Delphi, the freedom to go where they want. (The third, interpreted as the freedom to pursue any economic activity they choose, is neither attested nor ruled out by any evidence from Chaironeia.)

54. See also Darmezín (n. 53) 328, with comparative examples from Delphi.

55. See Albrecht (n. 6) 126-37 for a convenient summary; also Darmezín (n. 53) 325-26 and R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*, (Leiden 2005) 85-99.

56. See discussion of M. Mirković, «*Katagraphé* and the Consecration of Children», *Mélanges d'histoire et d'épigraphie offerts à Fanoula Papazoglou par ses élèves à l'occasion de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire*, (Belgrade 1997) 1-33.

57. Darmezín (n. 53) 326, 328.

That is, as *hiaroi* they are geographically bound to the sanctuary: not necessarily living in it, but living close enough to it to perform whatever sorts of religious or pragmatic services the sanctuary should require of them. Being a *hiaros* meant some form of service; some form of service, however often performed, restricted the freedom of these dedicated slaves to move. The sanctuary would always be able to call on their services.

The city, then, is guaranteeing a pool of available service (of unknown extent but probably of lifelong duration, cf. *SEG* XXVIII 451, «for all time») to its sanctuaries. Why? Darmezis is correct in her instinct to compare the Chaironeia dedications to the Delphic manumissions, for the regional influence and the regional pull of Delphi were very strong: in addition to the comparability of ways of thinking about freedom and obligation, and small similarities like the mention of the fate of children,⁵⁸ there is also the simple fact of proximity and travel between Chaironeia and Delphi. Chaironeians like Aristion son of Kraton, whether or not the same man as the dedicator of the base published here, did manumit slaves in the Delphic sanctuary, and every time he or others did so, a body and a transaction eventually deemed taxable left Chaironeia. The sanctuary of Apollo in the second century was at its most ebullient, pursuing both the fruits of its own independence and the favor of Rome,⁵⁹ and in doing so threatened to dominate and possibly starve out of existence the smaller cities and sanctuaries around Parnassus. Supporting Chaironeian sanctuaries was a way for Chaironeia to support herself, and to assure her own continued existence. This was also not a unique strategy: this kind of dedication of slaves is found also to other gods in other sanctuaries around or near Parnassus, like to Asklepios at Stiris (*IG* IX 1, 35), to Athena Polias at Daulis (*IG* IX 1, 66), and to Artemis and Apollo at Hyampolis,⁶⁰ as well as in some of Chaironeia's neighbors like Thisbe (to Artemis Eileithuia, *IG* VII 2228) and Orchomenos (to Sarapis, Isis, Asklepios, and the Mother of the Gods, *IG* VII 3198-3204).

That this was most likely a strategy that reflected the local influence of Delphi will be true whether or not the bulk of the Chaironeian dedications are down-dated to 135 BC and after. If they and other dedications like them are down-

58. As F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom II. Die sogenannte sakrale Freilassung in Griechenland und die (douloi) ieroi*, (Wiesbaden 1960) 65 noted, the unusual reference to children in *IG* VII 3322 and 3377 should be traced to Delphic influence.

59. G. Daux, *Delphes au I^{ie} et au I^{er} siecle*, (Paris 1936) 5.

60. Pappadakis (n. 3) 263-65.

dated, however, they respond to a problem rather than anticipate it. For 40% of Delphi's 1273 manumissions occurred between 201 and 150 BC,⁶¹ and the percentage of external manumissions (i.e. performed by manumitters not from Delphi) also dropped in the first century BC: that is, either the inhabitants of cities around Parnassus, who had contributed signally to Delphi's statistics in the first half of the second century BC, thereafter had no more slaves to free, wished to free no more slaves, or were freeing them at home. By situating the Chaironeian slave-dedications after 135 BC, this paper makes the explanation clear: the Chaironeians were employing a strategy to protect themselves and their city's sanctuaries against a new pressure from a near, and old, neighbor.

Tables

Table 1. Examples of links between new stone, *SEG XXVIII 444-452*, and *IG VII 3375-3377* (each column is a separate stone; names in brackets are non-archon names; d = dialect, k = *koinē*).

Table 2. The shift from dialect to *koinē* (each column is a separate stone; d = dialect, k = *koinē*).

61. Percentage, K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves*, (Cambridge 1978) 140; D. Mulliez, «Les Actes d'affranchissement delphiques», *CCG 2* (1992) 31-44 at 32, corrected Hopkins's total.

TABLE 1

Asklepios		Artemis	Sarapis
[new] all dialect		[SEG XXVIII 444-452] all dialect	[IG VII 3375-3377]
left	front Aristion, son of Kraton	right	
Kallitimos			
Philoxenos			
Philoxenos, son of Xenon, priest			3375 Patron, son of Dioklidas 3377d
		(unknown archon) [Kraton, son of Aristion] [Olioumpichos, son of Andrias] [Euruphaon, son of Wanaxidamos]	XXVIII 444 Epitimos Epitimos (right side)
	Phanodoros Nikodamos	[Olioumpichos, son of Andrias] Wanaxidamos [Nikodamos is dedicator] XXVIII 446 unknown XXVIII 447 Mnasigenes XXVIII 448 Kallikles XXVIII 449 Automenes XXVIII 450 Aristion XXVIII 451 Klion XXVIII 452d Ariston ⁶²	
			3376k Ariston (front)

62. Roesch and Fossey (n. 35) 132 restored an iota in the middle of this name to make it Aristion, but this is both unnecessary and unlikely: there is no room on the stone for it, another archon already intervenes after the earlier dedication dated by Aristion, and the archon Ariston is clearly attested in 3376.

TABLE 2

3341k Samichos 3342k Samichos 3343d Brouchollos	3306d – 3307d – 3301d Menebolos	3351d –	3381d Mnasikles	3361k – 3360k –	3370k – 3371k Theodoros	3332k <u>Dexippos</u>	9 in dialect <u>3317d Samichos</u>
3302d Meliton	3352d Archeinos 3348d <u>Kallikon</u>	3349d <u>Theodoros</u>	3382k <u>Theodoros</u>	3362k <u>Dexippos</u> 3364k Nikon 3365d <u>Diokleides</u>	3350k Nikon 3353k <u>Diocleides</u>		
3303d <u>Kallikon</u> 3304d Alexikratos	3305d <u>Dexippos</u>						
3344k <u>Theodoros</u> 3345k <u>Dexippos</u> 3346k <u>Nikon</u>							

Summary

Prosopographical evidence from a re-publication of six inscriptions on a base at Chaironeia (*SEG XLIX 506-11*), and also from a reading of the unpublished dedication of the base itself, is the basis for arguing that the corpus of Chaironeian slave-dedications should be down-dated by approximately fifty years: that they should be seen as starting in the second half of the second century BC and lasting for around a century. The practice of dedicating slaves in Chaironeia is then integrated into this new historical context, with an exploration of the possibility that the Chaironeian slave-dedications, which grant the service of the slave to the sanctuary after manumission, are a local response to the contemporary sale-manumissions of slaves at Delphi.