

Τεκμήρια

Tóμ. 17 (2023)

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἥδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγίγνετο

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Eilers, C. (2023). Archival Dockets in Greek Inscriptions. *Τεκμηρία*, 17, 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.33956>

Archival Dockets in Greek Inscriptions

Claude Eilers

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.33956](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.33956)

Copyright © 2023



Άδεια χρήσης Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0.

CLAUDE EILERS

Archival Dockets in Greek Inscriptions*

Some time towards the end of the third century BC, the Ionian city of Lebedos passed a decree praising both Apollonius son of Demetrios of Samos for having served as a *dikastēs* (foreign judge) and his city, Samos, for having sent him. Honours such as these are well attested for foreign judges in the inscriptions of this period,¹ and this document is typical of the genre. Its text was inscribed both at Lebedos,² which passed the honour, and at Samos,³ where Apollonius was a citizen. Remarkably, both copies have survived. The two texts are identical –at least by ancient standards, which were less strict than our own⁴– except for five lines at the top of the Samian copy, which read:

Ἐπὶ Μηνοδότου, Ποσιδεῶνος πέμπτηι
ἀπιόντος: ἐκκλησίας νομαίας οὖσης:
ἐπιστατοῦντος Ἀπελλέω τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίδου
καὶ ὁμόσαντος κατὰ τὸν νόμον. ψήφισ-
μα παρὰ Λεβεδίων. [κτλ]

In (the year of) Menodotos, in (the month of) Posideon on the fifth day from month end; at a regular assembly (at which) Apelleus son of Apollonides presided after he took an oath according to the law. A decree from Lebedos. [*The decree follows*]

What is this text found at the top of the Samian version? It is an artefact of an archival process, added when the Lebedan decree was received at Samos and deposited in the Samian archive. Robert referred to it as a “marque

* This article has been improved greatly by the many suggestions of Kent Rigsby, Christina Kokkinia, and the anonymous reviewers of this journal. Its shortcomings remain my own. Epigraphic abbreviations follow the list of *AIEGL*.

1. Robert 1973; Crowther 1993; Crowther 1995; Crowther 1999; Magnetto 2016.
2. Robert 1960; Robert 1928.
3. *IG* 12.6.1, 146; Robert 1928.
4. On the question of the fidelity of ancient copying, see esp. Eich 2009.

d'enregistrement”;⁵ Hiller von Gaertringen called a similar text an “Aktenvermerk der Kanzlei”.⁶ In English, the technical term is “docket”, as Rigsby has reminded us,⁷ a term that, outside of papyrology, is mostly found in judicial contexts, where the term can designate “an identifying statement about a document placed on its outer surface or cover”.⁸ Such is the text that appears above the decree of Lebedos and elsewhere.

Archival dockets like this one are found elsewhere in Greek epigraphy, and some three dozen inscriptions that include examples are collected in the Catalogue below. Although extant epigraphical dockets show remarkable diversity of vocabulary and organization, they consistently share one key feature: a date according to the local calendar of the city where it was docketed. Indeed, a docket need be no more than a date, as in the case of a letter of P. Cornelius Dolabella (suff. 44) to Ephesus that has been preserved among the documents illustrating Jewish privileges reproduced by Josephus (AJ 14.225, with underlining to indicate the archival element):

(225a) ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Ἀρτέμιονος μηνὸς Ληναιῶνος προτέρᾳ.

(225b) Δολαβέλλας αὐτοκράτωρ Ἐφεσίων ἄρχοντι βουλῇ δῆμῳ χαίρειν. [κτλ]

In the prytany of Artemon, on the first of the month of Lenaion.
Dolabella, imperator, to the magistrates, council, and people of Ephesus. [The letter follows]

The letter itself begins with Dolabella’s name in the address formula, whereas the date that precedes was not part of his text: as far as we can tell, governors never dated their letters in the late Republic,⁹ and when Romans did so in private correspondence, such dates were placed at the end and naturally used the Roman calendar.¹⁰ The date in Dolabella’s letter, which is clearly

5. Robert 1960, 206.

6. L. Hiller von Gaertringen (*I.Priene*, p. 54) on no. 12 in the Catalogue below.

7. Rigsby, *Asylia* 138, 260, 268, 371, 510.

8. *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. “docket”, §3; cf. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “docket”, §7: “An endorsement on a letter or other document, briefly indicating its contents or subject; a label affixed for a similar purpose; a written direction, a ticket.”

9. None of the letters in Sherk, *RDGE* includes a Roman date.

10. Only a few dozen of Cicero’s hundreds of letters include dates, which are always

Ephesian, is an archival docket added when the document was received in Ephesus and deposited in its archive.¹¹ This docket is strikingly brief, but such date-only dockets are also attested in the epigraphic record. A letter of Augustus to Knidos of 6/5 BC, for example, discovered at Astypalaia, has the name of the local eponym and month appended to its top (Catalogue, no. 29), as do (it seems) other letters of his,¹² as well as one of the proconsul Vinicius to Cumae (no. 27). A letter of Q. Fabius Maximus (cos. 145) to Dyme in 144/3 BC (no. 13) may achieve something similar using the names of an eponymous theokolos and a (monthly rotating?) secretary.

Why add a local date to these letters when depositing them? The purpose is administrative and practical: to provide a reference for filing a document in an archive, the rough equivalent of the call number of a library book. Why a date, specifically? Clearly because the archives were organized chronologically. Once a docket had been added to a text on deposit, subsequent copies might include it when prepared for display or dissemination: Josephus' text of Dolabella's letter obviously descends from the copy that had once been docketed at Ephesus; the inscribed text of Fabius Maximus', from one docketed at Dyme; those of Augustus' letters, at their various cities.

The dockets accompanying letters such as these are less elaborate than those found attached to other kinds of document. The Samian copy of the decree for Apollonius quoted above, for example, begins with a date by eponym, month, and day and then includes other details: that an assembly met; the name of its presider; an affirmation that he had taken a legal oath; and that the document appended was a "decree of Lebedos". This last detail is important, since without it, what a document was, or where it was from, would have been almost impossible to determine.

Because dockets are filing references, the details found in them imply something about how archives were organized.¹³ At Samos, it seems, assembly business had either its own section in an archive or possibly its own archive

placed at the end. See Peter 1901, 31; Bickerman 1933, 236 (trans. Bickerman 2007, 411).

11. See *e.g.* Pucci Ben Zeev 1998, 141.

12. See the Catalogue, nos. 26 (letter of Octavian to Rhosos in Syria), 28 (Augustus to Samos, 19 BC), 30 (Augustus to Samos, after 2 BC).

13. On Greek civic archives and their organization and functioning see *e.g.* Wilhelm 1909, Lambrinoudakis, Wörrle 1983, and now especially Boffo, Faraguna 2021, some of which was adumbrated in Boffo 1995, 2003, 2005, 2012, 2013.

—this is why the assembly is explicitly mentioned in the docket— and within it, filing was done with reference to its eponym and calendar date (or, possibly, eponym and presider). As it happens, we know that in some cities archives used filing boxes or pots for storage, receptacles that presumably reflected the smallest subdivision (typically months, one assumes, though larger cities might have further subdivisions: perhaps, for example, a box for each meeting of the assembly, council, or board).¹⁴ At Delphi such a filing box was called a ζύγαστρον,¹⁵ and at Athens a jar used for such purposes (at least for private lawsuits) was an ἔχινος.¹⁶ At Rhodian Kamiros, there seem to have been two kinds of box: the πρόχειροι (“at hand, accessible”), which officials could consult, and κιβωτοί, which contained identical copies but were sealed. We know this from a decree of Kamiros that praises a certain Philokrates for (among other things) having opened and reorganized the κιβωτοί. The text itself is highly suggestive:¹⁷

τῶν τε χρηματισμῶν τῶν ἐν
 10 τοῖς προχείροις διαφωνούντων ἐξ ἐτέων ἔβδο-
 μήκοντα καὶ ἑπτὰ ἐπεμελήθη ὅπως, λυθεισᾶν τὰν
 κιβωτῶν, πάντες οἱ ἀπό〈λ〉ογοι ἀναγραφῶντι, ἐξ οὐδὲ συν-
 ἀντασε Καμιρεῦσι τούς τε αἵρουμένους ἐπὶ τὰς κο[ι]-
 νὰς πράξεις ὑπ’ αὐτῶν εὐχερῆ ποιεῖσθαι τὰν ἐπί-
 σκεψιν περὶ ὃν κα χρήζωντι ἐμ μηθενὶ καθυστε-
 ροῦντας, καὶ πλείονα χόραν ἀμφισβατηθεῖσαν
 ὑπό τινων ἀνακτήσασθαι, εὑρεθέντων τῶν περὶ
 αὐτᾶς χρηματισμῶν.

14. See generally Ghinatti 2004, 8 with Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 507-508.

15. Delphi: *Syll.*³ 241, ll. 49, 146; cf. *F.Delphes* III 2, 205, l. 12.

16. Boegehold 1995, 79-81, with testimonia. The lid of one has been discovered with its painted docket mostly intact (*ibid.* 80-81, no. E1): [ἔνεστι: τά]δε: τέτταρα [τῶ]ν: ἐκ[γε-
 γρα]||[μμένων: διαμαρτυρία: ἐξ ἀνακρίσεω[ς]:] | [νόμος: ἐπικλήρω]ν κακώσεω[ς]: ἐπίσκη-
 ψις:] [ὅρκοι: ἀντιδίκων: Ἀντίνω]ρ: ἐπέθ[ηκεν:] || [- - -]θ[- - -] | [- - -]η[- - -] (“Of the writ-
 ten copies, the following four are inside: diamartyria from the anakrisis, law on abuse
 of heiresses, challenge of testimony, oaths of litigants. Antenor put the lid on”. Trans.
 Boegehold 1995). The names of officials and/or litigants probably followed.

17. Badoud 2015, 369 no. 21 (*Tit. Camirenses* 110), ll. 9-15.

And because the documents in the accessible boxes [πρόχειροι] from seventy-seven years were in disorder, [Philocrates] saw to it that the sealed boxes [κιβωτοί] were unsealed and all the contents-lists [ἀπόλογοι] transcribed; the outcome for the Kamireis was both that those chosen by them to undertake public affairs could easily inspect whatever they need without any delay and that a rather large property, disputed by some, was recovered when documents about it were found.

The reorganization described here, one might reasonably guess, will have involved dockets, whether by replacing or fixing them, or using them to re-compile the ἀπόλογοι (lists of contents, it seems).¹⁸

Another docket is found at the top of the inscribed version of a decree of Erythrae honouring another *dikastēs*, this time from Priene, where it was docketed, deposited, and later inscribed. Its docket reads:¹⁹

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Δημητρίου· μηνὸς Πανήμου· | τὸ παρὰ Ἐρυθραίων, τιμῶν δικαστῆι Κλεάνδρῳ. [κτλ]

In the stephanopherate of Demetrios; in the month of Panemos; the (decree) from Erythrae, (concerning) honours for the *dikastēs* Kleandros. [The decree follows]

As at Samos, this includes a date by local eponym and month, followed by a title for the document: τὸ παρὰ Ἐρυθραίων (ὑπὲρ) τιμῶν δικαστῆι Κλεάνδρῳ. Archival organization is probably again reflected here: τὸ παρὰ Ἐρυθραίων and other similarly named documents (see below) presumably come from an archive (or section of an archive) reserved for foreign *ψηφίσματα*, which was apparently arranged chronologically by year and month. In this case no day is mentioned, presumably because this particular detail was unnecessary from the perspective of the archive, which needed only to specify the box (apparently by month) in which a document was filed. (For a list of other examples see below, n. 23). The docket again supplies a documentary title, which identifies

18. For this important document, see the discussions of Lambrinoudakis, Wörrle 1983, 348-350; Faraguna 2000, 85-87.

19. *IPriene B-M* 114 (Catalogue no. 12).

the document as “(a decree) from Erythrae concerning honours for Kleander”. Its prominent placement at the end of the docket allowed the document to be found at a glance, which was important. Indeed, Philokrates’ archival reorganization at Kamiros was praiseworthy precisely because officials could now find documents easily.²⁰

Another of Josephus’ quoted documents is a decree of Athens (AJ 14.150-155) that has a docket added before its prescript:²¹

ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου, μηνὸς Πανέμου πέμπτη ἀπίόντος, ἐπεδόθη τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ψήφισμα Ἀθηναίων. [κτλ]

In the presidency and priesthood of Dionysios son of Asclepiades, on the fifth day before the end of the month of Panemus, delivered to the *stratēgoi*, a decree of the Athenians. [The decree follows]

As in the examples above, a date is prominent; also reported, however, is that delivery was made to the *stratēgoi* of the receiving city –Pergamum, as it turns out²² – a detail that again probably reflects archival organization: the document was to be filed among documents related to the performance of that office. Again, the docket concludes with a title (here, *ψήφισμα Ἀθηναίων*).

A most impressive collection of dockets is found on the monument honouring Iason of Kyaneai, the first column of which lists twenty-five documents pertaining to Iason and his honours that had accumulated over a three-year period. (The list of dockets, as I suggest in no. 33 below, probably summarizes the contents of a dossier once sent to Antoninus Pius).

20. Badoud 2015, 369 no. 21 (*Tit. Camirenses* 110), ll. 13-15, quoted and translated above.

21. Josephus, AJ 14.149 (no. 21). Niese, following the codex Palatinus, omits τοῖς *στρατηγοῖς*; the dative, however, is idiomatic in this context: documents are delivered to the *stratēgoi*. For the formula cf. *IG* 12.7, 240, ll. 31-33 (Amorgus): περὶ τοῦ | αὐτοῦ ἐγράφη ψηφίσματα τρία, ἐξ ὧν τὰ δύο ἐπ[ε]||δόθη ἄρχοντι, ἵνα ἀποθήται εἰς τὸ ἄρχεῖον (“Concerning the same man, three decrees were composed, of which two were delivered to the archōn to be deposited in the archive”).

22. An eponymous *πρύτανις καὶ ἱερεύς* is attested only at Pergamum (Sherk 1992, 238-239), as Willrich 1924 recognized.

The examples discussed above and collected in the Catalogue below demonstrate how diverse archival dockets could be, which is only to be expected given that every city had its own bureaucratic processes, its own magistrates, and its own calendrical system. Despite that diversity, some features are common throughout the corpus.

First, an almost universal feature is a date according to the local calendar, a chief purpose of which was to provide the filing references for archives that were organized chronologically. That the purpose is archival rather than historical is implied by the fact that several cities specify a month but not a day,²³ presumably because archiving was typically done by dividing first by genre (e.g. decrees from external bodies), then year, and then month; once a document had been filed in the smallest subdivision (typically a filing box, one assumes), a specific day of the month might not be needed. Indeed, there may have been circumstances in which a year and title provided a sufficient docket, either because the material in question was annual (as perhaps in Samothracian mystai lists: see no. 22 below) or because some other system was used, as at Dyme (no. 13) or Rome (nos. 36 and 37).

Second, archival dockets reflect the organization of their archives. At Samos (no. 1, with the discussion above), for example, assembly business had a separate section in the archive –or possibly its own archive– with subdivisions for year, then month, then day. At Pergamum (no. 21) there was a section (or, again, a separate archive) for documents related to its *stratēgoi*, with the same subdivisions; decrees from foreign cities were probably archived together at Priene, filed, it seems, by eponym (year) and month, but not by day (apparently unnecessary, to judge from no. 12). From other evidence, it seems that council business was archived separately at Thasos;²⁴ and similarly documents related to “the sacred”, at Philippi.²⁵ (Conceivably, these cities had

23. No day is specified in surviving dockets from Iasos (nos. 4, 10); some from Cos (nos. 7 and 15 have no day; 25 includes a day; 7 and 16 are too fragmentary for certainty); Tenos (no. 9); Priene (no. 12); Astypalaia (no. 29).

24. Thus, the two references to archives found at *I.Lampsakos* 7 (SEG 13, 458), ll. 10 and 28-29 are to *ψηφίσματα ἐκ βουλῆς* (“decrees transcribed from the archives of the council”: see L. & J. Robert, *BE* 1954, no. 209). For an overview of scholarship about this complicated document see Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 505 n. 11.

25. *IG XII* 4.1, 220, l. 36: *ἱερῶν*.

all of these categories, but the available evidence allows only the most fleeting of glimpses).

Third, in so far as archival dockets include verbs or describe actions, they refer to functions related to the handling of documents, with references to delivering (ἐπεδόθη, no. 21), sending (ἀποσταλεῖσα, no. 31), copying (ἀντιγεγραμμένον, no. 36), and oath-taking (ὁμόσαντος, no. 2).

Fourth, most archival dockets conclude by describing their document with a title: ψήφισμα παρά (with a city in the genitive, and sometimes with ψήφισμα or παρά elided: nos. 2, 3, 14, 21, 22); ὑπέρ τιμῶν (with the name of the honorand in the dative: nos. 3, 6, 12, 14, 16); δόγμα (with a genitive: nos. 20, 24); ἐπιστολή (with a genitive: nos. 10, 31). There are two exceptions. First, Coan dockets mostly lack titles,²⁶ perhaps because, for its own reasons, Cos was simply more systematic in removing them when preparing texts for display. Second, such titles are typically absent from dockets attached to letters,²⁷ presumably for the simple reason that titles offered no information that was not already included in a letter's address: a title reading “ἐπιστολή of so-and-so” would add little to what was already in the address “so-and-so to the magistrates, council, and people of such-and-such a city”. That titles were expendable in such cases is nicely illustrated by the letter of Queen Laodike to Iasos (no. 10): when a lapicide's errors made surgery necessary, it was the title that could be amputated to save the text.²⁸

Fifth, extant archival dockets all appear above their documents in inscriptions, apparently corresponding to the dockets of tablets and whitened boards. The point (one must assume) was to make the finding of a specific document as efficient as possible: placing a docket at the top of tablets of wax or clay (κεραμίδες) or whitewashed boards (λευκόματα, πινάκια, δέλτοι, σανίδες) will have made this easier. Papyrological dockets, by contrast, are found on the verso, on the first sheet of a roll (the πρωτόκολλον, whence English “protocol”), or on the σύλλυβος (“label”) attached to the protocol.²⁹ Again, the point is to make the process of identifying a sought-for document as easy as possible and to minimize handling.

26. Nos. 7, 8, 25 have no title, but no. 15 does.

27. Nos. 13, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30. Exceptions: nos. 10 and 31.

28. See the remarks of Nafissi 2001, 13 on no. 10 below.

29. Turner 1968, 5.

Still, given that archives were ubiquitous in Greek cities,³⁰ and all official documents and many private ones needed to be filed in them, it is noteworthy how few such dockets are attested in Greek epigraphy. Why are they not more common? A few explanations come to mind. First, most inscribed documents did not need them. It is surely significant that all but one of our collected examples appear on documents that had originated outside the city where they were displayed,³¹ and that local decrees typically have similar details already built into their own formulary. Indeed, it has been observed that the elaborate prescripts so well attested in Athenian decrees reflect the organization of that city's archive, the Metroon.³² That observation also explains why surviving archival dockets so closely resemble the prescripts of the civic decrees of their respective cities: dockets and prescripts served the same purpose of facilitating the filing and retrieval of their documents.

Even most foreign documents, however, do not include a docket. Much more common is a simple heading. Take, for example, the foreign decrees found at Priene, which have the following headings:

τὸ παρὰ Ἰασέων (*I.Priene B-M 108 = I.Priene 53*)

τὸ παρὰ Υδ[ισ]έων (*I.Priene B-M 111 = I.Priene 52*)

[τὸ παρὰ Μα]γνήτων (*I.Priene B-M 112 = I.Priene 61 + p. 310*)

τὸ παρὰ Δαιοδικέων (*I.Priene B-M 113 = I.Priene 59*)

τὸ παρὰ [- - -] (*I.Priene B-M 128 = I.Priene 72*)

[τὸ παρὰ τ]ῶν [Γ]ιόνων | [ὑ]πὲρ τιμῶν Διογνούσιοι Ἀμεινίου (*I.Priene B-M 43 = I.Priene 55 + p. 310*)

Each of these headings has the formula τὸ (sc. ψήφισμα) παρά followed by the genitive plural of the city whose decree was displayed, and it is striking how similar these headings are to the final few words of our only extant docket from that city:

30. Posner 1972; Haensch 2003; Boffo, Faraguna 2021 with earlier bibliography.

31. The exception is from Tenos (no. 9), where the date is recorded on which the document was “transacted” or “processed” (κεχρημάτισται), rather than when it was passed by the assembly.

32. West 1989, 532-533; Sickinger 1999, 86-91.

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Δημητρίου· μηνὸς Πανήμου· | τὸ παρὰ Ἐρυθρά-
ων, (ὑπὲρ) τιμῶν δικαστῆι Κλεάνδρῳ. *I.Priene B-M* 114 = *I.Priene* 50 +
p. 310 (Catalogue no. 12)

The fact that the surviving headings listed above are so similar to the title that concludes this docket suggests that such titles were often in fact the remains of dockets that had had their filing details removed in preparation for display.³³ (Normally, one assumes, only the title was needed).

If dockets were normally removed when texts were prepared for public display –or severely truncated leaving only a title, as seems to be the case at Priene– the salient question may be less why dockets are relatively rare in extant inscriptions than why any survive at all. The information included in them was useful only within a narrow, administrative context –the archive and its workings– and even in that context they had little purpose other than specifying where a document might be found, which would mostly have become irrelevant once a text was put on public display. This, however, may have been the point, since a docket provided a means of authentication, making it possible to locate an original document in the archive and verify a copy against it.³⁴ This might explain why, despite the relative rarity of dockets in epigraphically preserved documents, three dockets are found among the documents related to Jewish rights quoted by Josephus in *AJ* 14 (nos. 21, 23, and 36). Given that these documents had probably first been collected as evidence of the privileges that they contain, preserving their dockets offered a means to allay any scepticism that they might encounter. Josephus applies this premise in a comment about an exchange of letters between Solomon and Tyre, regarding which he assures his readers (*AJ* 8.51–54):

Διαμένει δὲ ὅχρι τῆς τίμερον τὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τούτων ἀντίγρα-
φα οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις μόνον σωζόμενα βιβλίοις ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ
Τυρίοις, ὥστ' εἴ τις ἐθελήσει τὸ ἀκριβὲς μαθεῖν, δεηθεὶς τῶν ἐπὶ
τοῦ Τυρίου γραμματοφυλακείου δημοσίων εὗροι συμφωνοῦντ'
ἄν τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὑφ' ἡμῶν τὰ παρ' ἔκείνοις.

33. Rhodes 1985, 135 and Rhodes, *Decrees*, 18–19 supposes that headings were added during preparation for display; for possible archival origin see Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 228.

34. Cf. the remarks of Sherk 1969, 10 on his 22 (no. 35), 29 (no. 37), and Josephus, *AJ* 14.219 (no. 36).

To this day there remain copies of these letters, preserved not only in our books but also by the Tyrians, so that if anyone wishes to learn the exact truth, he would, by enquiring of the public officials in charge of the Tyrian archives, find that their records are in agreement with what we have said.

Josephus must surely be wrong in his assertion that these documents could be found in Tyre, not least because his source for the episode (*1 Kings 5.1-9*) describes an exchange that took place through envoys and mentions no documents. It is nonetheless worth noting that he assumes that contemporary archival practice had always existed and that the authenticity of a controversial document could be confirmed by going to an actual archive. If that assumption was common, preserving the dockets of potentially controversial documents made some sense.

Could concern about authenticity have been a motivating factor for including dockets in other inscriptions? Such a concern might be reflected in Nero's letter to Rhodes (no. 31), which includes a docket. It mentions a “letter falsely brought to you in the name of the consuls” (ll. 11-12: τῇ ψευδῶς ἐπι-
στολῇ πρὸς ὑμᾶς κομισθείσῃ τῷ τῶν ὑπάτων ὄνόματι). Apparently, this false letter had implied imperial displeasure towards the Rhodians, something that Nero denies while assuring them of his benevolence. Exactly what lay behind this episode is unclear, and it is surprising to read that dispatches from Rome could be contradictory and possibly falsified. The Rhodian decision to inscribe Nero's letter with its local archival docket intact may have been taken in order to provide locals with extra assurance that they were reading an authentic copy.³⁵

A similar impetus might have been at work in a letter written by Augustus to Knidos rebuking that city for its treatment of Eubulos and Tryphera. They had fled Knidos after one of their slaves had accidentally killed a man involved in an attack on their home that lasted several days. The letter's contents have been much discussed,³⁶ and its details and multiple controversies need not detain us here. Especially noteworthy, however, is that Augustus' letter to Knidos was discovered not at Knidos but in nearby Astypalaia, where Tryphera

35. See the discussion of Oliver, *Greek Constitutions*, 112-115; Fabia 1896; Griffin 2000, 210-211.

36. See Rigsby 2019, with earlier bibliography.

had taken up residence (Eubulos had died in the interim). If the inscription was privately commissioned by Tryphera, as is often supposed,³⁷ including the Astypalaian docket may have been meant to assure readers of its authenticity.

This raises the possibility that sometimes dockets were included in other inscriptions because they were private commissions. This is often thought to be the case for the SC de Asclepiade (no. 35), erected in Rome, which includes a docket.³⁸ Including one for (say) a foreign decree honouring some private individual (as at nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, etc.) may similarly have acted as a guarantee of the document's authenticity.

A few other factors might have been involved. The concern for authentication mentioned above might overlap with a desire to make a document look more authoritative or official, perhaps a rough equivalent to the way in which official documents in our own times are printed on letter-head paper or notarized with stamps or seals. In some cases the point might have also been to lend public endorsement to (say) the honours that foreign cities had bestowed on a prominent local or to signal a document as worthy of public attention. Given this, it may be worth observing that a disproportionate number of the docketed texts are among the most important that a city might possess, including Roman measures (nos. 20, 24, 25) and letters from officials (nos. 13, 16, 23, 27) and emperors (26, 28-31). That such documents figure especially among the docketed texts might mean that a docket could add further prominence to a document that was already intrinsically prominent.

Finally, it is worth noting the ways in which dockets are used in dossiers of honours for notables such as Opramoas of Rhodiapolis (no. 34) and Vibius Salutaris of Ephesus (no. 32). In these dossiers, civic decrees begin with their prescripts; for letters, edicts, and other documents a docket achieves a similar effect and helps articulate a monument by marking where documents begin. This use of dockets as an organizational device is adumbrated in the dossier inscription of Rhosos enumerating the privileges awarded to its citizen Seleukos by Octavian (no. 26).

In all this it is worth remembering that an inscription was not identical to the document or documents that it contained. It might also include what would be called metadata in our modern, digital age –data about data– that is,

37. Rigsby 2019, 112 n. 25: “So most have deduced from the findspot”.

38. Gallet 1937, 255-257 and 262-264; Sherk 1969, 9-10, 131-132; Raggi 2001, 87-88.

details that were not part of an inscribed document but were about that document: such material would include various kinds of heading with full dockets or shortened titles; and supplementary post-documentary notes of appointments, delivery dates, names of the delivering envoys, descriptions of seals, and so forth. Further work remains to be done on such phenomena and their place in epigraphy, especially as they relate to other practices regarding decisions about organization and display.

Catalogue of Archival Dockets

When a document was deposited in the archives of a city, it would be docketed and filed. Later, when such a document was extracted from the archive either for display or for dissemination, vestiges of its deposit were sometimes preserved in the form of a docket. The clearest examples of these occur where a city received a document from abroad to which it added a docket when archiving it. The following Catalogue, which lists the examples known to me, limits itself to texts that have been clearly added during archiving and are separate from the documents that they were added to. This leaves aside, then, prescripts of civic decrees, although it seems likely that they had archival purposes (see the discussion above with nn. 31-32), which are part of the decrees and therefore excluded from this list. Also left aside are annual lists of (say) ephebes, mystai, or politai, which sometimes have an eponymous date in their headings. Here, again, the dates were probably part of the list itself and not external to it.

The order is (roughly) chronological. Roman dockets are listed separately in the Appendix.

1. Letter of Seleukos (I) to Miletus (288/7 BC); docketed at Didyma. Günther 1977-8 (*OGIS* 214; Welles, RC 5; *I.Didyma* 424; Petzl 1991):

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ποσειδίππου,
ταμιευόντων τῶν ἱερῶν χρημά-
των Τιμέα τοῦ Φύρσωνος, Ἀρισταγόρα
τοῦ Φιλήμονος, Κλεομήδους τοῦ Κρέ-
5 σωνος, Φιλίππου τοῦ Σωσιστράτου, Ἀλεξάν-
δρου τοῦ Λοχήγου, Πολυξένου τοῦ Βάβωνος

τάδε ἀνέθηκαν βασιλεῖς Σέλευκος καὶ
Ἀντίοχος τὰ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ γε-
γραμμένα. [κτλ.]

In the (year) in which Poseidippos was stephanēphoros, when the treasurers of sacred funds were Timeas son of Phyrson, Aristagoras son of Philemon, Kelmedes son of Kreson, Philippus son of Sosistratos, Alexandros son of Lochegos, Polyxenos son of Babon; the Kings Seleukos and Antiochos communicated the following things which were written in their letter. [*The letter of Seleukos follows*]

A letter of Seleukos I to Miletus announcing gifts to the sanctuary of Apollo in Didyma was prominently displayed at the site. The letter is preceded by the lines quoted above, which attribute the gifts to both Seleukos and Antiochos. Welles, *RC*, 36 characterized these lines as “note of explanation, added by the publishing official”. It is more likely to be archival, however, added when the document was received.

2. Decree of Lebedos honouring a foreign judge and his city, Samos (late 3rd cent. BC); docketed at Samos. *IG XII* 6.1, 146 (Robert 1928, 165-168):

ἐπὶ Μηνοδότου, Ποσιδεῶνος πέμπτῃ
ἀπιόντος· ἐκκλησίας νομαίας οὕσης·
ἐπιστατοῦντος Ἀπελλέω τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίδου
καὶ ὁμόσαντος κατὰ τὸν νόμον. ψήφισ-
μα παρὰ Λεβεδίων. [κτλ.]

In (the year) of Menodotos, in (the month) of Posideon, on the fifth day from month end; at a regular assembly (at which) Apelleus son of Apollonides presided after he took an oath according to the law. A decree from Lebedos. [*The decree follows*]

This honorific decree of Lebedos survives in two copies: one from Lebedos (Robert 1960) and one from Samos, the docket of which is quoted here.

Other Samian dockets at nos. 17, 28, 30.

3. Decree of Knidos honouring foreign judges and their city, Magnesia on the Maeander (221/220 BC); docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 15a with Engelmann 1973:

[στεφ]ανηφορούντος Ζη[νοδό]του τοῦ Ἀρισ[ταγό]-
 [ρου] μηνὸς Κουρεῶνος, φυλῆς προεδρευούση[ς Δι]-
 [άδος], γραμματεύοντος τῇ βουλῇ Ἐπηράτου [τοῦ]
 [Μορί]μου, δευτέραι ἐν νομαίαι ἐκκλησίαι προέδρ[ων]
 5 [έπιστ]ατοῦντος Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Παυσανίου· π[αρὰ]
 [Κνιδί]ων ὑπὲρ τιμῶν τῶι τε δήμωι καὶ τοῖς ἀπο[στα]-
 [λεῖσι]ν πρὸς αὐτοὺς δικασταῖς τε καὶ γραμμα[τεῖ]· [κτλ.]

(In the year of) the stephanēphoros Zenodotos son of Aristagoras, in the month of Koureon, when the tribe [Dias] held the presidency, when Eperates son of Morimos was secretary for the council, on the second (day), in the regular assembly, when Apollonios son of Pausanias was presiding over the proedroi; (decree) from [Knid]os concerning the honours for the people and for the judges sent to them and for the secretary. [*The decree follows*]

Other Magnesian dockets at nos. 5, 6, 14, 16, 18.

4. Decrees of Rhodes related to a diplomatic appeal of Iasos (220/213 BC); docketed at Iasos. Meadows 1996 (*I.Iasos* 150; *I.British Mus.* 3, 441; *SGDI* 3, 3750):

ἐπὶ στεφανηφ[όρ]ου Δημέου τοῦ Στησιόχου,
 γραμματέως δὲ Μένητος τοῦ Πόδωνος· Γηφοριῶνος·
 ψηφίσματα παρὰ Ῥοδίων· [κτλ.]

In the year in which the stephanēphoros was Demeos son of Stesiochos; and the secretary was Menes son of Podon; (in the month of) Gephoriion; decrees from Rhodes. [*The decrees of Rhodes follow*]

Four Rhodian decrees are inscribed below this docket, reacting to complaints of Iasos against Podilos, the officer of a local dynast. For context and a full republication of this dossier of decrees, see Meadows 1996.

Another docket from Iasos at no. 10.

5. Decree of koinon of Dionysian technitai honouring theōroi and their city, Magnesia on the Maeander, and accepting an invitation to the Leukophryene (late 3rd/early 2nd cent.); docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 89, ll. 1-10:

[*The names of three theōroi*]

παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσο[ν]
τεχνιτῶν·

5 στεφανηφοροῦντος Ἀναξήνορος τοῦ Ἰφ[ικρά]-
τον μηνὸς Λευκαθεῶνος, φυλῆς προεδρευ[ού]-
[σ]ῆς Ἀτταλίδος, γραμματεύοντος τῆι β[ουλῆι]
[Λά]μπωνος τοῦ Μανδροδώρου, τετράδι ἀπ[ιόντος],
[ἐν] νομαίαι ἐκκλησίαι, προέδρων ἐπιστατοῦν[τος]
10 [Πο]λεμάρχου τοῦ Εὐάνδρου. [κτλ.]

From the koinon of Dionysian technitai. In the stephanophorate of Anaxenor son of Iphicrates, month Leukatheon; the tribe Attalis presiding; secretary of the council, Lampon son of Mandrodoros; on the fourth day from month end; in the regular assembly; Polemarchos son of Euandros presiding over the proedroi.
[*The decree follows*]

Other Magnesian dockets at nos. 3, 6, 14, 16, 18.

6. Decree of Antiocheia (on the Maeander?) honouring a foreign judge and his city, Magnesia on the Maeander (late 3rd/early 2nd cent.); docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 90:

[στε]φανηφοροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μετὰ Φρήτορ[α],
[μηνὸς] Ποσιδεῶνος, φυλῆς προεδρευούσης Ποσειδ[ωνι]-
[άδος], γραμματεύοντος τῆι βουλῆι Λάμπωνος τοῦ [Μαν]-
[δροδ]ώρου, τετράδι ἀπιόντος, ἐν νομαίαι ἐκκλησίαι, π[ροέ]-

5 [δρων ἐ]πιστατοῦντος Ἀπολλοφάροντος τοῦ Ἀπολλοφάνο[ν]·
[π]αρ[ὰ] Ἀντι[ο]χέων·
[ὑπὲρ] τιμῶν Πινθοδότωι Χαρισίου·
[κτλ.]

In the (year) in which the god was stephanēphoros, following Phretor; [in the month] of Posideon; the tribe Poseidonias was

presiding; the secretary of the council was Lampon son of Mandrodoros; on the fourth from month end; in the regular assembly; while Apollophanes son of Apollophanes was presiding over the proedroi; (decree) from Antiocheia concerning honours for Pythodotos son of Charisios. [*The decree follows*]

The grammateus is the same as in no. 5; other Magnesian dockets at nos. 3, 5, 14, 16, 18.

7. Decree of Halicarnassus (c.220 BC) honouring a physician from Cos; docketed at Cos. *IG XII 4.1, 142 (SGDI 3.1, 3620; I.Cos Segre ED 132):*

[ἐπὶ μονάρχου] Μακαρέως, Βαδρ[οιμίου - - -]

In (the year) in which Makareus was monarchos, (in the month) Badromios. [- - -]

The date uses a Coan month and eponymous monarchos (supplied, on which see Sherk 1990, 265-266). Following are two decrees, the first from Halicarnassus describing honours for Hermias of Cos, including the selection of an envoy to deliver the document to Cos (frag. a and frag. b, 1-22), and then a decree of Cos (frag. b, 23-35) in response. This Coan decree has no dating formula in its own prescript, but the docket at the top of the inscription may have functioned as such. Cf. also Rigsby 2010; Bosnakis, Hallof 2005.

Other Coan dockets at nos. 8, 15, 25.

8. Decree of Miletus on the Didymeia (end of 3rd cent.); possibly docketed at Cos. *IG XII 4, 153-154 (Syll.³ 590; I.Milet 3, 1052):*

(face a) ἐπὶ Ἰποκράτευς, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμιτίου. [κτλ]

(face b) ἐπὶ Φιλίνου, νουμηνίαι μηνὸς Ὑακινθίου. [κτλ]

(face a) In (the year) of Hipokrates, month Artemitios. [*The decree of Miletus follows*]

(face b) In (the year) of Philinos, new moon of the month Hyakinthios. [*The decree of Cos follows*]

Two sides of a stele contain decrees of Miletus and Cos; each document begins with a date, and the date introducing the Milesian decree on face a

has been traditionally understood to be a Coan docket (thus Robert, 1960, 206 with n. 6). This interpretation, however, is either inconsistent with our understanding of the date of the Coan new year or implies a delay between the two documents that is too long to be easily explicable. Because of these problems, Rigsby 2010 proposes that the date on face a is not a Coan docket but a Milesian prescript with a date that had been mis-inscribed. See also Bosnakis, Hallof 2005, 239-240 and Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 536 n. 94.

Coan dockets could forgo a title: cf. nos. 7 (no title), 15 (title), 25 (no title).

9. Decree of Tenos (c.200 BC) honouring a citizen; docketed at Tenos. Étienne 1990, 226-227, no. 24 (SEG 40, 695):

ἐφ' Ἡγύτορος, Ἀνθεστηριῶνος, κεχρημάτισται
 vacat
 [κτλ]
 [- - -]

In (the year) of Hegetor, (month) of Athensterion, transacted ...
 [The decree of Tenos follows]

Étienne (1990) noted the rarity of the formula in the first line, which identifies the date on which the appended decree was “transacted” or “processed” (κεχρημάτισται), rather than when it was passed by the assembly. This surely reflects some archival function, which makes the inscription doubly unusual in preserving the remains of a local docket on a local decree (most dockets are on documents that had come from a foreign city). This deviation from normal practice may also have motivated the empty line that separates the docket from the text of the decree proper, emphasizing that it is not part of it. See Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 508 and n. 18.

10. Letter of Queen Laodike (III) (197/6 BC or shortly thereafter) to Iasos; docketed at Iasos. *I.Iasos* 4 with Nafissi 2001, 104-113:

[- - -]
 ἐπί στεφανηφόρου Κυδίου τοῦ Ἱεροκλείους·
 ἐπιστολὴ ΠΑ ἹΕλαφηβολιῶνος·—]
 Βασίλισσα Λαοδίκη Ἰασέων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δῆμῳ χαίρειν·[κτλ]

This, however, is a tangle of mistakes, erasures, and imperfectly applied corrections. According to the reconstruction of Nafissi 2001, 104-113 (building on Fischer 1986, Piejko 1990, 138 n. 14, and Mastrocinque 1995), the text was originally meant to look like this (marking with {braces} letters that were subsequently erased and overwritten):

{ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Κυδίου τοῦ Ἱεροκλείους}·
 {Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος}·
 ἐπιστολὴ πα{ρὰ Βασιλίσσης Λαοδίκης}.
 Βασίλισσα Λαοδίκη Ἰασέων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δῆ-
 μῳ χαίρειν· [κτλ]

In (the year) Kudias son of Hierokles was stephanēphoros;
 (in the month) of Elaphebolion;
 a letter from Queen Laodike.
 Queen Laodike to the council and peo-
 ple of Iasos, greetings [etc.]

Something went wrong with the first transcription, and the attempted correction involved completely erasing the eponymous date of the first line and overwriting the second line with it. This overwrote the month that was there, which in turn was transferred to the third line, where it (imperfectly) overwrote the heading “Letter of Queen Laodike”, part of which was then stranded. It is noteworthy that the attempt to save the docket involved overwriting the title, which may confirm the observation made above (text with n. 28) that dockets for letters could forgo a title since the information was so apparent in the first lines.

Another docket of Iasos at no. 4.

11. Decrees of Rhodes (c.169-167 BC) honouring theōroi of Cyzicus; docketed at Cyzicus. Rigsby, *Asylia* 166 (CIG 3656; SGDI 3752):

ἐπὶ Ἀριστάνδρου τοῦ {Ἀπ}ολλο[φάνου ἀρχιθέωρος Ἀπατούριος?]·
 Σωσιβίου καὶ θεωροὶ Οινόβιος Εύνεω, Ἰκέσιος Διονυσίου ἀπο-
 σ[ταλέντες ἀπέδωκαν τάδε τὰ]
 ψηφίσματα παρὰ Ῥοδίων· [κτλ]

In (the year) of Aristandros son of Apollophanes, [the arch-
 theōros Apatourios(?)] son of Sosibios, and the theōroi Oinobios

son of Euneus (and) Hikesios son of Dionysios were dispatched and delivered these decrees from Rhodes. [*The Rhodian decrees follow*]

The inscription begins with a Cyzican docket that includes names of the theōroi whom Cyzicus had sent to Rhodes and who returned with the Rhodian reply, apparently in multiple decrees. Whether the docket had included a month and a day is uncertain owing to a lacuna. Only part of the first of these decrees survives; the Rhodian eponym that begins the text of this first decree provides an approximate date (see Finkelsztein 2001, 192 with Habicht 2003, 552).

12. Decree of Erythrae (c.160 BC) honouring a foreign judge of Priene; docketed at Priene. *IPriene B-M* 114 (*IPriene* 50; *IErythrai* 111; *IBritish Mus.* 3, 418; cf. Robert 1960, 202-204):

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Δημητρίου· μηνὸς Πανήμου·
τὸ παρὰ Ἐρυθραίων, (ύπερ) τιμῶν δικαστῆι Κλεάνδρῳ.
[κτλ]

(In the year) Demetrios was stephanēphoros; month Panemos; the (decree) from Erythrae (concerning) the honours for the foreign judge Kleandros. [*The decree follows*]

For a discussion of this docket see text with nn. 19 and 33, above. Although several decrees passed by foreign cities honouring Prienan judges were erected in Priene, this is the only one with a docket. It is unclear whether this was due to an oversight –perhaps the lapicide had been instructed to include only the title, but this instruction was not given or was missed– or because of special circumstances related to this moment or honorand.

13. Letter of Q. Fabius Maximus (cos. 145) to Dyme (c.144/3 BC); docketed at Dyme. Sherk, *RDGE* 43 (*Syll.*³ 684; Rizakis, *Achaïe* III, 5):

ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέ-
ος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος. [κτλ]

In (the year) Leon was theokolos; when the secretary of the council was Stratokles. [*The letter of Q. Fabius follows*]

This (probable) docket is inscribed in slightly larger letters than the rest of the inscription. The prescripts of Dyme's decrees are slightly unusual in not including any calendrical details but rather a series of officials (cf. Rhodes, *Decrees*, 97-98) who presumably rotated, making an implicit chronological arrangement less apparent, with no month or day specified. For the date see Hurlet, Müller 2020, 81-82 n. 151 with earlier bibliography.

14. Decree of Samos (2nd cent. BC) honouring a citizen of Magnesia on the Maeander; docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 103 (*IG XII* 6.1, 154):

ὁ δῆμος ὁ [Σαμίων Τηλέστρατον]
 Διογένους [Μάγνητα ἀπὸ Μαιάνδρου]
 ἐτείμησεν.
 στεφανηφοροῦντος [- -]
 5 παρὰ Σαμίων ὑπὲρ τιμ[ῶν Τηλεστράτῳ Διογένους - -] [κτλ]

The people of [Samos honoured Telestratos] son of Diogenes [Magnesian from the Maeander]. (When) the stephanēphoros was [- -]; (a decree) from Samos concerning the honours for Telestratos son of Diogenes [- -]. [*The decree follows*]

The inscription begins with a statement summarizing the honours that follow and is reminiscent of texts found on statue bases. Might one have been nearby? Following that is a docket, beginning with mention of the stephanēphorate, which will have followed with the holder's name and the month and day of registration.

Other Magnesian dockets at nos. 3, 5, 6, 16, 18.

15. Decree of the Dionysian technitai (2nd cent. BC); docketed at Cos. *IG XII* 4.1, 124 (*I.Cos Segre* ED 141):

ἐπὶ μονάρχου Χρηστίωνος, μην[ὸς]
 'Υακινθίου, γνώμη τοῦ κοινοῦ [τῶν πε]-
 ρὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τ[εχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπ' Ἰ]-
 ωνίας κα[ὶ] Ἐλλ[ησπόντου καὶ τῶν]

5 περὶ τὸν κ[αθηγεμόνα Διόνυσον]
καὶ[ι] τ[ὸν συναγωνιστῶν] [κτλ]

In the (year) in which Chrestion was monarch, month Hyakinthios; a decree of the Association of Dionysian Artists of Ionia and the Hellespont and those (associated with) [Dionysos Kathergemon] and the extras. *[The decree follows]*

This decree, which is too fragmentary for certainty about its contents, is preceded by a docket comprised of a date by Coan eponym and month and a title identifying what follows as a γνώμη (“resolution”) of the Dionysian technitai.

Other Coan dockets at nos. 7, 8, 25.

16. Letter of M. Aemilius M.f. to Magnesia on the Maeander (mid-2nd cent. BC); (possibly) docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 93b (*I.Priene* 531; *Syll.*³ 679 IIb; Sherk, *RDGE* 7):

(34) [... c.5 ... δόγμα τὸ κομισθὲν παρ]ὰ τῆς συγκλήτου {ν} Ὁμ[μαίων
- - -]
[κτλ]

[Decree brought from] the senate of the Romans [by envoys sent on behalf of those at Priene] *[The letter of Aemilius and a decree of the senate follow]*

A long-standing boundary dispute between Magnesia on the Maeander and Priene led to an appeal to the Roman senate that is inscribed here together with a covering letter from the praetor Aemilius. This pair of documents was included on side B of a four-sided marble block; originally there had been a block above it and one below that presumably displayed other documents related to the dispute (see von Gaertringen’s description at *I.Priene* no. 531). The first reported line of this surviving middle block is a title (quoted above) describing the documents that follow. If a local date were to be supplied there instead of δόγμα τὸ κομισθέν at the beginning of l. 34, the line would be a typical docket rather than the slightly idiosyncratic title that is there now.

Other Magnesian dockets at nos. 3, 5, 6, 14, 18.

17. Decree of Bargylia honouring Samian judges (2nd cent. BC); docketed at Samos. *IG XII* 6.1, 145 (*I.Iasos* 2, 609; *SEG* 49, 1147):

ἐπὶ Ἀρχαγάθου, Πελυσιῶνος ιζ'

vacat

[κτλ]

In (the year) of Archagathos, on the 17th of Pelusion.

[*An empty line followed by the decree*]

The dating formula is Samian (Robert 1935, 478, where other examples are collected). That the decree comes from Bargylia is not explicitly stated but may be deduced from its formulary (cf. Robert 1960, 206).

Other Samian dockets at nos. 2, 28, 30.

18. Decree of Larbenoi honouring five foreign judges and their city, Magnesia on the Maeander (2nd half of 2nd cent. BC); docketed at Magnesia on the Maeander. *I.Magnesia* 101, 1-63:

[ll. 1-4: *five crowns naming the Magnesian honorands*]

5 [ἐ]πὶ Ἀριστοκράτου τοῦ Ἀριστοκράτου τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἡραιῶνος δευ[τέραι]
[π]αρὰ Λαρβηνῶν ὑπὲρ τιμῶν τῷ τε δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς δικασταῖς καὶ τῷ γρ[αμμ]ατεῖ.

[κτλ]

In the (year of) Aristokrates son of Aristokrates, grandson of Artemidoros; in (the month) Heraion, on the second (day); (a decree) from Larbenoi concerning honours for the people (of Magnesia) and the judges and the secretary. [*The decree of Larbenoi follows*]

The stele, which contains two documents, is arranged as follows: the names of the Magnesian judges being honoured (ll. 1-4); the docket dated by the Magnesian month of Heraion, quoted above (ll. 5-6); a decree of Larbenoi honouring the judges (ll. 7-61); and a heading πρὸς τὸ Λαρβηνῶν (“In response to the [decree] from Larbenoi”, l. 62), which introduces the decree of Magnesia in which the honours are accepted (ll. 63ff.).

Other Magnesian dockets at nos. 3, 5, 6, 14, 16.

19. Letter of the koinon of the Amphiktiones to the Athenians (130 BC); docketed at Athens. *IG II² 1132*, ll. 40-51 (Le Guen, *Technites*, TE 7; *CID* 4, 115):

ἐκ τοῦ μητρώου· ἐπὶ Δημοστράτου [ἄρχοντος· μηνὸς Βοη]-
δρομιῶνος· τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων Ἀθηναίων τεῖ]
45 βουλεῖ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· [κτλ]

From the Metroon. In the archonship of Demostratos; month Boedromion. [The letter of the koinon of the Amphiktiones follows]

The inscription contains three documents: a decree of the Amphiktiones of 278 BC (ll. 2-39; dated by eponymous archon at Delphi to 279/8 BC), then a letter of the Amphiktiones to Athens (partially quoted above) and a new decree of the Amphiktiones (ll. 52-94), which the letter shares (see Sickinger 1994, 289-292). The letter is preceded by an Athenian docket, identifying the document as coming from the Athenian archive, the Metroon, and its filing reference as an eponymous date with month.

Another Athenian docket at no. 20.

20. SC de collegiis artificum Bacchiorum (112 BC); docketed at Athens and inscribed on the Athenian treasury in Delphi. Sherk, *RDGE* 15 (*F.Delphes* III 2, 70; *Syll.³ 705*):

[ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς -(tribus)- πρώτης πρυτανείας, ἦ λάμιος
Τιμούχου Ραμνούσιος ἐγραμμάτευεν],
[Ἐκατομβ]αιώνο[ς - - -, καὶ - - τῆς πρυτανείας. vacat δόγμα συγκλήτου.
κτλ]

[In the archonship] of Dionysios, [in the first prytany, that of (the tribe) - - -, for which Lamios son of Timouchos, of the (deme) Rhamnous, was secretary], on the [nth] day of (the month of) Hekatombaion, [on the nth day of the prytany. Decree of the senate]. [The SC follows]

The Association of Dionysian Artists at Athens had been involved in a long dispute with the Association from the Isthmus, a dispute that was decided by a Roman decision in their favour. To celebrate this, the Athenian technitai received permission from their city to engrave the Roman decision on a wall of the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi (see Ferrary 2009, 72); an Athenian docket was included.

Another Athenian docket at no. 19.

21. Decree of Athens honouring the Jewish high priest John Hyrcanus I (105 BC); delivered to the magistrates of Pergamum, where it was docketed. Josephus, *AJ* 14.149:

ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου, μηνὸς Πανέμου πέμπτη ἀπόντος, ἐπεδόθη τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ψήφισμα Ἀθηναίων. [κτλ.]

In the (year) in which Dionysios son of Asclepiades was prytanis and priest; month of Panemos, fifth day from the end; delivered to the strategoi; decree of Athens. [*The decree of Athens follows*]

The receiving city can be identified as Pergamum from its eponymous formula (see n. 22 above). Josephus quotes the document to show the high regard in which Greek cities held Hyrcanus II. The decree, however, is securely dated by Athenian archon to 105 BC, showing that Josephus had confused Hyrcanus II with his homonymous grandfather, John Hyrcanus I. The docket is one of three found among Josephus' documents (the others are nos. 23 and 36).

22. Decree of Odessos relating to the mysteries; possibly docketed at Samothrace (2nd/1st cent.? BC). *ISamothrace*, no. 6 (*IGBulg.* I² 42, comm.):

ἐπὶ βασιλέως [τοῦ δεῖνος]
ψήφισ[μα] Ὁδησσιτῶν
ώς δὲ ἐν Ὁδησσῷ ἐπὶ [ἱερέω τοῦ δεῖνος].
[κτλ.]

In the (year) in which [- -] was basileus; decree of the [Odessians]; so, too, in Odessos in the priesthood [of so-and-so]. [*The decree of Odessos follows*]

In this decree of Odessos, as in some other mystai lists at Samothrace, a double date is found. The second is a date according to the sending city; the first, which is followed by the document's title, could be a Samothracian docket, given that identifying year and sending city might be sufficient to file the records of an annual event. (The eponymous official in Samothrace was the basileus: Livy 45.5.6 with Sherk 1990, 289-290, no. 48).

The eponymous years with title found at the head of other Samothracian lists might also be regarded as dockets: *IG XII* 8, 185-188.

23. Letter of Dolabella (suff. 44) to Ephesus (43 BC); docketed at Ephesus (Josephus, *AJ* 14.225):

ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Ἀρτέμιωνος μηνὸς Ληναιῶνος προτέρᾳ. [κτλ]

In the (year in which) Artemon was prytanis, month of Lenaion, first day. [*The letter follows*]

In *Antiquities* 14, Josephus quotes a number of documents to prove Roman benevolence towards the Jews. Among them is a letter of Dolabella declaring that Jewish Roman citizens were exempt from legionary service. Josephus' copy is descended from one that had once been docketed at Ephesus.

24. SC de Panamara (39 BC); docketed at Stratonikeia. Sherk, *RDGE* 27 (*I.Stratonikeia* 1, 11):

δόγμα. [vacat] ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀρτεμιδόρου τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου τοῦ Παμφύλου, καθ' υἱοθεσίαν δὲ Ἀριστείδου, Ἡρακλεῶνος μηνὸς [τ]ρι[τη] ἐξ ικάδος. [κτλ]

Decree. In (the year in which) the stephanēphoros was Artemidoros son of Artemidoros son of Pamphilos, by adoption son of Aristeides; month of Herakleon; the third day from month end. [*The SC follows*]

The sanctuary of Zeus at Panamara, in the territory of Stratonikeia, was the site where a senatus consultum was displayed in which Rome recognized the suffering of the city during the Parthian invasion. Its text was preceded by a docket of Stratonikeia.

25. Lex Fonteia bestowing privileges on a citizen of Cos (prob. 39 BC); docketed at Cos. *IG XII* 4.1, 266 (Crawford, *Roman Statutes* 36; *SEG* 46,1088):

[(erasure)]
[(erasure)] μηνὸς Πανάμου δευτέρου
[ραι ἐξ ικάδος [vacat] [κτλ]

[(text erased)] in the month of Panamos, second day from month end. [*The Lex Fonteia follows*]

This fragmentary stele had contained a Roman lex that had bestowed privileges, including citizenship, on some citizen of Cos for his services to the triumvirs. The erasure in the first lines apparently obliterated the name of M. Antonius and the indication of a year. Other Coan dockets are dated eponymously (cf. nos. 7 and 15), as this one should be, too. Buraselis 2000, 27 suggests that Antony had been an honorary eponym, as he is attested to be elsewhere. (This seems likelier than the suggestion of Crawford, *Roman Statutes* 504 that Antony's name was erased and that the year was according to the Seleucid era, which, as Buraselis points out, would be unparalleled at Cos).

Other Coan dockets at nos. 7, 8, 15.

26. Four documents of Octavian (30s BC) regarding privileges granted to Seleukos of Rhosos; docketed at Rhosos. Raggi 2006 (Sherk, *RDGE* 58; *IGLS* III 1, 718):

- (l. 1) ἔτους [. .] μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου [- - -]
- (ll. 2-8: covering letter of Octavian (36-33 BC) instructing that an attached document be entered into Rhosos' archives and forwarded to neighbouring cities)
- (ll. 9-72: edict of Octavian granting privileges to Seleukos)
- (l. 73) [ἔτους . . .] μηνὸς Δύστρου τε'
- (ll. 73-84: letter of Octavian acknowledging envoys of Rhosos)
- (l. 85): [ἔτους . . μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου θ̄']
- (ll. 85-95: letter of Octavian (30 BC) commending Seleukos)

This famous dossier of documents that bestow privileges on Seleukos of Rhosos in Syria was inscribed on a large stele erected by that city. It includes three dockets for four documents: the first precedes an edict of Octavian and its covering letter (probably c.35 BC); the second, a letter of Octavian to Rhosos; the third, another letter of Octavian.

27. Letter of the governor Vinicius (27 BC) to Cumae and iussum of Augustus and Agrippa; docketed at Cumae. Sherk, *RDGE* 61 (*I.Mus. Leyden* 57):

- (ll. 1-11: order of Augustus and Agrippa in Latin regarding ownership of sanctuaries)

(ll. 12-22: Latin version of Vinicius' letter)

22 ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Φανίτου [vacat]

(ll. 23-28: Greek version of Vinicius' letter)

The inscription begins with a iussum (“order”) made by Augustus and Agrippa as consuls against the private ownership of sanctuaries. Following this is a letter of the proconsul Vinicius to Cumae about one such sanctuary, first in Latin, then in Greek. Before the Greek version is a date by eponymous year but without any calendrical details, which probably functioned as a docket.

28. A letter or edict of Augustus to Samos (19 BC); docketed at Samos. *IG XII 6.1, 159* (Sherk, *RDGE* 62, ll. 12ff.):

(ll. 1-11: letter or edict in Latin regarding military grants?)

[ἔτους] ιψ' τῆς Αὐτοκ[ράτορος]

[Σεβαστ]οῦ νίκης, ἐ[πὶ - - -]

[- - -] μηνὸς Ἐ[κατομβαιῶνος?]

15 [. . πρὸ] ἐπτὰ εἰδ[ῶν Ἰουλίων?]

[Γ. Σεντί]ωι Σατ[ορνίνωι ὑπάτωι]

[In year] 12 of the victory of Imperator [Augustus], in the [year of - - -], month [Hekatombaion?], seven days before the Ides of [July?], in the [consulship] of C. Sentius Saturninus.

This fragmentary inscription includes two texts: a Latin one mentioning military matters (ll. 1-11), followed by a Greek dating formula (ll. 12-16), and then a fragmentary letter or edict of Augustus (ll. 17ff.), of which only the emperor's name survives. The dating formula, probably a docket, combines the year according to the era of Actium (ll. 12-13); its equivalent by Samian eponym introduced with ἐπί followed by a Samian calendar date with month and (possibly) day (l. 14); and finally, its Roman equivalent (l. 15) and the year by consular date (19 BC, which began with only one consul, Sentius Saturninus, l. 16). The arrangement is apparently chiastic: local year, local date, Roman date, Roman year.

Other Samian dockets at nos. 2, 17, 30.

29. Letter of Augustus to Knidos (6 BC); docketed at Astypalaia. *IG XII 3, 174* (*Syll.³ 780*; Sherk, *RDGE* 67; *IKnidos* 34; Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* 6):

[---]

(5) [δαμι]οργοῦ δὲ Καιρογένευς Λευ[κ]αθέον. [κτλ]
 [... and in the year in which] Kairogenes was damiourgos, (in the month of) Leukatheos. [*The letter of Augustus follows*]

In 6 BC Augustus wrote to Knidos to rebuke it for its treatment of two citizens. The letter was not inscribed there but in nearby Astypalaia, where it seems the vindicated parties had re-located. The letter was docketed with the eponymous damiourgos and local month of Astypalaia. Something had been inscribed above this line; Rigsby (2019, 112 n. 27) has suggested a Roman date (cf. e.g. no. 28).

30. Letter of Augustus to Samos (c.2 BC–AD 9); docketed at Samos. *IG XII 6.1, 161*:

ἐπὶ Τρύφωνο[ς] τοῦ [--- ἔτους ---]
 τριακοστοῦ, μη[νὸ]ς [--- [κτλ]]

In (the year) of Tryphon son of [---] the thirtieth [year of ---],
 [---] month.

A highly fragmentary letter of Augustus to Samos about one of its citizens published by Hallof, Kienast 1999, 216 (*SEG 49, 1149*). It seems to be double-dated: first by an eponymous date, then with a date by the Actian era (cf. no. 28, above, where the order seems inverted).

Other dockets from Samos at nos. 2, 17, 28.

31. Letter of Nero to Rhodes (AD 55); docketed at Rhodes. Badoud 2015, 443–444, no. 65 (with photograph) (*Syll.³ 810*; Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* 34):

[---]

[ἐπ’ ἵ]ερέως Ἀ[ρ]τεμεῦς, πρυτανίων τῶν σὺν
 Μενεκλεῖ τῷ Δαμαγόρᾳ, γραμματεύοντος
 βουλᾶς Νεικασιμάχου Διαφάνου καθ’ υ(ἱοθεσίαν δὲ) Ἀρχεδάμ[ου].

ἐπιστολὰ ἀποσταλεῖσα ὑπὸ Νέρωνος

(5) Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος· Πεταγειτνύου κζ'. [vacat]

[- - -] In the priesthood of Artemes; the prytaneis were those with Menekles son of Damagoras; Nikasimachos son of Diaphanes, but of Archedamos by adoption, was secretary of the council; a letter sent by Nero Claudius Caesar; Petageitnuos the 27th. [Nero's letter follows]

In AD 55 Nero wrote to the Rhodians to assure them of his affection and support when a report had come from Rome implying the opposite; for a discussion of the background, see above p. 11 with n. 35. The letter seems to have been docketed according to the year of eponymous priest. (Oliver's reading of the name as Διογένενς, based on autopsy, is inconsistent with Badoud's photograph). The 27th of Petageitnuos presumably reflects (as Oliver noted) the date of the letter's reception in Rhodes. The separation of the calendar date from the eponymous year is a little odd. Without clear parallels from other Rhodian dockets it is difficult to say whether this arrangement was accidental or deliberate.

32. Dossier of honours for Vibius Salutaris (AD 104); docketed at Ephesus. *I.Eph.* 1a, 27:

134 (doc. B) Σέξτ[ῳ Ἀττίῳ]

Σουβόυρανῷ τ[ὸ β', Μάρκῳ Ἀστινίῳ]

Μα[ρκέλλῳ ὑπάτοις, ... Ιαν. ...]·]

[ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Τιβ(ερίου) Κλ(αυδίου) Ἀντιπάτρου Ἰουλιανοῦ,]

[μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος - ἵσταμένου.]

[κτλ]

334 (doc. C) [ἐπὶ πρυτ]άνεως Τιβ(ερίου)

[Κλαυδίου Ἀντι]πάτρου Ἰουλιανοῦ,

[μηνὸς] Ποσειδεῶνος.

[κτλ]

370 (doc. D) ἐπ[ὶ] πρυτάνεως Τ[ιβ(ερίου) Κλ(αυδίου) Ἀντι]πάτ[ρου]

Ἰουλιανοῦ, μηνὸς [Ποσειδεῶνος.]

[κτλ]

447 (doc. G) Σέξτῳ Ἀττίῳ Σουβουρανῷ τὸ β', Μάρκῳ Ἀσινίῳ Μαρκέλλῳ ὑπάτοις πρὸ η' Καλανδῶν Μαρτίων ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Τιβ(ερίου) Κλαυδίου Ἀντιπάτρου Ἰουλιανοῦ μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος β' Σεβαστῆ.
[κτλ]

(doc. B) (In the year in which) [the consuls were] Suburanus for the [second] time and Marcellus; [January ...; (in the year in which) Ti. Claudius Antipater Iulianus (was) prytanis; month Poseideon; the -th day.]

[*The disposition of Vibius Salutaris follows*]

(doc. C) When the prytanis was Ti. [Claudius] Antipater Iulianus; [month] Poseideon.

[*The letter of Aquilius Proculus, proconsul, follows*]

(doc. D) In the (year) in which Ti. [Claudius] Antipater Iulianus was prytanis; month [Poseideon.]

[*The letter of Afranius Flavianus, leg. pro praetore, follows*]

(doc. G) When the consuls were Sex. Attius Suburanus for the second time and M. Asinius Marcellus; eight days before the Kalends of March; (in the year in which) Ti. Claudius Antipater Iulianus (was) prytanis; month Anthesterion; the 2nd (and) Augustan day.

[*The disposition of Vibius Salutaris follows*]

C. Vibius Salutaris was an equestrian whose gifts to Ephesus in AD 104 are recorded in a monumental inscription erected at the entrance of the city's theatre. Seven documents are included, including a decree of the city (doc. A, ll. 1-133), which began (as expected) with a prescript dated by eponymous prytanis. This was followed by a διάτοξις ("disposition") of Salutaris (doc. B) and the letters of two Roman officials (docs. C and D), each of which was preceded by a dating formula that had probably been its archival docket.

33. List of honours for Iason son of Nikostratos, with dockets (AD 143). *IGR* III, 704 (Heberdey, Kalinka 1896):

I.1 χρόνοι ψηφισμάτων τειμητικῶν καὶ ἐπι[στολ]ῆν γραφ(ε)ισῶν ἥγεμόσι καὶ ἀντιγραφῶν περὶ Ἰάσονος τοῦ Νεικοστράτου Λυκιάρχου

εἰσὶν καθὼς ὑπογέγραπται·

Κυανειτῶν.

5 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν Φλανίου Ἀττάλου, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμεισίου ια',
Εὐδήμου τοῦ Ἀρτοπάτου γραμματέως Καλεστρίφ Τείρωνι ἡγεμόνι
καὶ ἀντιγραφὴ Τείρωνος· μηνὸς Ἀ]ρτ[εμ]εισίου η' Μυλητῶν· Λώου λ'
Χωματειτῶν· Γορπιαί[ου -'] Μυρέων. ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν
Ἰουλίου
Τιτιανοῦ Φ[α]γ[ί]ου, μηνὸς Δείου σ' Κανδυβέων, ιε' Λιμυρέων· Ἀπελ-
λαίου λ'
10 Κορυδαλλέων, Φελλειτῶν· Ἀρτεμεισίου ε' [Τ]ρεβενδατῶν· ιη' Ποδαλιω-
τῶ[ν].
ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν Φλανίου Σώσου, μηνὸς Δύστρου -' Ἀντι-
φελλειτ[ῶν].
Ἀρτεμεισίου β' Γαγατῶν, Ὁλυνπηνῶν· γ' Ἀρυκανδέων· ιθ' Φασειλει-
τῶ[ν],
Ιουλίου Παίτου ἡγεμόνος ἐπιστολὴ περὶ λογιστείας Ἀρυκανδέων.
ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν Ούηρανίου Π[ρ]εισκιανοῦ, μηνὸς Δείου
κ' (?)
15 ἐπιστολὴ Μολέους τοῦ καὶ Ἀλκίμου Ἰουνίφ Παίτω· Ἀπελλαίου β' (?)
ἀντιγραφὴ Παίτου· Ἀρτεμεισίου γ' ἐκ(κ)λησίας ἀπόλογος· Δαισίου κα'
ἐπιστολὴ Μολέους τοῦ καὶ Ἀλκίμου Ἰουνίφ Παίτω· Ὑπερβερεταίου ιη'
ἀντιγραφὴ Παίτου. ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν Λικιννίου Στασιθέμι-
δος,
Ξανδικοῦ γ' Τα[νδά]σε[ος(?)] τοῦ Δημητρίου πρυτάνεως εἰσγραφαὶ τει-
20 μῶν. Ἀρτεμεισίου α' ἀπόλογος βουλῆς· γ' ψήφισμα Μαυσώλῳ
Ιάσονος, Δημητρίου β' τοῦ Μεγίστου γ' εἰσγραφαὶ τειμῶν Μαυσώλου τοῦ
[Ι]άσονος· Λώου γ'
IIA.1 [ψήφ]ισμα [Μυρέ]ων·
[κτλ]
IIB.24 ψήφ[φ]ισμα Παταρέων
[κτλ]
IIIA.4 [ψ]ήφισμ[α κοινοῦ]
[κτλ]
IVD.42 [letter of Antonius Pius]
[κτλ]

Dates of honorific decrees and letters written to governors and

their responses concerning Iason son of Nikostratos, the Lycia-rch, were written as follows;

Of Kyaneai.

(5) In the high priesthood of the Augusti of Flavius Attalus, month Artemisios, 11th (day), ^[i] (letter) of Eudemos son of Artopates, secretary, to Calestrius Tiro, governor, and ^[ii] Tiro's reply;

month Artemisios, 8th (day), ^[iii] (decree) of Mylai;

month Loos, 30th (day), ^[iv] (decree) of Choma;

month Gorpiaios, [nth] (day), ^[v] (decree) of Myra;

(8) In the high priesthood of the Augusti of Iulius Titianus Fanias, month Deios, 6th (day), ^[vi] (decree) of Kandyba;

15th (day), ^[vii] (decree) of Limyra;

(month) Apellaios, 30th (day), ^[viii-ix] (decrees of) Korydalla
(and of) Phellos;

(month) Artemisios 5th (day), ^[x] (decree of) Trebendai;

18th (day), ^[xi] (decree of) Podalia;

(11) In the high priesthood of the Augusti of Flavius Sosus, month Dystros, nth (day), (decree of) Antiphellos;

Artemisios, 2nd (day), ^[xii-xiii] (decrees) of Gagai (and of) Olympos;

3rd (day), ^[xiv] (decree) of Arykanda;

19th day, ^[xv] (decree) of Phaselis (and) ^[xvi] letter of Iulius Paetus, governor, about the *logistea* of Arykanda;

(14) In the high priesthood of the Augusti of Veranius Priscianus, month Deios, 20th(?) (day), ^[xvii] letter of Moles, alias Alkimos, to Iunius Paetus;

(month) Apellaios, 2nd (day), ^[xviii] answer of Paetus;

(month) Artemisios, 3rd (day), ^[xix] a summary [?ἀπόλογος]³⁹
of the assembly;

39. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions*, 296 translates ἀπόλογος here and at l. 20 as “defense [of Jason] by the assembly/council”, apparently taking it as a synonym for ἀπολογία. I can find no clear example of such a usage, and in any case, a defense made by the assembly would be in the form of a decree (ψήφισμα) and presumably described as such. At Kamiros (see text with n. 17 above), Philokrates was praised for having overseen the transcription of all the ἀπόλογοι, apparently ‘lists of contents’ (*vel sim.*), but that

(month) Daisios, 21st (day), ^[xx] letter of Moles, alias Alkimos,
to Iunius Paetus;

(month) Hyperberetaios, 18th (day), ^[xxi] answer of Paetus;

(18) In the high priesthood of the Augusti of Likinnios Stasithe-
mis, (month) Xandikos, 3rd (day), ^[xxii] lists [εἰσγραφαῖ] of hon-
ours (by) Tandasis son of Demetrios, prytanis;

(month) Artemisios, 1st (day), ^[xxiii] a summary [?ἀπόλογος:
see n. 39] of the council;

3rd (day), ^[xxiv] decree for Mausolos son of Iason, and
^[xxv] lists [εἰσγραφαῖ] of honours (by) Demetrios II,
grandson of Megistos III.

(month) Loos, 13th (day), [column II begins here], decree of
Myra

[*The decree of Myra is quoted in full*]

Decree of Patara

[*The decree of Patara is quoted in full*]

Decree of the League

[*The decree of the League follows, then the letter of Antoninus Pius in
column IV*]

This impressive inscription was carved into an outcrop of rock near an ancient roadway to the Lycian city of Kyaneai, in 125 lines over three panels of one (IA), two (IIA, IIB), and then three columns (IIIA, IIIB, IIIC-D). The second and third panels contain four quoted documents: two honorific decrees for Iason passed by the cities of Myra and Patara; a decree of the Lycian koinon, which had appealed to the emperor, and which introduces a letter of Pius to the Lycian koinon about Iason and his honours.

Preceding these four quoted documents is a list of twenty-five documents. It is arranged chronologically except for the first item, which seems to have been placed first because it was local. (One of the reviewers points out that chronological consistency could be restored by emending the numeral in line 7 to *(t)ην*). The listing for each document is presented as a date and title: that is, in docket form. Repetition is avoided for year, month, and day.

too seems unlikely here, where the most plausible interpretation seems ‘summary’ or ‘summarized account’ or ‘minutes’.

In the final lines of his letter to the Lycian koinon, Antoninus Pius mentions “evidence sent by you to us” (τεκμηρίοις τοῖς [ἐπεσταλμέ]νο[ις] | ὑφ’ ὑμῶν [π]ρὸ[ι]ς ἡμ[ᾶ]ς, IIID, ll. 54-55). It seems likely that this evidence was a dossier prepared by the koinon and that the list in column I was, in essence, its “table of contents”. When the time came to honour Iason with a monument, inscribing the entire dossier was deemed impractical and the decision was taken that all but the most important documents would be summarized in the list we find in column I.

34. Dossier of documents honouring Opramoas (AD 139-151); docketed at Rhodiapolis; Kokkinia 2000 (TAM 2, 905; IGR III, 739):

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| col. I A. 1 (Kokkinia, doc. 1) | [ἐπὶ ἀρχιερ]έος Κλαυδί- |
| | [ον Τη]λεμάχου |
| | [Αφό]ν [κτλ] |
| col. I E. 16 (Kokkinia, doc. 5) | ἐπὶ ἀ[ρχιερέος Κλαυ(δίου) Σα- |
| col. I F. 1 | [κέρ]δ[ωτος Πανέμου? - -] |
| | [κτλ] |
| col. V D. 14 (Kokkinia, doc. 19) | [ἐπ]ὶ ἀρχιερέο[ς - - -] |
| | [κτλ] |
| col. V F. 15 (Kokkinia, doc. 20) | ἐπὶ ἀρχ[ι]ερέος [Ιάσ]ωνος τοῦ Ἐμβ[ρ]όμου [- - -] |
| | [κτλ] |
| col. VII A. 1 (Kokkinia, doc. 25) | ἐπὶ [ἀρχιερέος Φ]λανή[ον Αττάλου] |
| | Αφό[ν - -] |
| | [κτλ] |

(doc. 1) [In the year in which Claudius Telemachos was high priest, (month of) Loos. *[The letter of the governor Pompeius Falco to Rhodiapolis follows]*]

(doc. 5) In the [year in which Claudius Sacer]d[os was high priest, (month of Panemos?)]. *[The letter of the governor Ti. Iulius Frugi to Rhodiapolis follows]*

(doc. 19) In the year [- - -] was high priest [- - -].

[The letter of the governor Sufenas Verus to the Lyciarch follows]

(doc. 20) In the high priesthood of Iason son of Embromos [- - -].

[*The letter of the governor Sufena Verus to the Lyciarch follows*]

(doc. 25) In the year in which Flavius [Attalus was high priest], (month of) Loos [- -].

[*The letter of the governor Domitius Seneca to the high priest of the Augusti and Lycian grammateus follows*]

The benefactions to the cities of Lycia made by the grandee Opramoas of Rhodiapolis were commemorated in seventy documents inscribed on the front and side walls of his mausoleum. Among them are decrees of the Lycian League and letters of provincial governors and the emperor Antoninus Pius. At the head of the five documents listed above are five clear dockets (docs. 1, 5, 19, 20, and 25: numbering and references correlate with Kokkinia's edition) and three others can be supplied with confidence (Kokkinia, docs. 2-4, 12). The docketed items are all letters of Roman officials. In the monument there are many league decrees that are introduced by dating formulae that could be their own prescripts but may also have fulfilled a docketing function in Rhodiapolis (Kokkinia, docs. 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 31, 53, 54, 58, 61, 63, 64, 69). There are also letters that append notes recording the date they were registered or transcribed (ἀναγέγραπται; Kokkinia, docs. 7-11, 14, 15, 17, 32, 35-45, 51); some letters (Kokkinia, docs. 19, 29, 30) also include a date when they were delivered ("given" [ἐδόθη, on which see Kokkinia 2000, 191 n. 316]) or "submitted" (ὑποτέτακται; Kokkinia, docs. 47-49, 51, 52).

Appendix: Some Roman Dockets

Some Roman dockets have also survived, which are useful comparanda for the material gathered above.

35. SC de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque (78 BC). Docketed and inscribed at Rome. Raggi 2001 (SEG 51, 1427; Sherk, RDGE 78; IGUR I, 1):

[A, ll. 1-16: Latin version of the SC]

ἐπὶ ὑπάτων Κοίντου Λυτατίου Κοίντου νίοῦ Κάτλου καὶ Μάρκου Αἰμ[ιλίου
Κοίντου νίοῦ]
Μάρκου νίωνοῦ Λεπίδου, στρατηγοῦ δὲ κατὰ πόλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων
Λευκίου Κορνηλίου [- - νίοῦ]

Σισέννα, μηνὸς Μαίου. [κτλ]

In the (year) in which Q. Lutatius Q.f. Catulus and M. Aemilius Q.f. M.n. Lepidus were consuls, and the praetor urbanus and perergrinus was L. Cornelius [-. f.] Sisenna, month of May.

[B, ll. 3ff.: *Senate decree*]

Following the First Mithridatic War, a senatus consultum was passed recognizing Greeks who had fought for the Romans, including Asclepiades of Clazomenae and two other Greek naval captains. A bronze copy of this decree was displayed in Rome both in Latin (A 1-11) and in a Greek translation (B 3ff.). A docket in Greek is included at the top of the Greek translation, comprised of a consular date, the name of the praetor, and its month. Whether a similar docket had appeared above the Latin version is unknowable. The inscription may have been commissioned privately by the honoured sea captains (Raggi 2001, 87-89, with earlier bibliography). The form of the docket differs from other, slightly later, Roman dockets (nos. 36 and 37), presumably because it pre-dates a reorganization of Rome's archives that took place later in this year (ILS 35-35a [CIL 1, 590-591; 6, 1313-1314]).

36. SC Cornelianum Antonianum of April 44 BC; docketed according to the archive of the quaestors in Rome. Josephus, *AJ* 14.219:

δόγμα συγκλήτου ἐκ τοῦ ταμείου ἀντιγεγραμμένον ἐκ τῶν δέλτων τῶν δημοσίων τῶν ταμευτικῶν, Κοίντῳ Ῥουτιλίῳ Κοίντῳ Κορνηλίῳ ταμίαις κατὰ πόλιν, δέλτῳ δευτέρᾳ κιρώματι πρώτῳ. [κτλ]

Decree of the senate; copied from the quaestorium from the quaestorian archives; Q. Rutilius and Q. Cornelius, urban quaestors; in the second tablet, first leaf. [*The SC follows*]

Among the documents that Josephus quotes as demonstrating Roman benevolence towards the Jews is a fragmentary version of a senatus consultum from 11 April 44 BC, by which the consuls M. Antonius and P. Dolabella confirmed decisions of Caesar that had not yet been formalized. See the discussions of Pucci Ben Zeev 1998, 121-136, with earlier bibliography. The docket references the quaestorian archives, supervised by the urban quaestors, who are named.

37. SC de Aphrodisiensibus (35 BC); displayed in Aphrodisias. *I.Aphrodisias and Rome 8*:

[ἐπὶ Γαῖου Καλουεισίου Γαῖου νίοῦ, Λευκίου Μαρκίου Λευκίου νίοῦ
ὑπάτων, ἐκ τῶν ἀνε[ν]εχθέντων δογμάτων συνκλήτῳ, δέλτῳ
[πρώτη?, κηρώμασι τετάρτῳ, π]έμπτῳ, ἕκτῳ, ἑβδόμῳ, ὅγδῳ, ἐνάτῳ, ταῖς δὲ
ταμιακαῖς δέλτοις ἐπὶ Μάρκου Μαρτί-
[--- ταμι]ῶν κατὰ πόλιν δέλτῳ πρώτῃ [κτλ.]

In the (year) in which C. Calvisius C.f. and L. Marcius L.f. were consuls,
from the decrees passed in the senate; [first tablet, fourth], fifth, sixth,
seventh, eighth, and ninth [pages]; when M. Marti[--- and --- were]
the urban quaestors, first tablet. [The SC follows]

This senatus consultum survives from Aphrodisias' famous "archive wall",
a monument constructed in the third century AD onto which were inscribed
documents demonstrating the city's privileges, including this document from
the 30s BC.

The Roman docket here is the most elaborate seen thus far, identifying
not only the location but its extent over multiple pages (δέλτοι, Latin *codices*
or *tabulae*) with waxed or whitewashed pages (κηρώματα, *cerae*). This is pre-
sumably the first tablet of the month of October (Reynolds, *I.Aphrodisias and Rome 8*).

Claude Eilers
McMaster University
eilersc@mcmaster.ca

Summary

In addition to the documents that they disseminate, inscriptions sometimes contain artefacts of archival processes or “dockets”. Some three dozen examples are collected in the Catalogue, almost all of which accompany documents that originate outside the city where they are displayed. The article discusses what dockets imply about civic archives and what motivated their inclusion.

Abbreviations-Bibliography

Badoud, N. 2015. *Le temps de Rhodes: une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions* (Vestigia 63). Munich.

Bickerman, E. 1933. "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. 1, 1-9)", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32.1, 233-254.

Bickerman, E. 2007. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, Vol. I (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 68.1). Leiden – New York.

Boegehold, A.L. 1995. "Echinos", in A.L. Boegehold et al. (eds.), *The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure, and Testimonia*. Princeton, 79-81; 222-226.

Boffo, L. 1995. "Ancora una volta sugli 'archivi' nel mondo greco: conservazione e 'pubblicazione' epigrafica", *Athenaeum* 83, 91-130.

Boffo, L. 2003. "Per una storia dell'archiviazione pubblica nel mondo greco", *Dike* 6, 5-85.

Boffo, L. 2005. "Per il lessico dell'archiviazione pubblica nel mondo greco: note preliminari", in F. Crevatin, G. Tedeschi (eds.), *Scrivere Leggere Interpretare: studi di antichità in onore di Sergio Daris*. Trieste, 112-115.

Boffo, L. 2012. "L'archiviazione dei decreti nelle poleis ellenistiche", in R. Bargnesi, R. Scuderi (eds.), *Il paesaggio e l'esperienza: Scritti di antichità offerti a Pierluigi Tozzi in occasione del suo 75º compleanno*. Pavia, 23-37.

Boffo, L. 2013. "La 'presenza' dei re negli archivi delle poleis ellenistiche", in M. Faraguna (ed.), *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies (Legal Documents in Ancient Societies IV)*. Trieste, 201-244.

Boffo, L. Faraguna, M. 2021. *Le poleis e i loro archivi: studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca* (Graeca Tergestina. Storia e Civiltà 6). Trieste.

Bosnakis, D., Hallof, K. 2005. "Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos II", *Chiron* 35, 219-272.

Buraselis, K. 2000. "Kos between Hellenism and Rome: Studies on the Political, Institutional, and Social History of Kos from ca. the Middle Second Century B.C. until Late Antiquity", *TAPhS* 90.4, 1-189.

Crowther, C.V. 1993. "Foreign Judges in Seleucid Cities (GIBM 421)", *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8, 40-77.

Crowther, C.V. 1995. "Iasos in the Second Century BC III: Foreign Judges from Priene", *BICS* 40, 91-138.

Crowther, C.V. 1999. "Aus der Arbeit der «Inscriptiones Graecae» IV: Koan Decrees for Foreign Judges", *Chiron* 29, 251-319.

Eich, A. 2009. "Diplomatische Genauigkeit oder inhaltliche Richtigkeit? Das Verhältnis von Original und Abschrift", in R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation: Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt* (Vestigia 61). Munich, 267-299.

Engelmann, H. 1973. "I.Magnesia 15.10", *ZPE* 10, 278.

Étienne, R. 1990. *Ténos II: Ténos et les Cyclades du milieu du IV^e siècle av. J.-C. au milieu du III^e siècle ap. J.-C.* (Bibliothèque de l'École française d'Athènes et de Rome 263bis). Paris.

Fabia, P. 1896. "Néron et les Rhodiens", *RPh* 20.3, 129-145.

Faraguna, M. 2000. "A proposito degli archivi nel mondo greco: terra e registrazioni fondiarie", *Chiron* 30, 65-115.

Ferry, J.-L. 2009. "La gravure de documents publics de la Rome républicaine et ses motivations", in R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation: Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt* (Vestigia 61). Munich, 59-74.

Finkielstejn, G. 2001. *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des épônymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ: premier bilan* (BAR International Series 990). Oxford.

Fischer, T. 1986. "Zum Laodike-Brief an Iasos (um 195 v.Chr.): Aktenvermerk in einer hellenistischen Inschrift?", in H. Kalcyk, B. Gullath, A. Graeber (eds.), *Studien zur Alten Geschichte: Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag am 4. August 1981* (Historica 2). Rome, 237-243.

Gallet, L. 1937. "Essai sur le senatus-consulte de Asclepiade sociisque", *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 16, 242-293, 387-425.

Ghinatti, F. 2004. *I decreti dalla Grecia a Creta*. Alessandria.

Griffin, M. 2000. *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*. New York.

Günther, W. 1977-78. "Textkritische Nachträge zur Seleukos-Stiftung in Didyma", *MDAI* (I) 27-28, 261-266.

Habicht, C. 2003. "Rhodian Amphora Stamps and Rhodian Eponyms", *REA* 105.2, 541-578.

Haensch, R. 2003. "Amtslokal und Staatlichkeit in den griechischen Poleis", *Hermes* 131.2, 172-195.

Heberdey, R., Kalinka, E. 1896. "Eine neue Ehrenliste aus Lykien", in S. Frankfurter (ed.), *Serta Harteliana*. Vienna, 1-7.

Hurlet, F., Müller, C. 2020. "L'Achaïe à l'époque républicaine (146-27 av. J.-C.): une province introuvable?", *Chiron* 50, 49-100.

Kienast, H.J., Hallof, K. 1999. "Ein Ehrenmonument für samische Scribonii aus dem Heraion", *Chiron* 29, 205-223.

Kokkinia, C. 2000. *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis: Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien* (Antiquitas, Reihe 3, 40). Bonn.

Lambrinoudakis, V., Wörrle, M. 1983. "Ein hellenistisches Reformgesetz über das Urkundenwesen von Paros", *Chiron* 13, 283-368.

Magnetto, A. 2016. "Interstate Arbitration and Foreign Judges", in E.M. Harris, M. Canevaro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*. Oxford – New York.

Mastrocinque, A. 1995. "Iaso e i Seleucidi", *Athenaeum* 83, 131-142.

Meadows, A. 1996. "Four Rhodian Decrees: Rhodes, Iasos and Philip V", *Chiron* 26, 251-266.

Nafissi, M. 2001. "L'iscrizione di Laodice (IvIasos 4): revisione del testo e nuove osservazioni", *PP* 56, 101-146.

Peter, H. 1901. *Der Brief in der römischen Litteratur: litteraturgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und Zusammenfassungen* (Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 20.3). Leipzig.

Petzl, G. 1991. "Zum Brief Seleukos' I", *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 1, 145-152.

Piejko, F. 1990. "To the Inscriptions of Labraunda", *OpAth* 18.9, 133-156.

Posner, E. 1972. *Archives in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass.

Pucci Ben Zeev, M. 1998. *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 74). Tübingen.

Raggi, A. 2001. "Senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque", *ZPE* 135, 73-116.

Raggi, A. 2006. *Seleuco di Rhosos: cittadinanza e privilegi nell'Oriente greco in età tardo-repubblicana* (Studi Ellenistici 18). Pisa.

Rhodes, P.J. 1985. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.

Rigsby, K.J. 2010. "Cos and the Milesian Didymeia", *ZPE* 175, 155-157.

Rigsby, K.J. 2019. "Notes on Anatolian Cities", *EpigAnat* 52, 107-115.

Robert, L. 1928. "Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique, xxvi: décret de Lébédos", *BCH* 52, 165–168.

Robert, L. 1935. "Inscriptions de Lesbos et de Samos", *BCH* 59, 471-488.

Robert, L. 1960. "Décret de Lébédos pour un juge de Samos", in L. Robert (ed.), *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* 11-12. Paris, 204-213.

Robert, L. 1973. "Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque", in E. von Caemmerer (ed.), *Xenion: Festschrift für Pan. I. Zepos*. Vol. I. Athens – Freiburg – Cologne, 765-782.

Sherk, R.K. 1990. "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities, II", *ZPE* 84, 231-295.

Sherk, R.K. 1992. "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities, IV", *ZPE* 93, 223-272.

Sickinger, J.P. 1994. "Inscriptions and Archives in Classical Athens", *Historia* 43.3, 286-296.

Sickinger, J.P. 1999. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill – London.

Turner, E.G. 1968. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Oxford – New York.

West, W.C. 1989. “The Public Archives in Fourth-Century Athens”, *GRBS* 30, 529-543.

Wilhelm, A. 1909. “Über die öffentliche Aufzeichnung von Urkunden”, in A. Wilhelm (ed.), *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*. Vienna, 229-299.

Willrich, H. 1924. “Von Athen über Pergamon nach Jerusalem”, *Hermes* 59, 246-248.