

Victors in the Prytaneion Decree (IG I² 77)

Edmond J. Morrissey

THE MUCH-STUDIED Athenian decree regulating access to the rare privilege of lifetime board in the Prytaneion, IG I² 77, contains two problematic sections dealing with the benefits afforded victors in the Panhellenic festivals, lines 11–19.¹ The following text, kindly provided by M. Jameson, includes a number of readings slightly different from those of previous editions. Several letters once considered certain are now dotted; the *iota* formerly read as the last preserved letter in line 16 must now be restored. Conversely, a dotted *nu* has now been read as the first preserved letter of line 15 whereas formerly it had been restored; and the second preserved letter in line 18 is now read as *iota* rather than *nu*. A number of relatively secure restorations have been incorporated, including several attractive suggestions for lines 15, 16 and 18 fairly recently proposed by W. E. Thompson.² The decree has been dated to the late 430's B.C.³

ΣΤΟΙΧΗ. 45

11	
	κα[ῖ ἠοπός]-
12	[οι ¹⁰ Ὀλυμπίασι] εἰ Πυθοῖ εἰ ἠιθμοῖ εἰ Νεμέ[αι . . . ⁴ .]
13	[. ¹³ εἶναι αὐτ]όρισι τὲν κίτεσιν ἐν πρυτανε[ῖο]-
14	[ι ¹⁸ π]ρὸς τῆι κίτεσει κατὰ τὰ [ἐν τ]ε[ῖ σ]-
15	[τελεῖ γεγραμμένα τῆι ἐ]ν τῶι πρυτανεῖοι. ἠο[π]όσο[ι δὲ ἠάρ]-
16	[ματι τελεῖοι εἰ ἠίπποι κ]έλετι νενι[κ]έκασι Ὀ[λ]υμπ[ί]ασι εἰ Π]-
17	[υθοῖ εἰ ἠιθμοῖ εἰ Νεμέαι εἰ] νικέσοσι τὸ λοιπό[ν], εἶναι [. . . ⁵ . .]
18	[. . . ⁵ . . κίτεσιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν τ]εῖ στελε[ῖ] γεγραμ[μ]ένα Ε[. . . ⁵ . .]
19	[. ²²]εἰ περὶ τὸ κτρατ[. ¹¹]

¹ R. Schoell, *Hermes* 6 (1872) 14–54; H. T. Wade-Gery, *BSA* 33 (1932/33) 123–27; M. Ostwald, *AJP* 72 (1951) 24–46; W. E. Thompson, *AJP* 92 (1971) 226–37.

² Thompson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 226.

³ The dating rests on letter-forms. W. E. Thompson, *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 13 (1975) 1–8, has recently adduced additional arguments in favor of the traditional date.

Ever since Schoell, the seventeen letter-spaces subsequent to Νεμέ[αι] in lines 12–13 have uniformly been restored with the phrase [τὸς γ|υμνικὸς ἀγῶνας], presumably on the ground that a reference to specific sorts of events at the festivals, corresponding to those in the second section, lines 15–16, was required to give the proper force and meaning to the clause. There are, however, four major shortcomings to this approach. First, Schoell's phrase can be restored only after the names of the festivals, whereas the events specified in lines 15–16 precede, as is logical, the list of festivals. Secondly, the phrase can be made to fit only in the accusative, but the framer of the decree employed the dative for the events in lines 15–16. Thirdly, it becomes extremely difficult to find a suitable restoration for the missing verb at the beginning of line 12 once Schoell's phrase has been accepted. Most editors adopted [νεμικέκασι] on the model of line 16, but this has the unfortunate effect of depriving future victors of board. Realizing that, Thompson cleverly proposed [ἄν νικέσσι] instead on the ground that this verb must be subjunctive rather than future in line 17. Yet this approach is not without its difficulties. The restoration of the three missing festivals in lines 16–17, long considered certain, becomes impossible if space must be found for [ἄν] before the verb. The subjunctive, unaccompanied by the perfect, seems moreover vague and inadequate in regard to the rights of past victors in line 12.

Finally, and most serious, Schoell's restoration has the effect of excluding from board all victors, past and future, in the various musical competitions. These events hardly fall under the gymnastic or hippic categories, yet there is no space in the decree for a third section in which board might have been granted to musicians. Discrimination against musical victors does not seem likely to have been practiced at Athens, especially in the period of this decree. Thucydides 3.104.4 states that musical contests were included in the Delia, reinstated by Athens in 426/5 B.C. Plutarch, *Per.* 13.8–12, attributes to Perikles the introduction of contests for musicians at the Panathenaia and also the building of the Odeion to house such activities. In this climate, Panhellenic victories in music ought to have been welcome. The exclusion of musicians from board would be especially odd if, as Wade-Gery suggested, Perikles was the proposer of our decree.⁴

What is needed in lines 12–13 is a substitute for Schoell's [τὸς

⁴ Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 123.

γυμνικὸς ἀγῶνας] that will provide board to *all* victors, past and future, in gymnastic *and* musical competition, and at the same time be harmonious with the style and contents of lines 15–18. The solution is in fact quite simple. The seventeen-letter phrase [ἐ] νικέεσι τὸ λοιπὸ[ν] which stands at the end of the list of festivals in line 17 should be restored in the same relative position in lines 12–13; the verb [γενικέεσσι] should be restored at the beginning of line 12. With these restorations, the clauses in both sections of the decree are identical. Board is guaranteed to all victors, past and future, in lines 11–15; the same grant is repeated specifically for the benefit of hippic victors in lines 15–19. Despite Thompson's arguments to the contrary, the verb νικέεσι must be future, so the problem presented by a particle in line 17 does not arise. The list of four festivals can thus be restored identically in both sections.

Although these restorations are all but unavoidable, they serve to make the separate section dealing with hippic victors seemingly redundant and unnecessary. Thompson is surely right to restore the privilege conferred in line 18 as *sitesis* and not, as earlier scholars conjectured, some other sort of honor.⁵ Other unrelated honors would not have been germane to this decree. Yet Thompson cannot be correct in thinking that hippic victors were being given board for the first time. This grant, like that in lines 11–15, is justified on the authority of an earlier decree which has already been inscribed and erected. The location is missing, but it may well have been the same document as that cited in line 15. Thompson's argument that line 18 should be restored without the article before [είτετιν], as would befit a new grant of the privilege, is thus unconvincing. In order to include the article, the phrase beginning with εἶναι in line 17 must be restored on the model of line 13; both clauses are therefore asyndetic.

A possible motive for the emphasis given to the rights of hippic victors may have been the existence of a dispute concerning their eligibility or suitability for the privilege of board under previous legislation. Lines 15–18 would then be in the nature of a ruling or clarification of the law rather than a wholly new statute. Echoes of discontent regarding equestrian victories occur in literature of the period. Thucydides 6.15.3 mentions extravagant spending on such competitions as a factor in Alkibiades' unpopularity. Plato, *Apol.* 36D,

⁵ Thompson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 227.

has Sokrates say that he has a fairer claim to *sitesis* than someone who gained it through hippic victories at the Olympia. By contrast, Isokrates 16.34 rates equestrian victories above those gained in gymnastics on the significant ground that a poor person, one low-born or from a small city, could not have succeeded in the former. Equestrian contests had two further peculiarities. First, the horse-owners who benefited from the victories, with rare exceptions, neither participated personally nor drove their own teams.⁶ Secondly, they were free to increase the odds of their success by entering several teams in the same race.⁷ Horse-breeding and racing were the special preserve of the landed aristocracy, who could often put victories to political advantage.⁸ Under these conditions, democratic opposition towards the granting of *sitesis* to hippic victors could well have become serious enough to warrant an explicit restatement of their rights in our decree.

Another matter for study is the proper restoration for the missing first half of line 14. The context seems to require a reference to “other honors” appertaining to *sitesis*. Of the various attempts to supply a suitable phrase, Thompson’s [καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δορυαῖς] seems best. Perhaps to avoid further redundancy, the proviso was not repeated in the otherwise parallel section concerning hippic victors. Whether the additional perquisites applied to all who received board, or merely to the victors, is unclear, but the former prospect seems more likely. The privilege most often awarded in connection with that of permanent board in later honorific decrees was *proedria* at all athletic festivals conducted by the city.⁹ In each instance, the formula is the same εἶναι . . . κρίτην . . . καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῖς τῆς πόλεως, κτλ. *Sitesis*, as the greater honor, is regularly bestowed before *proedria*, but *sitesis* seems not to have been given without *proedria* until Roman times.¹⁰ Precedence at festivals would have been an honor especially suitable for former victors.

⁶ IG V 123.

⁷ Thuc. 6.16 states that Alkibiades once entered *seven* teams at the Olympia and gained first, second and fourth place.

⁸ J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) xxv–xxvi, employs the practice of competitive *hippotrophia* as evidence for membership in the liturgical class; the Philaidai and Alkmeonidai gained considerable political advantage from their many hippic victories.

⁹ IG II^a 450b, 646, 657, 672, 682, 1223; S. Dow, *HSCP* 74 (1963) 82–86.

¹⁰ IG II^a 1990.

With the restorations just suggested, the portion of the decree concerned with victors would stand as follows:

- 11 κα[ὶ] ἠοπέ[οι]-
 12 [οἱ νενικέκασι Ὀλυμπίασι] ἔ Πυθοῖ ἔ ἠισθμοῖ ἔ Νεμέ[αι] ἔ νικ]-
 13 [έσοσι τὸ λοιπόν, ἔναι αὐτ]οῖσι τέν τίτεσιν ἐν πρυτανε[ίῳ]-
 14 [ι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δορεῖας π]ρὸς τῆι τίτεσει κατὰ τὰ [ἐν τ]ε[ί] σ]-
 15 [τελεῖ γεγραμμένα τῆι ἐ]γ τῶι πρυτανείῳ. ἠο[π]όσο[ι] δὲ ἠάρ]-
 16 [ματι τελείοι ἔ ἠίπποι κ]έλετι νενικ[κ]έκασι Ὀ[λ]υμπ[ί]ασι ἔ Π]-
 17 [υθοῖ ἔ ἠισθμοῖ ἔ Νεμέαι ἔ] νικέσοσι τὸ λοιπό[ν], ἔναι [αὐτοῖ]-
 18 [σι τέν τίτεσιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν τ]εῖ στελέ[ι] γεγραμ[μ]ένα Ε[...⁵...]
 19 [...²².....]ι περὶ τὸ στρατ[...¹¹.....]

RANDOLPH, MASSACHUSETTS

February, 1978