# Epaminondas of Acraephia 

James H. Oliver

Epaminondas of Acraephia was a benevolent rich man who under the Julio-Claudian emperors lived in a small city in northeast Boeotia. He happens to be known to us because large inscriptions of documents for or by him were preserved in the walls of the church of St George at Akraiphnion (see Plate 2 figure 1), formerly called Kardhitsa. Among the testimonials to Epaminondas is a letter of Caligula; in preparing a corpus of imperial letters the writer visited the site in March 1971 and found the inscription still there. The writer thought it prudent to check the reading of the two inscriptions, IG VII 2711 and 2712, which were still at the church.

## Inscription A, the Testimonials from Abroad

W. M. Leake, Travels in Northern Greece II (London 1835) 301, mentioned the long inscription serving as a jamb of a door on the north side. It is still there. The inscribed surface faces the passage, the left side faces the exterior. It is of local grey limestone: $\mathrm{h} ., 1.80 \mathrm{~m}$.; w., 0.46 m. ; th., 0.47 m . Height of letters, 0.01 m .
H. N. Ulrichs, Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland I (Bremen 1840) 249-53, no.26a; K. Keil, Sylloge Inscriptionum Boeoticarum (Leipzig 1847) 116-27, no.XXXI; M. Holleaux, "Inscription d'Acraephiae," BCH 12 (1888) 305-15, a much better reading after a cleaning; W. Dittenberger, IG VII (1892) 2711, proposing some excellent restorations; M. Holleaux, REA 1 (1899) 16-18, a note concerning only line 7 but even so vitiated by a false measurement of lacunae; [ILS 8792; E. M. Smallwood, Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero (Cambridge 1967) 361]. The documents are discussed somewhat by J. A. O. Larsen in Tenney Frank's Economic Survey IV (Baltimore 1938) 450f, U. Kahrstedt, SymbOslo 28 (1950) 70-75, and J. Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit (Vestigia 6, Munich 1965) 90 f.

The dossier consists of the following documents:
1, Epistle of the general ${ }^{1}$ of the (all Hellenic) League of the Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Euboeans and Phocians, perhaps Achilles, son of Diodotus, of Argos, to the archons of Acraephia, in lines 1-15; with

2, decree of the above mentioned League at their assembly, called synod of the Hellenes, in lines 15-20;

3, epistle of the emperor to the League of the Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians and Euboeans, in lines 21-42;

4, epistle of the acting secretary of the Achaean League to the Boeotian League and its secretary, in lines 43-50;

5, epistle of the Boeotian League and its secretary to the archons of Acraephia, in lines 51-55; with

6, decree of the naopoioi at the festival of the Pamboeotia, in lines 55-77;

7, epistle of the archons, council and demos of the Thebans to the archons, council and demos of the Acraephians, in lines 78-87; with

8, decree of the Thebans, in lines $87-124$;
9, note concerning decrees of other Boeotian cities, in lines 125-28.
Holleaux's revision cleared up many problems, but the lacunae were still of uncertain extent, and readings around the ends of lines and edges of lacunae could still be improved. The beginning of line 1 extends one letterspace into the margin and should probably be restored [' $O$ $\left.\tau \tau \rho \alpha \tau \eta \gamma o \mathrm{o} \subset \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} A_{\chi \alpha \iota} \omega \bar{\omega}\right]$. In the epistle of Caligula, line 29, the right form appears to be cvvєcт $\alpha \mu \epsilon \in v o v c$. The upper part of the inscription need not be printed here, but lines 78-128 read after the writer's revision somewhat as follows:


 $[\mu \nu \nu \omega ́] \nu \delta o v \tau \hat{\omega} \pi о \lambda \epsilon і ' \tau \eta \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \pi o ́ \mu[\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{v} \mu] \in \hat{i} \nu$




[^0]

 $[\nu \omega \nu] \delta o v \dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \kappa \alpha \lambda o ̀ c \kappa \alpha \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta[\dot{o} c \dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \tau o \hat{v}] \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \theta \nu o v c$



 [ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha c \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau o \hat{v} \chi \rho o ́ v o v ~ \dot{\alpha} \epsilon i ~ \tau]$ ]ô $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta o ́ \tau о с$






 $[\lambda \alpha \nu \theta] \rho \omega \pi i \alpha \kappa \propto \alpha \dot{v} \tau \epsilon \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau о с \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa о \iota \nu \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\varphi} \nu \Pi \alpha \nu$

 [ $\rho \alpha<\kappa \epsilon] \nu \eta ̀ \nu \chi \rho o ́ v o \nu \alpha i \tau \eta \subset \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o c \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \iota \pi \omega \hat{\omega} \epsilon \in \xi \hat{\eta}[\lambda]$



 $[\kappa \alpha \grave{\grave{\prime}} \phi \iota] \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i^{\prime} v_{\alpha c} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon \subset, \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \beta \alpha \rho \eta_{\eta} \tau о v \subset \kappa \alpha[i]$


 $[\delta \epsilon \delta o ́] \subset \theta \alpha \iota \pi о \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \nu{ }^{\prime} E \pi \alpha \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \omega \prime \nu \delta \alpha$



 $\left[\tau \alpha c \cdot{ }^{\circ} O\right]$ § $\hat{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \circ \subset \Theta_{\eta} \beta \alpha i \omega \nu{ }^{\prime} E \pi \alpha \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \omega \nu \delta \alpha \nu{ }^{\prime} E \pi \alpha \mu \epsilon \iota$ $[\nu \omega ́ v \delta o] v \pi \rho \epsilon \subset \beta \epsilon v^{\prime} \subset \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \in \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa о \iota$
 $[\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \Sigma \epsilon] \beta \alpha c \tau \grave{\nu} \nu K \alpha i c \alpha \rho \alpha$ Г $\epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \nu \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \subset$
 $[\gamma \rho \alpha \phi o] \nu \tau o \hat{v} \psi \eta \phi i ́ c \mu \alpha \tau о с \pi \rho o ̀ c ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ' $A \kappa \rho \eta \phi \iota \epsilon ́ \omega \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.


 [ $\epsilon$ Iv $\alpha l]$ vacat
Restorations: 78 Ulrichs. 79-81 Holleaux. $82\left[{ }_{\alpha} \nu\right] \tau^{\prime} \gamma \rho \alpha \phi o \nu$ Ulrichs; $\subset \eta \mu \eta \nu \alpha \prime \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$ $\tau \hat{\eta}]$ Dittenberger. 83 [cía Holleaux. 83-84 $\tau$ ó $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon^{\epsilon}[\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \alpha \iota \tau \hat{\eta}] \delta \iota \alpha \kappa o \mid[\mu \iota \delta] \hat{\eta}$

 $\pi о \iota \eta \subset[\alpha c \theta \alpha \iota \pi \rho o ̀ c]$ Holleaux. 86-88 Holleaux. 89 Oliver. 91 [cєv $\alpha \rho i c \tau \eta ~ \chi \rho \eta c-$
 Oliver, $\tau \epsilon$ Dittenberger, cetera Holleaux. 93 [ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \epsilon \alpha \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa ~ \tau o] \hat{v}$ Holleaux, [ $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha c \delta \iota \alpha ́ \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \tau 0 \hat{v} \chi \rho o ́ v o v$ Dittenberger, $\dot{\alpha} \in i$ Oliver. 94 [ $\chi$ рóvov



 Holleaux. 99-102 Ulrichs. 103 [ $\pi \rho \circ с$ ] $\kappa \alpha \lambda o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$ Oliver, [ $\pi о \lambda \lambda o i]$ Ulrichs. 10405 Holleaux. 106-09 Ulrichs. 110 [ $\kappa \alpha i \phi\rangle] \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \omega \pi i \alpha c$ Oliver, $[\phi \iota] \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \eta c$ Ulrichs. $111[\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho] \epsilon \epsilon \beta \epsilon i \alpha$ $115[\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau] \hat{\eta} c$ Holleaux; $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \nu[\epsilon \in] \gamma$ Oliver. $116 \epsilon^{\prime} \mid[\nu \tau i \mu]$ oıc Holleaux, ${ }^{\prime} \mid[\gamma \chi \omega \rho i ́]$ oıc Dittenberger, $\epsilon^{\prime}[\nu \mid$ oi̋k $]$ oıc Ulrichs. 117-18 Holleaux. 119 Ulrichs. 120-21

 [ $\alpha \boldsymbol{i} \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ Dittenberger. 127 [ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha i]$ Holleaux. 128 [ $\epsilon \hat{i} \nu \alpha \iota$ ] Oliver, [ $\hat{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \rho \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ] Dittenberger.

Line 82: The word $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{i}[\nu$, first read by Ulrichs and retained by the later editors, was a mere misreading of $c \eta \mu \eta \nu\left[\alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \iota\right.$.

Line 83: $\tau$ ó $\tau(\epsilon)$, not $\tau$ ó $\tau(\epsilon)$. The phrase means "we called upon Dorotheus son of Nicocles in respect to his being in charge of the delivery to you and his making the speech of transmittal from our city to yours."

Line 88: The letters $\mathrm{Y} \Pi$ which Holleaux reported at the end of the line would still show if they had ever existed.

Line 96: The new Augustus was the emperor Gaius, the year A.D. 37.

Lines 97-100: The Boeotians, because by themselves they could not afford the expense of the embassy, would have had to drop out of the Panachaean League, which they shared with the other Hellenes of Achaia.

Line 98: $\tau$ ò $\beta$ ó $\rho o c$. The same noun occurs in lines 62-63, and the verb in line 33. In Latin one used onus similarly (Aes Italicense, lines 17-18: Hesperia 24 [1955] 331). For the Athenian formula $\dot{v} \pi \circ \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \alpha \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho-$ $\gamma^{\prime} \alpha \nu$ see Hesperia 17 (1948) 21f and 28 (1959) 181.

Line 109: $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \pi \tau \beta \alpha \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \tau v c$. The word occurs in IG $\mathrm{II}^{2} 1043$ line 64, and in other inscriptions.

Line 111: The word $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \pi \rho \epsilon \subset \beta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$ occurs in Polybius 24.10.5, 26.3.14 and 28.15.11 and in the Menogenes inscription, Sardis VII 8 lines 35 and 53.

Lines 127-28: Dittenberger emended to read $\delta i \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{o}\langle\tau \grave{\partial} \nu\rangle \tau o ́ \pi o \nu$ $\mu \grave{\eta} \mid[\epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha \rho \kappa \epsilon i \nu]$, but the lacuna at the beginning of line 128 cannot be more than five letters.

## Inscription B, the Acraephian Decree in Honor of Epaminondas

Two fragments of a large block or orthostate of grey limestone were and still are built into the exterior of the south wall of the church of St George at Akraiphnion.

Height of letters 0.009 m .
The main piece (Plate 3 ), originally containing the uninscribed bottom, all or most of the last seventy-five lines and parts of the preceding eleven lines, was copied by W. M. Leake, who years later in Travels in Northern Greece II (London 1835) 296, complained: "The longest of the inscriptions has required a continued labour of six hours, the letters being small, and in some places much defaced; and the stone which is in the wall of the church on the outside, on a level with the earth, being so placed that the lines are perpendicular to the horizon, whence it it is impossible to obtain a distinct view of them without lying on the ground." Lolling does not seem to have found the stone, for Dittenberger says "periisse videtur." Yet the stone is still there minus the uppermost twenty-six lines recorded by Leake. The writer examined it in March 1971, reading each line kneeling, then standing. He spent much more than six hours upon it and so was able to read much more than Leake did in the last sixty lines. Fortunately Holleaux read a section in the part now lost and so improved the text of lines $22-28$. Leake did not record blank spaces, which usually served as punctuation, but he scrupulously noted the
indentation of lines 77 ff , where a slice missing from the left edge limited the engraver. Dittenberger misrepresented the situation by resetting Leake's diplomatic transcript with a straight left edge. The bottom and sides are preserved, probably the back too, though the stone is and was broken away above. The piece must have been about 1.34 m . high when Leake and Holleaux saw it, but the dimensions were in March 1971: h. 1.04 m.; w. $0.56 \mathrm{~m} . ;$ th. 0.34 m .

The smaller piece ( $\mathrm{P}_{\text {late }} 2$ figure 2 ), broken all around and containing parts of lines $1-30$ at or near the right edge, is likewise built into the south wall of the church. It was first copied by Lolling and first located in respect to the large piece by Dittenberger, who published it from Lolling's copy and showed the two pieces as probably contiguous fragments. Its thickness cannot be measured, but it is 0.38 m . high and 0.28 m . wide.

Editions and Commentary: W. M. Leake, Museum Criticum 2 (1826), inset to face page 581; A. Boeckh, CIG I (1828) 1625; K. Keil, Sylloge Inscriptionum Boeoticarum (Leipzig 1847) 137-47; W. Dittenberger, IG VII (1892) 2712; M. Holleaux as cited by L. Robert, BCH 59 (1935) 446 and 452 ( $=$ Opera minora selecta I [Amsterdam 1969] 287 and 293). [Ph. Lebas, Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie mineure II (Paris 1847) 588, Leake's transcript]. The inscription is discussed by J. A. O. Larsen, in Tenney Frank's Economic Survey IV (Baltimore 1938) 466 and 476, by U. Kahrstedt, Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit ( $=$ Diss. Bernenses, ser. I, 7, 1954) 83-85, and by L. Robert, ArchEph 1969, 34-39.

Translation: W. M. Leake, Travels in Northern Greece II (London 1835) 296-99.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [----------------------------------1] }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [------------------- } \alpha \rho \tau \omega \nu \nu \alpha \iota \circ \iota[----]
\end{aligned}
$$
































 $[\kappa] \alpha i \tau o ̀$
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\circ}$



27 ПАРЕПI $\triangle H M O Y T \Omega N$




 $\pi \rho \alpha \hat{\alpha}[\mu \alpha]$



 $\epsilon \epsilon_{\gamma}[\lambda \epsilon] \lambda o 九 \pi o ́$







 по́лєос

 $\dot{\eta} \mu i \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu{ }^{v}{ }^{v} \tau \dot{\alpha} \subset \tau \epsilon \pi \alpha \tau \rho \dot{o}$




 $\pi \quad$ о $\epsilon \iota$
 ov̀
 ทріст兀єє























 $[\dot{\alpha}] \gamma[\omega]$









 $\tau \circ \hat{v}$ 'A

95 METAYTA 97 TOT $\Omega \mathrm{N} 98$ โYNTE $\wedge$ OYMEN 102 EIKONE $\Sigma 105$ $\triangle$ IKAIOTA
Restorations and emendations: 4-7 Dittenberger. 9-10 Holleaux. $11 \gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon-$ $\theta \lambda i ́\left[o u c ~ H o l l e a u x ; ~ \delta \grave{~ O l i v e r . ~} 12\right.$ тôv $\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha c \tau o \hat{v}$ Holleaux; cetera Dittenberger.



21 Dittenberger． 22 ［ $c \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho \hat{\omega} c$ Dittenberger，$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda[\iota] \nu$ Holleaux． 23 Holleaux． $28 \delta o u ́\left[\lambda o u c ~ B o e c k h, \delta_{\iota}[\grave{\alpha}\right.$ Dittenberger． $29[\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta] \dot{\omega} \nu[\delta \dot{\epsilon}]$ Dittenberger；
 cetera Leake．36－37 Leake． 38 ［ $\alpha i]$ rov Leake，$[\zeta \eta]$ rov Keil；cetera Leake．40－42 Leake． $43 \epsilon \dot{v}[\gamma] \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ Boeckh，$\epsilon \dot{v}[c \theta] \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ Leake；$[\kappa] \alpha i$ Leake． $44[\tau \grave{\eta} \nu] \alpha 火 \delta \omega \rho[o] \nu$ $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ c \beta \epsilon v \subset \iota \nu$ Leake，$[\kappa \alpha i] \ddot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho[0] \nu \quad \pi \rho \epsilon \subset \beta \epsilon \dot{v} c(\epsilon) \iota \nu$ Boeckh，$[\epsilon i c] \tilde{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho[o] \nu$ Ditten－ berger，$[\kappa \alpha \tau] \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho[\epsilon \dot{\alpha}] \nu$ Oliver；$\theta \alpha v \mu[\alpha c \theta \epsilon] i c$ Dittenberger． 46 Leake．49－50 Leake． 51 ［ $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota]$ c $\kappa \alpha i$ i $\kappa[\hat{\omega}] \mu \alpha \iota$ et $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha \gamma}[\mu \alpha]$ Boeckh；cetera Leake． 52 关 $\tau \epsilon \iota[\nu o] \nu$
 $\kappa \alpha i]$ є́ $\alpha v \tau o ̀ \nu$ Boeckh． 55 Leake． $63 \dot{\epsilon}\langle\nu\rangle с \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau o c$ Keil． $69 \stackrel{้}{\epsilon}[\pi] \iota \tau \alpha$ Oliver；$\pi \rho o c-$ $\langle\epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon c\rangle \epsilon \nu$ Wilhelm，JOAI 10 （1907） 26 dubitanter．72－73 Leake． 75 Leake． 79 Leake． 88 Leake． 92 Leake． $95[\chi \alpha] \lambda \kappa \hat{\eta}$ Oliver；$\langle\tau \alpha\rangle \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ Boeckh；$[\hat{\alpha}] \gamma[\omega]$ Leake． 96 Leake． $97[\pi \rho o \epsilon] \delta \rho^{\prime} \alpha[\nu]$ Leake；$\tau o\langle v\rangle \tau \omega \nu$ Dittenberger． 98 Boeckh． 99 Leake． 102 Leake． 105 Oliver．

Many new readings by the writer merely confirm previous restora－ tions like Boeckh＇s splendid reconstruction of line 28 ，or alter spellings， but more important are：$\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha c \tau o \hat{v} \pi \alpha \alpha_{\lambda} \nu$ in 48 ，vi $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi \sigma \delta \epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ for

 （where Boeckh had caught the right meaning），oïvov｜$\dot{\eta} \mu i \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu$ in 65 for Leake＇s $\dot{\eta} \mu i[\nu \alpha \nu]$ which had made its way into $L S J,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon[\pi] \iota \tau \alpha$ in 69 ，
 ［ $\pi \epsilon$＇］$\mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ in 76，$\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon_{\kappa} \alpha$ for Leake＇s［ $\left.\epsilon \bar{\epsilon}\right] \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ in 80 ，$\dot{v} \pi \eta \nu \tau \eta<\alpha \nu$ for
 $\alpha u ̛ ̉ o v ̀ c ~ f o r ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o \hat{v}$ in 101，к $\alpha i \delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha \iota o ́ \tau \alpha}\langle\tau \alpha\rangle$ in 105．Lines 29，44，and 52 offer new solutions to old problems．

In the text as now revised dittography occurs in lines 66 and 99. Omissions occur in lines $27,63,69,95,97,98$ ，and 105 ，without counting the cases of iotacism where epsilon is dropped in the words $\theta$ eic（23），
 （51，69），к $\alpha \tau \alpha \subset \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon i ́ c(56), \delta \epsilon i ̂ \pi \nu \nu \nu(61,68,79), \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \iota c(69), \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon i ̂ c \theta \alpha \iota$ （89），єiс（37，97），то́入єıс（51）．

Line 21：The word eicríace may have run over to line 22，though Robert has Holleaux make $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda[\iota] \nu$ the first word．

Line 26：$\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \theta \notin \notin \alpha \tau o c$. See line 73．A．Wilhelm，JOAI 10 （1907）26， compares the Eretrian decree，$S I G^{3} 714, \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \theta v c i \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \iota{ }^{`} E \rho \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \eta \mu \sigma \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha c$ ．The phrase is $\delta_{\iota} \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho o \gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \alpha \sigma$ in an honorary decree at Panamara published by Deschamps and Cousin，BCH 15 （1891）

196-99, which has some interesting similarities with our own inscription.

Line 27: $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \pi \iota \delta \eta \mu o v ́\langle\nu\rangle \tau \omega \nu$. Examples of loss of $n u$ before a dental were, as Robert noted, collected by A. Wilhelm, JOAI 24 (1929) 189.

Line 31: Perhaps a reference to the $\pi \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \alpha \chi o c \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ of a pancratiast.
Lines 33-37: The dike held back the Copaic Lake from the wheat lands of the Acraephians. Pausanias 9.23 .5 does not mention it. See below on Inscription C.

Line 42: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \%$. The same verb occurs in Inscription C line 50, and in $S I G^{3} 800$ of A.D. 42.

Line 44: The restoration $[\kappa \alpha \tau] \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \rho[\epsilon \dot{\alpha}] \nu$ is imposed by the parallels in Inscription A lines 13, 64, and 76, even if $\langle\tau 0 \hat{v}\rangle$ must be supplied before it (section now lost). He financed the whole Boeotian contingent.

Line 49: $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi \sigma \delta \epsilon \xi \xi^{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$. The word turned up at or near Mylasa in a mutilated inscription of an honorary decree for a benefactor, published by E. Hula and E. Szanto, SBWien 132.2 (1895) 12, cited in $L S J$. Certain people were described as oi $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi o \delta \epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu[o \iota]$. But the inscription from Acraephia is the first to give a complete context.

Line 53: The hanging participles need not reflect the loss of a main verb. A good parallel for the first phrase will be found three generations earlier in $I G I^{2} 1043$ lines 65-66, vi $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \iota \mid[\theta \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o ́ v \tau] \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \iota \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda о \psi v \chi i \alpha \iota$.

Line 56: For the past history of the Ptoia see M. Feyel, Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne (PublFacLettStrasbourg 95 [1942]) ch. viI, and Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie (BEFAR 152 [1942]) 254-56; S. Lauffer, RE 23 (1959) 1547-53.

Line 60: The formula $\alpha$ º $\rho \chi о \nu \tau \epsilon c$ к $\alpha i$ cúv $\epsilon \delta \rho o \iota$ occurs already in $I G$ VII 4127, which M. Guarducci, RivFC 61, n.s. 11 (1933) 234-35, dates between 205 and 201 в.с.

Line 63: The participle occurs in Inscription C line 50, $\tau 0 \hat{v} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$


Lines 63-64: The word $\delta \iota \alpha$ © $\delta o \mu \alpha$, which occurs on inscriptions at Didyma, Cibyra and Beroea and on a papyrus, is explained by L . Robert, Hellenica 11-12 (1960) 470-74, as meaning "distribution either of cash or in kind."

Line 66: $\dot{\eta} \mu i \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu$. The same phrase, ö้ขov $\mid h \in \mu i \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$, occurs in the regulations for the cults of Asclepius and Apollo at Epidaurus in the late fifth century b.c. in $I G \mathrm{IV}^{2}(1) .40$ and 41 ( $=$ E. J. and L. Edelstein, Asclepius [Baltimore 1945] 561 and 562; F. Sokolowski, Lois sacrées des cités grecques [Paris 1969] 60). At Epidaurus Asclepius, doubtless also

Apollo, was to receive a medimnus of barley, a half medimnus of wheat and a hemiteia of wine. The Edelsteins translate hemiteia as "one twelfth medimnus" of wine, but the medimnus was not a liquid measure. Hiller von Gaertringen, $S I G^{3} 998$, and Sokolowski in his index treat the word as $\dot{\eta} \mu i c \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu$. Mabel Lang, "Numerical Notation on Greek Vases," Hesperia 25 (1956) 1-24, has nothing that suggests a feminine noun as a likely measure of wine to accompany at Epidaurus and Acraephia a basket of grain. Certainly a kotyle will not do, and we are thrown back on Hiller von Gaertringen's $\mu o i ̂ \rho \alpha$. The old phrase has continued in use and surely refers to a jug of half size.
 costumes. See S. Lauffer, RE 23 (1959) 1551.
Line 68: On $\gamma \lambda v \kappa \iota \_\mu o v ́ c, ~ ' s w e e t ~ w i n e ', ~ s e e ~ A . ~ W i l h e l m, ~ J O A I ~$ 10 (1907) 27.
Lines 70-71: This example of the entertainment of slaves does not seem to have been known to W. L. Westermann, The Slave Systems of Antiquity (Philadelphia 1955).

Line 76: $\dot{\rho} \dot{\prime} \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ (not $[\pi \epsilon] \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha)$. That these were missilia Ph. Fabia recognized in his good article in the Dictionnaire des Antiquités 3 (1904) 1934b, though he had a problem in the word $\pi \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, which was Leake's strangely unchallenged restoration. The whole word is clear. The missilia differ from congiaria and other liberalitates by their random character. The big spender throws them out to the populace. Feyel anticipated this reading and passed it on to L. Robert, who in ArchEph 1969, 34-39, published a rich commentary on lines 75-78.

Line 80: For dining rooms connected with sanctuaries see the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth, to be published by Nancy Bookidis.
Line 81: Diocletian's Edict contains prices of wine, vini veteris primi gustus 24 denarii an Italian pint, vini veteris sequentis gustus 16 denarii an Italian pint, vini rustici 8 denarii an Italian pint.
Line 83: $\pi \alpha \nu \delta \eta \mu \epsilon i \quad \dot{u} \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \subset \alpha \nu$ oi $\pi o \lambda \epsilon i \tau \alpha c$. The best parallel for the royal reception accorded to Epaminondas is the reception for Herodes Atticus recorded in IG $\mathrm{II}^{2} 3606$. For the later history of the hypantesis see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, 'The King's Advent and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina," ArtB 26 (1944) 204-31. The whole population dressed in white would have waited for Epaminondas outside the gate along the road down from the Ptoion and would have strewn wild flowers in his path as he arrived.


Figure 1. Chlrch of St George at Akraiphnion


Figure 2. Inscription B [IG VII 2712], small fragment


Inscription B [IG VII 2712], large fragment

Lines 85-86: The sacrifices to Zeus Megistos were sacrifices to the chief god of Acraephia, Zeus Soter, on the acropolis of Acraephia (L. Robert, BCH 59 [1935] 442 n.5).

Lines 89-90: $\delta \iota^{\prime} \hat{\alpha} \delta \grave{\eta} \mid \pi \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \tau \tau \alpha$. So also Inscriptions C line 65 and D line 46, and IG IV ${ }^{2} 81$.

Lines 98-99: Examples of the formula $\tau 0 \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ ovi $\tau \omega$ cvv $\tau \epsilon \lambda o v \mu \epsilon ́ v\langle\omega \nu\rangle$ will be found in $I G I I^{2}$ Pars Quarta p.64, but the usual Athenian version of the formula $i v \alpha \ldots \dot{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota c \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \chi \alpha{ }^{i} \rho \iota c \tau о c ~ \phi \alpha i \nu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ runs
 See, however, OGI 267 at Pergamum, ì $\nu \alpha \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho o ̀ c \hat{\eta} \iota \delta \delta \hat{\eta} \mu[o c] ~ \alpha ̈ \pi \alpha c \iota \nu$ $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho ı с \tau о с \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \nu$.

Line 99: $\zeta_{\eta \lambda} \lambda\{\eta \lambda\} \omega \tau \alpha i$. Compare IG II ${ }^{2} 1043$ line 60, $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha i$ ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \mu{ }^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \omega \nu \zeta \eta \lambda \omega \tau \alpha i ;$; and $I G I^{2} 1343$ line 41.
 the public corporations with the agonothetae. The latter are not involved in this expense. The difference between $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \iota^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon c$ and $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ need have been nothing more than a difference of material. At Teos a benefactor was to be honored with both a bronze $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha^{\prime} c$ and a marble ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ (CIG 3085). The apparent indecision disturbed Keil, but local conditions may have recommended giving the magistrates a free hand to choose the material which they could more conveniently or inexpensively order, perhaps after consultation with the benefactor. After all he probably paid for them himself.

Lines 105-06: Much the same ending on Inscription D.

## New Translation of Inscription B

-[line 21] times at which he entertained all the city, and again after sacrificing a bull to Hermes and Heracles and the Augusti at the festival of these gods an athletic contest, where he set shields as prizes for the victors, as first and only man in all history to have excogitated this honor. And he entertained the city at breakfast on the same day in the gymnasium after publishing a proclamation; he did not omit anyone not only of the local residents but even of the visiting strangers along with free children and the slaves of citizens because of his customary love of good repute.

When he undertook the chief magistracy he displayed greatness of soul. For he sacrificed a bull to the Augusti and on one day feasted
the city, accomplishing the so-called pa--- feat in the gymnasium, so that the surpassing and uninterrupted flow of his expenditures was a subject of wonder not only here among us but in the surrounding cities. The plastering of the very great dike which protects our land had been neglected in letting the contract; all by himself, facing the situation, he planned and accomplished the task of having the whole thing repaired and plastered, the repairs on twelve stades of its length costing more than six thousand denarii.

But now he extended the magnanimity of his inclination to the Boeotian League as well. In the synedrion of the Achaeans and Panhellenes at Argos a search was on for an embassy to the new Augustus; many of the first rank and dignity who had come together from the various cities were refusing to go and challenging others to take part; he subordinated all his own business and wholeheartedly undertook the embassy in behalf of the Boeotian League and to the nobility of his proud intention he added the magnanimity of a promise to pay for the embassy. Admired for all this and deemed worthy of approval, he received honors among the Panhellenes and recognition also in the epistle sent by them to our city.

When he had completed the embassy along with the other representatives of leagues and had brought back the emperor's reply, again he received honors along with his fellow-ambassadors, and the Pamboeotian synedrion, which had been overjoyed to accept the spontaneously offered favor and goodwill, voted him the suitable honors and sent a despatch to our city. And then also the rest of the cities and villages, they too doing something nice, hastened to honor him with decrees and citizenship and a placing of portraits.

Surpassing in his magnanimity and general excellence all those before him and even surpassing himself in respect to the love of honor and the pleasure of doing good, rating with his successive expenditures as uniquely patriotic and beneficent-For when he was appointed agonothete, after the contest of the Ptoia had been omitted for thirty years, he most eagerly took it upon himself in the hope of renewing creditably the ancient splendor of the contest, and he became all over again founder of the Great Ptoia and Caesarea. Immediately upon assuming the office he carried out the sacrifices and the oracles of the god. Feasting magistrates and councillors five times with magnificent annual banquets and supplying the city with a breakfast for a stretch of five years, he never once put off a sacrifice
or expenditure. In the sixth year at the beginning of the contest, he gave the town distribution for the coming festival, giving all the citizens and incolee and alien property holders a basket of grain and a half-jug of wine each. He carried out the great ancestral processions and the ancestral dance of the trailing costumes, and sacrificing a bull to the gods and Augusti he continuously offered gifts of meat, breakfasts, sweet wine and banquets. Then in groups from the twentieth to the thirtieth he invited to all the breakfasts also sons of the citizens and male slaves of age, while his wife Kotila entertained at breakfast the wives of the citizens and also maidens and female slaves of age. He did not leave out even the stall keepers and those who helped in arrangements for the festival. He entertained them at breakfast privately after a proclamation, which no one else had done, none of his predecessors, for he did not wish anyone to be without a share in the favors that came from him.

At the spectacles of the thymelic contest which took place he treated with a sweet wine collation in the theatre all the local spectators and those who had come from the other cities, and he tossed out great and valuable presents, so that his expenditures became the talk of even the surrounding cities.

Assuming the office all over again, with the carrying out of the games after the banquet for the whole demos he now gave distributions of ten denarii to be spent on each dining room, and a jar of old wine and six denarii for what they ate with their bread as the rest of the expenditure on each. After the consummation of all these festivities, when he came down from the sanctuary to the city the citizens en masse met him with a demonstration of full honor and gratitude. He did not forget his greatness of soul but in the city sacrificed a bull to Zeus the Greatest and at once invited those who had come together to the feast of thanksgiving.

Wherefore after such acts it is right that good men of such magnanimity and patriotism receive recognition in the form of honors and grants. For all these reasons the archons, councillors and demos decided to praise the aforesaid man Epaminondas for the intense goodwill he has had for his ancestral city and magnanimity toward the Boeotian League, for with the embassy he was helping also his ancestral city; secondly, to honor him with a gold crown and a bronze portrait, to good fortune; and thirdly, that those who shall afterwards be appointed agonothetae at the games to be carried out by them call
him on each occasion to a front seat like the other benefactors, so that with these things being so accomplished our city may appear grateful to its benefactors and many may become emulators of his good deeds when the previous good deeds for the city receive recognition; and fourthly, to set up, themselves, portraits in bronze or marble, one at the sanctuary of Apollo Ptous, the other in the city in the agora, and likewise gilded portraits with the following inscription, "The demos and council (honored) Epaminondas son of Epaminondas, for an excellent and most just performance as citizen and public official"; and fifthly, that there be an engraved copy of this decree at the sanctuary of Apollo Ptous and in the city in the agora.

## Inscription C, Contemporary Honors for other Benefactors

For their general similarity in the matter of benefactions to impoverished Acraephia and honors to benefactors, the Acraephian decrees for Empedon, Demetrius and Pamphilus, SEG XV 330, published by L. Robert, BCH 59 (1935) 438-52 (= Opera minora selecta I [Amsterdam 1969] 279-93), are the most interesting parallels for Inscription B; they were engraved together on a stele which dates from the reign of Claudius. Inscription $C$ was found near Akraiphnion and is reported to be now in the museum at Thebes.
The decrees honor men who, in a time of terrible difficulty when the land was lost, $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} \subset \chi \omega^{\prime} \rho \alpha c \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$, , aided the city financially. Robert aptly cites $S I G^{3} 800$, the decree of Lycosura which mentions the depression of a.d. 42 following a crop failure ( $\dot{\alpha} \phi o \rho i \alpha c c ~ \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \omega \hat{\nu}$ $\gamma \in \nu o \mu e ́ v \alpha c)$.

The loss of land, says Kahrstedt, ${ }^{2}$ was much more than a crop failure at Acraephia. He notes the absence of the name of Epaminondas, who was still alive in A.D. 67. The wealth of Epaminondas lay partly under water, and he thinks that the repair of the dike had come too late. "The Copaic basin, the eastern half of which was dry land in the Hellenistic Period, had formed the northeast bay in any case before Pausanias (9.24.1)." What happened once to Copae, he infers, now happened to Acraephia. The catastrophe did not touch the meadows of Apollo Ptous but swallowed the wheatlands of the citizens. Acraephia continued in existence but never recovered.

[^1]
## Inscription D, Nero and Epaminondas

In the year that Nero visited Greece, Epaminondas had for life the title "priest of the (divi) Augusti and of Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus." When Nero at the Isthmian Games on 28 November 67 proclaimed freedom and immunity for Greece, Epaminondas proposed an Acraephian decree in honor of Zeus Eleutherius Nero. The inscription containing Nero's edict and speech and the decree of Epaminondas was formerly built into the church of St George at Akraiphnion but is now in the museum at Thebes. It is completely preserved. H., 1.21 m. ; w., $0.34 \mathrm{~m} . ;$ th., 0.34 m . Height of letters, 0.011 m .
M. Holleaux, BCH 12 (1888) 510-28, and Discours prononcé par Néron à Corinthe en rendant aux grecs la liberté (Lyons 1889); W. Dittenberger, IG VII 2713 and SIG ${ }^{2}$ 376; H. Dessau, ILS 8794; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, SIG ${ }^{3}$ 814; [M. P. Charlesworth, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero (Cambridge 1939) Nero 2; Smallwood, op.cit. (p.221) 64].
American School of Classical Studies at Athens
April, 1971


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ A decree of the Achaean League during the Principate is known in two copies, Hesperia 10 (1941) 361-63 at Athens, and W. Dittenberger/K. Purgold, Die Inschriften von Olympia (Olympia V, Berlin 1896) 57. For the general see this decree and IG V (2) 517.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ U. Kahrstedt, Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit (Bern 1954) 90f.

