

(l. 35) is generally identified with the son of Skellias (Thuc. viii. 89, 92; Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 33; Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 2, 34); Pasiphon (l. 35) was killed shortly after this as *ἄρχων τοῦ ναυτικοῦ* (*Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 44, 48); Nikeratos (l. 36), the son of Nikias, was one of the victims of the Thirty (Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 39; Lys. xviii. 6, xix. 47).

The *διωβελία*, which appears here as a major object of expenditure, is not to be identified either with the *θεωρικόν* (cf. Sandys on Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 28. 3) or with the pay for juries or the Assembly (Beloch, *Rh. Mus.* xxxix (1884) 239 ff.; *GG* ii². 1. 398). The most probable theory is that which sees in it a measure of poor relief instituted by the state during the closing years of the Peloponnesian War, when the loss of Euboea and the Spartan occupation of Decelea brought widespread ruin to Athenian citizens (Wilamowitz, *Ar. u. Ath.* ii. 212-16); it was, Aristotle tells us (*Ἀθ. Πολ.* 28. 3), introduced by Cleophon, and was administered in 406 by Archedemos, another popular leader (Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 2). Beloch's objection (*GG*, loc. cit.) that such a system would involve an annual outlay of at least 240 T. is based on the assumption that every citizen could and did claim this dole, and this is probably untrue.

The following guide to the accounts of the treasurers for the rest of the war may be helpful. 409-8: *IG* i². 301; Wade-Gery, *Num. Chron.* 1930, 16-38, 333-4; Ferguson, *Treasurers* 16-37; Meritt, *AFD* 61-3; *SEG* x. 233. 408-7: lost. 407-6 (on the reverse of the stele before us): *IG* i². 304 B; Meritt, *AFD* 116-27; Tod, *GHI* 92; *SEG* x. 234; Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone*, 286-9; *BCH* lxxxviii (1964) 455-88 (with important new readings and suggesting, wrongly, we think, that it has parts of the accounts of 408-7 and 407-6), Meritt, *TAPA* xcv (1964) 204-12. 406-5: *IG* i². 305; *SEG* x. 235. 405-4: Meritt, *Hesp.* xi (1942) 275-8; Woodward, *ibid.* xxv (1956) 109-21. 404-3 (?): Woodward, *Hesp.* xxxii (1963) 144-55.

85 (86)

Phrynichus' Assassins honoured: 409 B.C.

Five joining fragments, and one placed by its text, of a marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, use of aspirate inconsistent. Ll. 3-47 stoichedon 36.

IG i². 110+.

I

[ἐπὶ Γλαυκί]ππο ἄ[ρ]χον[τ]ος.

[Λόβον ἐκ] Κεδὼν ἐγραμμάτενε.

[ἔδοχσεν τῇ] βολεὶ καὶ τοῖ δέμοι, ἡπποθοντι-

[ς ἐπρυτάνε]νε, Λόβον ἐγραμμάτενε, Φιλιστίδε-

5 [ς ἐπεστάτε,] Γλαύκιππος ἔρχε: Ἐρασινίδες εἶπ-

[ε· ἐπαινέσα]ι Θρασύβολου ὅς ὄντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθό-

[ν περὶ τὸν δέμ]ον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον καὶ πρόθυμον π-

[οιῆν ἡό τι δύνα]ται ἀγαθόν· καὶ ἀντὶ δὲ εὖ πεπο-

[ἴκευ τέν τε πόλιν] καὶ τὸν δέμ[ο]ν τὸν Ἀθηναίο-

10 [ν στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσὸν στέ]φάνοι, ποιῆσα-

[ι δὲ τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ χιλίων δρ]αχμῶν· ἦοι [δὲ ἡ]-

[ελλενοταμία] δόντον τὸ ἀργύριον. καὶ [ἀνείπ]-

[ἐν τὸν κέρυκα Διονυσίον ἐν τοῖ] ἀγῶνι ἦδὲ ἡέν-

[εκα αὐτὸν ἡο δῆμος ἐστεφάνουσ]ε: Διοκλῆς εἶπε·

II

15 [τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βολεῖ·] εἶναι δὲ Θρασύ-

[βολου Ἀθηναῖον, καὶ φυλῆς τε κ]αὶ φρατρίας ἡδ-

[ν ἂν βόλεται γράφσασθαι αὐτό]ν· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ἐ-

[φσεφισμένα τοῖ δέμοι κύρια ἔ]ναι Θρασυβόλο-

[ι· εἶναι δὲ αὐτοῖ εὐρίσκεσθαι π]αρά Ἀθηναῖον κ-

20 [αὶ ἄλλο ἡό τι ἂν δοκεῖ ἀγαθὸν π]ερὶ ἦδὲ εὐεργέ-

[τεκεν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον·] καὶ ἀναγραφά-

[το ἡο γραμματεὺς τὰ ἐφσεφισμ]ένα· ἡελέσθαι δ-

[ε ἐγ βολῆς πέντε ἄνδρας αὐτί]κα μάλα, ἡοίτινε-

[ς] δι[κ]άσοσι Θρασυβόλοι τὸ μέ[ρο]ς τὸ γιγνόμεν-

25 ον. τὸς [δὲ ἄλλος, ἡόσοι τότε εὖ ἐ]ποίησαν τὸν δῆ-

[μον τὸν Ἀθ]ε[ναῖον, ... 10.....]ιν καὶ Ἀγόρατο-

[ν καὶ Κόμονα [καὶ... 6...]ο[...]ο[...] καὶ Σίμον κα-

[ὶ Φιλίνον κα[ὶ... 8...]α, εὐεργέ[τα]ς [ἀ]ναγράψ-

[σαι ἐμ πόλε[ι ἐν στέλει λ]ιθίνει τὸν γραμ[μα]τέ-

30 [α τῆς βολῆς. [καὶ ἔγκτεσι]ν εἶναι αὐτοῖς ὁμπερ

[Ἀθηναίους, [καὶ γεπέδο]ν καὶ οἰκίας, καὶ οἰκεσ-

[ιν Ἀθῆνεσι, [καὶ ἐπιμέλ]εσθαι αὐτὸν τὴν βολὴν

[τὴν αἶε β[ο]λεύσαν κα]ὶ τὸς πρυτάνες, ἡόπος ἂ-

[ν μὲ ἀδ[ι]κῶνται. τὴν δὲ σ]τέλεν ἀπομισθοσάντο-

35 [ν ἡοι πολεταὶ ἐν τῇ βο]λῇ· τὸς δὲ ἡελλενοταμ-

[ίας δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον]. εἰάν δὲ δοκεῖ αὐτὸς καὶ

[ἄλλο εὐρίσκεσθαι, τὴν] βολὴν προβολεύσαν

III

- [ἐχσενεγκέν ἐς τὸν δέμ]ον; Εὐδικὸς εἶπε· τὰ μὲν
 [ἄλλα καθάπερ Διοκλῆς· περὶ] δὲ τῶν δοροδοκεσ-
 40 [άντων ἐπὶ τῷ φσεφίσματι], ὃ ἐφσεφ[ί]σθε Ἀπολλ-
 [οδόροι, τὲν βολὲν βολεῦσ]αι ἐν τῇ πρότει κῆδ-
 [ραι ἐν τῷ βουλευτερί]οι, καὶ κολάζεν, τῶν [δ]ορο-
 [δοκεσάντων καταφσ]εφίζομένεν καὶ ἐς δικασ-
 [τέριον παραδιδόσα]ν, καθότι ἂν δοκεῖ αὐτῇ[ι]· τ-
 45 [ὅς δὲ βουλευτὰς τὸς] παρόντας ἀποφαίνεν ἡ[α]ττ']
 [ἂν εἰδῶσιν, καὶ ἐάν] τίς τι ἄλλο εἰδῇ περὶ τ[ού-]
 [τον· ἐχσέναι δὲ καὶ] ιδιότει, ἐάν τις βόλετα[ι. υ]

vacat

The restorations are not all certain, and those adopted here often differ from those in *IG*. I. 9: βολέν is also possible. II. 12-13: καὶ [ἀνειπ]εῖν Διονυσίον τὸν ἐν ἄστει τῷ ἀγῶνι *IG*. I. 16: The normal fourth-century formula φυλῆς καὶ δέμο καὶ φρατρίας is two letters too long here and is not yet known in full in the fifth century. I. 23: [ἐ τὸν δέμον τρεῖς ἄνδρας Michel. I. 36: αὐτὸς = αὐτοὺς; ἐάν δὲ δοκεῖ αὐτὸς καὶ | [ἄλλο ἄχσιος ἀγαθὸ *IG*. I. 44: So Lipsius, *Attische Recht*, 184 n. 23; αὐτὸς ἐσάγε]ν *IG*. I. 45: παρόντας imperfect, 'those who were present when the decree was initiated'; τ[ὸς δὲ πέντε ἄνδρας] παρόντας Bannier (*B. Phil. Woch.* 1922, 835), *IG*. Valetton, *Hermes*, xliii (1908) 481 ff. has restorations of ll. 42, 45 which transfer the investigation to the Areopagus.

The assassination of Phrynichus upon his return from a mission to Sparta in the autumn of 411 heralded the fall of the Four Hundred. Thucydides states (viii. 92) that he was struck down in the Agora near the Council House by one of the περίπολοι, who made his escape; his accomplice, an Argive, when caught and tortured, refused to divulge the names of the conspirators but maintained that they were numerous. Lysias says (xiii. 71): Φρυνίχῳ . . . κοινῇ Θρασύβουλός τε ὁ Καλυδώνιος καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Μεγαρεὺς ἐπεβούλευσαν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐπετυχέτην αὐτῷ βαδίζοντι, ὁ μὲν Θρασύβουλός τῷ τύπτει τὸν Φρυνίχον καὶ καταβάλλει πατάσας, ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος οὐχ ᾔψατο, ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῳ κραυγὴ γίγνεται καὶ ὄχλοντο φεύγοντες. By Lycurgus, eighty years later (*Leocr.* 112), the deed is unequivocally assigned to both Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros.

Lysias in the first years of the fourth century (xiii. 70-2) quotes two decrees to refute the claim of Agoratos (I. 26) to have killed Phrynichus and been made a citizen for it. The first, he says, made Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros citizens, but not Agoratos. Agoratos and others had got themselves put on the stele as εὐεργέται by paying money to an orator. He cited a second decree to prove that this assertion was true. It is not easy to reconcile these statements with the

decree before us. This was passed in the eighth prytany (cf. No. 84, I. 27) of Glaukippos' archonship, i.e. in the spring of 409, already some nineteen months after the assassination, and falls into three parts: (I) a proposal, originating probably in the Council (I. 15), by Erasinides, almost certainly the general executed after the battle of Arginusae in 406 (Xen. *Hell.* i. vi. 29, vii. 2, 34; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F 42), praising Thrasyboulos for his loyalty to the δῆμος, and granting him a golden crown to be proclaimed at the Dionysia, now, we may calculate, imminent (Meritt, *Calendar* 98 n. 1; Dinsmoor, *Archons* 346 n. 6; Meritt, *AFD* 105 n. 3); (II) an amendment by Diokles, granting Thrasyboulos citizenship, the confirmation of privileges previously bestowed, a prospect of further benefits, and a share in some property or award; to seven or eight of his fellow conspirators, among them Agoratos, lesser honours and rights are awarded; (III) a second amendment by Eudikos orders an inquiry into the bribery alleged to have been used to secure a decree in favour of Apollodoros.

It does not seem that any part of our decree, except possibly ll. 25-30, corresponds with those quoted by Lysias. It is clear that some decree or decrees in favour of Thrasyboulos and Apollodoros have preceded ours. To save Lysias' credit, we must assume that the inquiry ordered in III rehabilitated Apollodoros' claims and resulted in his receiving the citizenship, and also that it cast some doubts on the claims of Agoratos and the minor conspirators. That the assumption is true at any rate as far as Apollodoros is concerned is perhaps supported by the fact (Lys. vii. 4) that Apollodoros received as a reward a plot of ground which had belonged to Peisander and retained it until shortly before the rule of the Thirty, as well as by his posthumous reputation attested by Lycurgus. It therefore seems unlikely that our decree represents the final state of the rewards for the assassination. As far as the true facts, as opposed to the official decision, are concerned, the variant story of Thucydides must be borne in mind.

The grant of ἐγκτησις (ll. 30-2), i.e. the right of a non-citizen to own real property in Attica, is among the earliest known (cf. No. 70). Fine (*Hesp.*, Suppl. ix. 204-5) argued from the circumstances of this affair that the privilege was originally necessarily linked with an actual grant of land as a reward for public services. The evidence certainly does not impose this view, which we think improbable. See J. and L. Robert, *REG* lxxv (1952) 141, and Pečírka, *Geras Thomson* (Prague, 1963), 193-201, who analyses the evidence about the origin of the privilege. See also Pečírka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, 18-21.