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In early April 2013 I had the opportunity to examine stone EM 10300 in the Athens Epigraphical Museum.1 The inscription, originally from Lamia in the southern periphery of Thessaly, was first published by Stephanos A. Koumanoudis in the Greek periodical Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν 24 October 1864 (No. 541) after a copy made in situ by A. Blastos.2 Two years later the stone had been brought to the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, and P. Eustratiadis made a revised publication of the text in the same periodical, 22 December 1866 (No. 617), based on an autopsy of the stone. Because Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν did not have wide circulation, Basilius Latischew (Vasilii Latyshev) re-published the inscription in the Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts No. 7, 1882, along with one other Lamian proxeny decree (now IG IX, 2 60), made on the basis of his own autopsy of the stone and provided in his publication an apparatus and minimal commentary on the dating of the inscription.3 The inscription was last edited in IG IX, 2 (1908) by Otto Kern from a squeeze. For the reason that no substantial commentary on this inscription currently exists, and because some relatively recently proposed restorations seem unlikely based on the examination of the actual stone, I present here a new edition of the text with a brief philological commentary.

Lamian Decree Granting Proxeny and Citizenship to Mêtrodôros son of Andromênês

EM 10300 146—ca. 130 BC

Architectural block of roughly hewn grey limestone from Lamia in Malis (Thessaly). Anathyrosis on all sides of the block and lack of other distinctive features (e.g. pedestal as a statue base) suggest the inscription originally was part of a much larger monument.

H. 0.380 w. 1.045 th. 0.530. Letters: h. 0.011–0.013; w. 0.010–0.015; sp. 0.185–0.187. Non-στοιχ. The best examples of letters have serifs, in clear Ionic script. See Fig. 1 and 2 for examples of lettering. The first line is damaged with large chips missing from portions of the first, second, and third lines. The remainder of the text is intact with only minor damage otherwise. Restored letters are enclosed in square brackets: [αβγ]. Letters unreadable on the stone but seen by previous editors are underlined: αβγ. Damaged letters of potentially uncertain reading are indicated with a subscript dot: αβγ. Letters omitted by the engraver are enclosed by angle brackets: ⟨αβγ⟩. Lost letters of a certain number are indicated by a number of dots in square brackets: [ . . . 5 . . ]. Lost letters of an uncertain number are indicated by hyphens enclosed in square brackets: [----].

Edd. Koumanoudis Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν 24 Οκτ. 1864 No. 541 (from Blastos’ autopsy) non vidi; Eustratiadis ibid. 22 Δεκ. 1866 No. 617 (autopsy) non vidi; Latischew Ath. Mitt. 7 (1882:363–366), No. 23 (autopsy); Kern IG IX, 2 69 (squeeze). Cf. Cauer No. 386a; SGDI No. 1447; Schwzyzer DGE 378; Kramolisch 1978; SEG 28:505.

Autopsy

1 I would like to gratefully thank the Director of the Epigraphical Museum, Mr. A. Themos, for permission to study the inscription. I would like to give thanks also to Robert Pitt and Graham Oliver for their helpful comments during the preparation of this edition and to Jürgen Hammerstaedt for many helpful suggestions improving my translation of the text.

2 For an overview of Lamia, cf. Stählin (1924:213–217). The original find-spot of the inscription at the site is unknown.

3 Latischew (1882:361–366). I have not been able to obtain access to these issues of Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν; however I have been able to incorporate the alternative readings of Koumanoudis and Eustratiadis as recorded in Latischew’s apparatus into my own.
Α γ α [Θ α ι τ υ χ α ι].

Strategoumelo[των Θεσ[α]λ[ικ]ον Τιμ[α]θεων του ... 4–6 ... ταχευόντων δε] εν Λαμία Φίλωνος του Ευθ[ου]λίδα, Χειρα του Νικοδήμου, Κλεομέν[ευς του ... μηνός]

4 Θωου δευτέραι, προστατεύοντος τας ἐκκλησίας των ταχας Φιλο[ν], Πορφυρίων του Ε[υθ]-

βουλίδα επικας ... ἐπει Μητρόδοχος Ανδρομένες Πελιννας ... [πνευτρος και ἀνεστραμμένος ἐν ταίς ἀμετάρτης πόλεις πάνω τῶν [τα] ἀναστραμμένοι καὶ [εἴ]δαιμον ἐποιεστο καθας ἐπέβαλλε ἄνδρι καλως καὶ ἀγαθος δια τα [ορ] μετεχειριζετο ἐγκαινια-

δέσμιος ὁφέλει τῶν πολιτάν τοὺς ἐντυνχάνοντας αὐτος ἀνευ μισθοῦ, σπουδας καὶ φιλοτιμεῖς ὑθενε ἐνλεῖπον. παρακληθε τοις ἐπει τὸ ἔργον ἐπεδέκετο τοις συνφο-

ροντι ταίς πόλεις, καὶ φαμένον Πορφυρίων δειν αὐτου ἀποδοθημεν χαρίτας, ἐδοξε ταίς πόλεις ἐπαι-

νέσας το Μητρόδοχον Ἀνδρομένες Πελιννας ἐτι τοις ἀναστροφάς καὶ ταίς κατα τὸ ἐπιτά-

δειμα φιλοτιμεῖς καὶ διδάσκαι αὐτος καὶ ἐγχόνοις αὐτοπο προξενιαν, πολιτείαν, ἰσο-

τελειαν, ἐνκτησιν γας καὶ οἰκίας καὶ ἀσφάλειαν καὶ ἀσυλιαν καὶ πολέμοι καὶ 

εἰράνας πάντα κατα τοις ἐπανατρισεις ιισα καὶ τοις ἄλλοις προξενιως καὶ εὐφρέτειας διδοται παρα τας]

12 πόλιος- ἐγγος τας προξενιας Σάτυρος Ῥώβα.

Rest. Latschew. 1 ἦν[θς]θαι Scarborough; Αγιαδαι τύχαι Latschew. 2 [Θε]σαλαν Τιμαθεων Eustatiadis; 2 [ταχευόντων δε] Kramolisch; 2 (end) του — ἀρχόντων δε] Kern. 3 Ευθουλίδα Koumanoudis; 3 (end) Kern; Κλεομέν[ευς του Νικα ---, μηνός] Latschew; Κλεομε [--- Νικα ...] Koumanoudis. 4 ἐκκλησίαςScarborough; ἐκκληςίας Latschew, Kern; Φιλον[ες] Koumanoudis; Φιλον [ες] Eustatiadis. 5 ἐπαργυρον Eustatiadis. 6 (end) καὶ [ἐπί]δαιμον Eustatiadis. 7 (end) ΔΙΑΤΕΟΥ μετέχειν τε τοι ιπτοδειματος Koumanoudis; δια τα του Eustatiadis. 15 ἄλλοις Kern; ἄλλοις Latschew.
Translation

With Good Fortune:
When Timasitheos [(son of) . . . ] was strategos of the Thessalians, [and the tagoi] in Lamia were Philon (son of) Euboulidas, Ages (son of) Nikodamos, Kleomenes (son of) [. . . ] on the second of [the month] Thymotho, presiding over the assembly of Tagoi was Philon, when Pyrrhas (son of) Euboulidas proposed a motion: Since Metrodoros (son of) Andromenes, a Pelinnaean, being a horse-doctor and having dwelled in our city (and) made his dwelling and residence (here) for a long time, as it was appropriate for a noble and good man, and (since) he aided those of the citizens who met him through the business which he practiced, without pay, leaving no zeal and generosity to be desired, and when he was asked to do the work he undertook it for the advantage of the city; and since Pyrrhas said that it was necessary that his goodwill be repaid to him, the city resolved: To praise Metrodoros (son of) Andromenes, the Pelinnaean, for his residence and for his generosity in regards to his practice, and that there be given to him and to his descendants proxenoi, citizenship, equality in taxation, the right of holding land and household, and security and inviolability, both in war and in peace, both by land and by sea, for all time, and the other privileges as are given from the city to the other proxenoi and benefactors. The guarantor of the proxeny is Satyros (son of) Rhubas.

Textual Commentary

1: Heading: Ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι is a common heading on Lamian decrees, cf. IG IX,2 60, 63–65, 67–68. The Γ on the stone is clearly legible, however a preceding alpha that was read on the stone by Latischew is no longer visible. Following the gamma I have further seen what looks like a deliberate diagonal stroke and a perpendicular connecting stroke that may be the remains of a broken crossbar. However any further remains of this letter have been lost due to flaking damage at this part of the stone. There is 0.05 spacing between the first gamma and the remains of the new letter traces that I have seen. Note the dialect of the inscription is Northwest Greek koina (cf. Buck 1955:178–179) and inherited *ά is retained throughout this inscription (Att.-Ion. Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι).

2–5: Prescript: 2 στραταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλῶν is known as an opening formula from other documents in the regions of Malis (IG IX,2 64–65, 67, 89) and Achaea Phthiotis (IG IX,2 107, 219); although Eustradis and Latischew saw traces of the sigmas and the lambda of Θεσσαλῶν, I was unable see them. Kramolisch (1978:65–66) dates the στραταγέος here Τμασίθεος to after 146 BC giving an upper limit to the dating of this inscription. A patronymic could be expected here in the text, cf. IG IX,2 65 [στραταγέοντος] τῶν Θεσσαλῶν Θεοδόρου [τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου Α]στραγγίου; IG IX,2 66 [στραταγέοντος Θ]εσσαλῶν Πρωτέα τοῦ Μονίου Μοστροπόλιτα; IG IX,2 89 [στρατα]σταταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλῶν Λέοντος [τοῦ Ἀ]ρσιάδου, ἐν δὲ Ναρθακίῳ[ίν], etc. In the same discussion Kramolisch’s (1978:65n32) proposed restoration of the text omits the restoration of a patronymic to Τμασίθεος, preferring the visible Τ following to be the start of a new clause τιςευνόντων δέ, on the basis of an estimation of ca. 12 characters possible in this section from the majuscule transcription of Kern in IG IX,2 69, and that elsewhere in Thessaly a στραταγέος Τμασίθεος is often named without a patronymic given. From my examination of the stone, I would roughly estimate that there is in fact room for ca. 16–20 letters possible in the damaged area (ca. 30 cm), leaving no objections to a restoration of a short patronymic (perhaps Kramolisch’s prosopographically conjectured Έρμιτα) along with the name of an office ἀρχόντων or ταξευόντων and the postpositive particle δέ. Strictly from the point of view of space on the stone, either ταξευόντων δέ or ἀρχόντων δέ would be equally possible, and there would be in principle no good reason to prefer one or the other. In early Lamian decrees from the fourth and third centuries (IG IX,2 60–63; SEG 16:373, 53:540) lists of archons are appended at the end. In Lamian decrees of the second century, by contrast, lists of archons are usually included in the prescript dating formula, cf. IG IX,2 64 ἐν δὲ Λαμίας ἀρχόντων (186/185 BC); IG IX,2 65 ἀρχόντων Νικόπολος (184/183 BC); IG IX,2 67 ἐν δὲ Λαμίας ἀρχόντων (186/185 BC). Against this evidence for a restoration ἀρχόντων, there is a single example of ταξευόντων is attested.
in IG IX,2 66b (ἐν δὲ Λαμίαι ταγευόντων) possibly dated to 125/124 BC (Kramolisch 1978:81), being much closer in approximate date to that of this inscription. In view of this more contemporary parallel, although inscriptions from ca. 50 years earlier favor ἀρχόντων for the titles of local magistrates, I have retained Latischew’s original restoration ταγευόντων in the text.

3 Εὐβουλίδα, Ἀγέα are contracted masculine ā-stems with genitive singular *-ᾱο > -ᾱ (cf. Méndez Dosuna 1985:92ff.). I have only seen the bottom horizontal and vertical strokes of the epsilon and the very beginnings of a vertical stroke of an upsilon. Koumanoudis printed a beta from Blastos’s transcription in situ, unseen by Eustratiadis and Latischew. It is possible that this part of the stone, which has a patch of flaking damage, may have incurred further damage on its edges during its transport from Lamia to Athens. I was unable to see the omicron of Νικοδάμου nor the kappa of Κλεομένεος seen by earlier editors. The patronymic Εὐβουλίδα is applied to two individuals in this text, Φίλων (this line), and Πυρρίας (l. 4, l. 10), perhaps brothers, cf. LGPN III.B. s.v. Εὐβουλίδας (10). Ἀγέας Νικοδάμου is not known from any other inscriptions from Thessaly, cf. LGPN III.B. s.v. Ἀγέας (9). Κλεομένεος is otherwise unknown (LGPN III.B s.v. Κλεομένης [19]). There is enough space in the damaged area to comfortably fit a patronymic and μηνός, beginning a new clause. We can be certain of the latter restoration from the month Θῦος immediately at the beginning of the next line.

4 Θῦος is the fifth in the sequence of Lamian months, cf. Samuel (1972:80). Another Πυρρίας Εὐβουλίδα is attested in IG IX,2 65 (Lamia, 184/183 BC) who may be the grandfather of Φίλων and this Πυρρίας, if the nomenclature follows the tradition of naming the first son after a grandfather. Cf. LGPN III.B s.v. Εὐβουλίδας (9) and (10). I was unable to read the final sigma in Φίλων[ν] read by Koumanoudis, Latischew, and Kern. ἐκκλησίας: The spelling ΕΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ with only a single kappa appears to be an error of the engraver. Cf. l. 15 ἀλλ’αυτὸς below.

5 Μητρόδωρος Ἀνδρομένεος Πελινναεύς is only known from this inscription, cf. LGPN III.B s.v. Μητρόδωρος (25). Πελινναεύς indicates his origins from Pelinna in the Hestiaeotis province of Thessaly. ὑπεύρχυον shows only a left vertical stroke of the pi, and the alpha is lost due to damage on the stone. Definite traces of all these letters were read by Eustratiadis, Latischew, and Kern.
6 Eustratiadis restored [ἐπι...] to ἐπιθομίων, the pi of which Latischew later saw. I, however, was unable to see the letters.

7 διὰ τε [ὁ]: The horizontal stroke of the delta is faint, but readable. The crossbar of the alpha is not visible. Koumanoudis correctly restored [ἐπίτα]δεύματος, of which Latischew saw all the letters, with the exception of the tau. I have only seen a clear pi and the alpha.

8 I have been unable to read the iota seen by Kern and Latischew for ωφέλεις, τῶν πολιτῶν. *φων > ἄν; cf. Méndez Dosuna (1985:92ff.). I have further been unable to see the final ΤΩI in οὐτόι as read by all other editors.

9 οὐθέν = οὐτι(ε) ἐν ‘and not one’; cf. οὐδέν < οὐδε + ἐν. I was unable to read the iota in εὑρί seen by all other editors.

10 ἀποδοθῆμεν: aorist passive infinitive (Att. ἀποδοθήγοι).

10–15: Resolution Formula: ἐδοξε ταῖς πόλεις κτλ. The following decisions are typical elements to a proxeny decree: to praise (l. 10–11 ἐπαινέσθη) the honorand for the services rendered, to give him and his descendants proxeny (l. 12 δοθήσθαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἐγγόνοις αὐτοῦ προξενίαν), and the typical privileges associated therewith: equality in taxation, the right of holding land and household, and security and inviolability (l. 12–13 ἵσταται καὶ ἀσφάλειαν καὶ ἀσυλίαν). The privileges are followed by the conditions under which they are granted (l. 13–14 καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰράνας καὶ κατὰ γήν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐν τὸν ἓπαντα χρόνον), and a rider clause covering any other privileges unmentioned or omitted (l. 14–16 καὶ τὰ λοιπά πάντα φιλάνθρωπα ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοίοις προξένοις καὶ ἐυεργετάς διδοῦται παρὰ ταῖς πόλεις). Regarding proxeny decrees more generally, cf. Knopfler (2001).

11 I have been unable to see the alpha in ἐπαινέσθη as read by all previous editors. Kern could only read ἀνοικτοφιῶ[ται] καὶ τὰ κατὰ τό. I confirm the earlier reading of Latischew that all letters are present on the stone.

12 Latischew read φιλοτιμία καὶ, while Kern saw φιλοτιμία[ται] καί. I have only seen φιλοτιμία[ται] καί.

13 ἐνκτήσιον: The quality of the vowel -η- demonstrates that the proxeny formula was borrowed here in toto from the Attic-Ionic koiné. Cf. IG IX.2 458.5–6 ἐν[κτασίν (Pelasgiotis, Krannon), SEG 23:343.4 ἐνκτασίν (Pelasgiotis, Krannon), SEG 43:310.4–5 ἐνκτασίν (Pelasgiotis, Skotoussa), and the discussion of Méndez Dosuna (1985:40ff.). Kern could only read ἄσυν[λίν καί]. I confirm the earlier reading of Latischew that all letters are present on the stone. I have been unable to read the final iota in καί at the very right edge of the stone seen by all previous editors.

14 Kern was unable to read the iota in εἰράνας as seen by earlier editors. I confirm that the letter is present on the stone.

15 ἀλλοίος: Contra Latischew (1882:364–365) who read ἈΛΛΟΙΣ, there is only ἈΛΟΙΣ visible on the stone with no space for an extra lambda. There is no evidence to suggest that there was a simplification of geminate liquids elsewhere in the inscription, cf. l. 7 ἐπέβαλλε, l. 10 Πυρρία. I have not been able to see the iota in προξένοις as read by all other editors. I can however confirm the full reading of εὐεργετάς made by Latischew, Eustratiadis, and Koumanoudis, as all letters are clearly legible on the stone where Kern had only seen εὐφ[λεία[ν] on the squeeze. Due to damage to the right edge and the unevenness at the end of the stone the reading of παρὰ ταῖς is quite difficult. I have clearly seen the right vertical stroke of the pi and the vertical of the rho, but the loop of the rho is faint. The final alpha of παρά is visible only through a diagonal stroke from the bottom left upwards. The ταις is clearly visible, but the stone has flaked along the right diagonal stroke of the alpha, and the sigma has been completely lost.

16 πόλος = Att. πόλεος. Σάτυρος Ῥόβα is given as a guarantor of the proxeny granted to the honorand. The appearance of the same individual in an inscription from the Treasury of Athens at Delphi as Σάτυρος Ῥόβα . . . Λαμεύς (FD II.214), which can be dated by the synchrony with the Athenian archon Δημόστρατος (III) of 130/129 BC who was archon in a Pythian year (Colin 1909–1913:74; Dinsmoor 1931:270–273), gives an approximate lower limit to the date of this inscription. Cf. LGPN III.B s.v. Σατύρος (54), Ῥόβας (1).
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