

THE DECREE CULTURES OF THE ANCIENT MEGARID*

In July 307,¹ the forces of Demetrius Poliorcetes laid siege to the ancient city of Megara, then garrisoned by the forces of his rival Cassander. The ancient literary sources for this event describe it in the language of liberty, *polis* autonomy and reciprocity: Diodorus described how, after the fall of the city, the Antigonids proclaimed a restoration of *autonomia* to the *demos* (Diodorus Siculus 20.46.3); Plutarch held that the expulsion of Cassander's garrison amounted to liberation (*Life of Demetrius* 9.5). According to Diodorus, Demetrius received worthy honours (*timôn axiologôn*) from those he had treated well at Megara.² This response suggests that there was, within that city, a group of citizens who were ready to react to his pledges of autonomy in an ostensibly positive way, probably in the hope of securing better treatment for their community.³ By passing decrees for Demetrius, the Megarian reaction was comparable to that of the Athenians, who bestowed extraordinary honours upon Demetrius by allowing him to live in the back chamber (*opisthodomos*) of the Parthenon (Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius* 13.3) and by setting up golden statues of Antigonos and Demetrius in a chariot near the statues of the tyrannicides (Diodorus Siculus 20.46.2). The passing and publication of decrees, I shall suggest in this paper, offers us insights into the political culture of ancient Greek city states and their reactions to different situations. The coming of Hellenistic monarchy, I shall

* Versions of this paper were presented at the Manchester Classics and Ancient History seminar in September 2007 and at the Lampeter Classics seminar in January 2008. I wish to thank both audiences for their useful comments. I would also like to thank Dr Paschalis Paschides for his help on aspects of Hellenistic chronology and prosopography and for showing me unpublished work. I am also grateful to the anonymous referee of *CQ* for comments on this paper, and to the journal's copy-editor.

Abbreviations used: *IPArk* = G. Thür and H. Taeuber, *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der Griechischen Poleis: Arkadien* (Vienna, 1994); *LSAG* = L.H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Revised edition with supplement by A. Johnston (Oxford, 1990); Sokolowski *LSCG* = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris, 1969); *LSCG* Suppl. = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*. Supplément (Paris, 1962); Lupu, *NGSL* = E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents* (Leiden, 2005); ML = R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the fifth century BC* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1988); *Nomima* = H. Van Effenterre and F. Ruzé, *Nomima: Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*. 2 volumes, (French School at Rome, 1994–5); RO = P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford, 2003); *SVA* = H. Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, vols 2–3 (Munich, 1969–75).

¹ Philochorus (*FGrH* 328F66) says that Demetrius captured Megara at the very start of Anaxicrates' archonship (307/6 B.C.) in Athens and then turned to Munychia. C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1997), 66 calculates that Munychia fell to Demetrius in August 307 after the conquest of Megara. Plutarch (*Demetr.* 8–10) suggests that the siege of Megara happened before Munychia fell; Diodorus Siculus 20.45–6, probably mistakenly, reverses the order of events.

² Diod. Sic. 20.46.3: although Megara was garrisoned, Demetrius took it by siege, returned autonomy to the people and received noteworthy honours from those whom he treated well (τιμῶν ἀξιολόγων ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ τῶν εὖ παθόντων).

³ Plutarch, however, suggests that Megara was spared owing to the intercession of the Athenians but that Demetrius carried away its slaves (Plut. *Demetr.* 9.5–6). Elsewhere, Plutarch (*Mor.* 5F) says that he enslaved the people and razed the city to the ground.

argue, led the Megarians to reconfigure long-established political and epigraphical habits.

This paper has four aims: first, it suggests that a study of the extant inscriptions of Megara emphasizes the ways in which public and private inscribing habits varied from one city to another in the Archaic and Classical period. Second, it suggests that the publication of decrees on stone appears to have offered a medium through which political separatism could be expressed. Third, as noted above, it proposes that in the early Hellenistic period, the Megarians came to use inscribed decrees in a way which was unprecedented in the history of their city and was more akin to, but not identical with, that of their Athenian neighbours. Fourth, and more broadly, it is the aim of this article also to emphasize the usefulness of the concept of 'decree culture' as a way of thinking about the political culture of the Hellenistic Greek world: in particular I shall suggest that the evidence for decrees presents insight into the reaction of one community to the onset of large external forces.

DECREE CULTURES AND THEIR RECEPTION

From the late sixth century B.C. onwards, Greek political and religious associations, both democratic and non-democratic,⁴ made legislation through the enactment of decrees. Decrees were often called *psêphismata* (literally 'things balloted'), but were sometimes referred to by other terms such as *rhêtraî* ('things spoken'), *dogmata* ('things resolved') or *gnômai* ('proposals').⁵ They concerned a broad area of administration and policy, ranging from the cleanliness of the streets (*IG* II² 380) to alliances, treaties and declarations of war;⁶ in particular, they appear to have been a tool central to any Greek community's organization of its citizens' performance of duties and its efforts to encourage external benefactions.⁷ They concerned also aspects of procedure, sometimes defining the obligations of magistrates and organizing the administration of justice.⁸ They were sometimes, but not always, inscribed, usually at the expense of the organization decreeing them,⁹ and set up in mostly public locations.

⁴ Delphi is an example of an oligarchic *polis* that published a large number of decrees: see P.J. Rhodes with D.M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1997), 126–40. Decrees from oligarchic Athens: see G. Oliver 'Oligarchy at Athens after the Lamian war: epigraphic evidence for the *Boule* and the *Ekklesia*', in O. Palagia and S. Tracy (edd.), *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 BC. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001* (Oxford, 2003), 40–51.

⁵ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 557–60. *Dogma* is never used of Athenian decrees, but is used of enactments of the Delphic Amphictyony (Aeschin. 3.116, 117), of the *synedrion* of the second Athenian confederacy (Aeschin. 2.60, 3.69. 70), and of the Peloponnesian League: see G.E.M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1972), 106–7. Decrees of the city of Delphi could be known as *tethmoi* (Rhodes with Lewis [n. 4], 134). A decision of the Megarians set up at Epidaurus in the third century refers to an *ainos* of the Achaeans (*IG* IV 926.4, translated by Buck as a 'decree, but distinct from a psaphisma': see C. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* [Chicago, 1955], 297).

⁶ See *SVA*, *passim*.

⁷ Decrees organized military conscription and financial levy (Dem. 24.92), and their navy (Dem. 50.6–7). On decrees as the starting point of obligations, see P.P. Liddel, *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 2007), 121–3. For an overview of the subjects covered in Athenian decrees, see M.H. Hansen, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 1987), 108–18.

⁸ Decrees on the administration of justice: see Hansen (n. 7), 110–13. Decrees, like laws, therefore concerned both procedure and substance: on the latter distinction see C. Carey, 'The shape of Athenian laws', *CQ* 47 (1998), 93–109.

⁹ On private participation in costs of sculptured decrees, see C. Lawton, *Attic Document Reliefs* (Oxford, 1995), 23.

The literary and material evidence for decrees has given rise to some of the most irreconcilable problems in the historiography of ancient Greece. But, whereas the scholarship of Greek law, the other chief form of legislation in the Greek world,¹⁰ has engaged with anthropology, rhetorical theory and cultural history,¹¹ the scholarship of decrees has continued to engage with more traditional dilemmas: the decrees of Themistocles,¹² Philocrates,¹³ the peace of Callias,¹⁴ the financial decrees of Callias,¹⁵ and the Megarian decrees¹⁶ have remained the mainstay of disputes about chronology, authenticity and causation, in many ways the nuts and bolts of traditional historiography.

Broadly, in the social sciences, it has been recognized that institutions have a dialectical relationship with culture, both structuring and being structured by cultural life.¹⁷ At the same time, it has emerged that there is more to the political history of ancient Greece than culturally objective accounts of narrative, institutions and ideologies.¹⁸ Indeed, Greek political historiography over the last few years has been reformulated as the historiography of ancient Greek political culture. The scholarship of Greek law and laws has developed into a branch of that new political historiography. Of course, much of the interesting scholarship on Greek law has focussed not only on the content of individual laws or legislative systems, but also on their deployment and interpretation. If the scholarship of the decree is also to expand into the realm of cultural historiography, one obvious starting point is the reception of decrees in literary texts. The Attic orators of the fourth century B.C. deployed decrees either as a way, in Davies's words, of 'chartering public decisions or of legitimating power',¹⁹ or in order to accrue or detract political capital from individual proposers.²⁰ But as will become clear, such a model would be absolutely inappropriate for those communities (like that of Megara) which do not mention proposers in the inscribed

¹⁰ In the fourth century there was a clear difference, in terms both of the nature of their procedure and substance, between laws and decrees of the Athenians: see M. Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia* (Copenhagen, 1983), 161–77, 179–206. The evidence for a distinction in terms of procedure outside Athens is more scanty: see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 498–9. However, regardless of procedure, it is clear that most Greek communities found it necessary to make enactments which equated with the substance of Athenian decrees.

¹¹ For a summary of recent work on ancient Greek law, see M. Golden, 'Epilogue: some trends in recent work on Athenian law and society', in V. Hunter and J. Edmondson (edd.), *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens* (Oxford, 2000), 175–85.

¹² N. Hammond, 'The narrative of Herodotus VII and the decree of Themistocles at Troezen', *JHS* 102 (1982), 75–93. However, there have been attempts to see this as the part of a third- or fourth-century attempt to reinvent history: see N. Robertson, 'The decree of Themistocles in its contemporary setting', *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 1–44.

¹³ See most recently, A. Efstathiou, 'The "Peace of Philocrates": the assemblies of 18th and 19th Elaphebolion 346 BC. Studying history through rhetoric', *Historia* 53 (2004), 385–407.

¹⁴ E. Badian, 'The Peace of Callias', *JHS* 107 (1987), 1–39.

¹⁵ See L.J. Samons II, *The Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finances. Historia Einzelschriften* 132 (Stuttgart, 2000), 113–33 and also L. J. Samons II, 'The "Kallias decrees" (*IG* I³ 52) and the inventories of Athena's treasure in the Parthenon', *CQ* 46 (1996), 91–102.

¹⁶ G. Cawkwell, *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War* (Oxford, 1997), 111–14.

¹⁷ See the ideas brought together in N. Demertzis, *Cultural Theory and Political Culture. New Directions and Proposals* (Lund, 1985), 160.

¹⁸ For this observation see E. Dench, *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* (Oxford, 2005), 364.

¹⁹ J.K. Davies, 'Greek archives: from record to monument', in M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-keeping in the Ancient World* (Oxford, 2003), 323–43, at 339.

²⁰ Liddel (n. 7), 242–3.

version of their decrees.²¹ Moreover, in order to think about the degree to which the decree culture of ancient Greece is *polis*-specific or, on the other hand, subject to bigger forces which transcend the *polis*, we have to move beyond the Athenian evidence, which in turn requires close study of both the epigraphical and literary manifestation of decrees.²² Surveying the epigraphical evidence with the intention of devising theories about publication habits is a risky business: it is an exercise which ultimately relies on the assumption that the extant range of evidence bears some relation to the epigraphical productivity of any given community. There are potential flaws in this approach: some communities may have inscribed more regularly on perishable materials or objects which were more likely to be plundered; the publishing locations of some communities have been more productively excavated than those of others. It follows, then, that new discoveries may radically change the picture that we create: the discovery, in 1996 and 1997, in the sanctuary of Athena and Zeus Soter in the Arcadian city of Phigaleia, of 11 proxeny decrees, appears to make her look like a prolific producer (*SEG* 51.512, 46.466).

There has been a recent spate of scholarly treatments of specific kinds of decree, such as the collections of documents relating to *syngeneia* or *epidosis*. But such studies betray the fragmentation of the study of the decree, and the failure to consider its broader significance as a form of political transaction or socio-cultural expression which, in different forms, existed right across the Greek world.²³ The only recent substantial investigation of the decree phenomenon is that of Rhodes with Lewis's *Decrees of the Greek States*, a book which contributes greatly to the understanding of decree-making institutions and formulae across the Greek world and has done a great deal to unlock the concept of decree culture. Nevertheless, historians have been too inclined to devise monolithic explanations of legislative habits, arguing that the publication of decrees is a sign of a political vitality,²⁴ makes manifest a democratic enthusiasm for accountability,²⁵ or suggests the diffusion of Athenian practices.²⁶

Decrees can on one level be read as official enactments of the community that published them. As transactions of the *polis* they say a great deal about mechanics of the institutions of the city. But given the way that the councils and assemblies of ancient Greek city states worked, decrees were proposed by individuals or by groups of individuals. This means that their proposal and enactment, their content, their publication and their deployment all say something about civic behaviour and the sociology of a citizen body and its attitudes towards specific groups inside and outside that organization. However, the fact is that whatever legislative tendencies may have been expressed or formulated in course of enactment, and whatever ideas may have inspired the proposal of decrees, our view is often cloaked by the formulaic tendency

²¹ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 492.

²² The evidence for many non-Attic communities is often largely epigraphical. However, there is a large amount of literary evidence for the decrees of the Aetolian and Achaean confederacies: see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 100–6, 151–7.

²³ *Syngeneia*: see O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires dans les cités grecques* (Geneva, 1995); *epidosis*: see L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques* (Québec, 1992). One joined-up study of the culture of the decree is Ma's article on the way in which decrees embody the nature of peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic period: J. Ma, 'Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic age', *Past and Present* 180 (2003), 9–39.

²⁴ G. Shipley, 'Between Macedonia and Rome: political landscapes and social change in southern Greece in the early Hellenistic period' *ABSA* 100 (2005), 315–30.

²⁵ C. Hedrick, 'Democracy and the Athenian epigraphical habit', *Hesperia* 68 (1999), 387–439.

²⁶ D. Lewis, 'Democratic institutions and their diffusion', in P.J. Rhodes (ed.), *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Oxford, 1997), 51–9.

of documentary publication in the Greek world.²⁷ The deployment and development even of formulae does offer insight into the legislative or political culture of a given organization, even if, in literary terms, the texts appear nugatory. In addition to the text, quantitative analysis of published decrees offers potential, and it is important also to consider the physical form that those publications take, and their relationship to the wider epigraphical habit and landscape of the publishing community.

The focus in this paper is on the decree culture of one medium-sized Greek city, Megara, the chief city of the Megarid. I shall proceed by exploring first the wider epigraphical habit of the city in its Peloponnesian context, second the history and development of the publication of decrees in that city, third the physical manifestation of those enactments, and I shall close by returning to geo-political contexts for the development of what we might tentatively call the 'decree culture' of Megara.

THE EPIGRAPHIC CULTURE OF MEGARA

Modern knowledge of Megarian epigraphical publication is affected by the location of the modern city, the old quarters of which are spread over the two ancient *akropoleis* and the agora. Despite a number of excavations, the only substantial remains now exposed are at the fountain of Theagenes. Rescue excavations and chance finds at the agora and a number of shrines have however made possible some reasonably detailed reconstructions of the layout of the ancient city.²⁸

A general survey of the provenance of Greek inscriptions bearing local scripts from the fifth century B.C. and earlier suggests that the Megarians produced inscriptions on the scale of a town like Sicyon but not on the scale of Athens or Corinth: they possessed an active but not prolific epigraphical habit.²⁹ Jeffery's catalogue of 15 inscriptions written in the Megarian script includes graffiti, dedications, grave markers, *horoi*, and an artist's signature.³⁰ But of these, four derive from outside Megara;³¹ of the three inscriptions added by Johnston to Jeffery's catalogue, two derive from outside Megara.³² This means that of the 19 inscriptions bearing

²⁷ But formulaic tendencies of inscriptions should not act as a deterrent to thinking about their political implications: on the possible relation between Delian inventories and Delian politics, see R. Hamilton, *Treasure Map. A Guide to the Delian Inventories* (Ann Arbor, 2000), 2.

²⁸ On the archaeology of Megara, see J. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Attika* (Tübingen, 1988), 258–87, with more bibliography at 260–1; H. Goette, *Athens, Attica and the Megarid. An Archaeological Guide* (London, 2001), 307–21. On the topography of the city, see in particular: A. Muller, 'De Nisée à Mégare. Les siècles de formation de la métropole mégarienne', *MEFRA* 95.2 (1983), 618–28 and, the last of a series of surveys, A. Muller, 'Megarika XII–XIV', *BCH* 198 (1984), 249–66.

²⁹ Such a view, based upon data from the work of Anne Jeffery, can be seen on the Poinikastas website at <<http://poinikastas.csad.ox.ac.uk/mapGallery/overview.shtml>>.

³⁰ L.H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Revised edition with supplement by A. Johnston (Oxford, 1990), 137–8. Note that in contrast to Corinth and Boeotia, Megara does not appear to have produced large numbers of graffiti or dipinti: see R. Wachter, *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions* (Oxford, 2001).

³¹ A graffito communicating a message on a *skyphos* is from Athens (Jeffery [n. 30], 137–8 no. 1 = *Ag.* xxi B 1); a dedication to Megarian Athena is from Kozani near Berea (Jeffery 137–8 no. 2); an inscribed statuette of Heracles is said to have been discovered at the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoeon in Boeotia (Jeffery, 137–8 no. 6); the gravestone of Apollodorus derives from Piraeus (Jeffery, 137–8 no. 15);

³² An inscribed armband derives from Olympia; the grave stele of Polytimus comes from Orchomenus in Boeotia. The other document introduced by Johnston is a fifth-century casualty list from Megara: Johnston, in Jeffery (n. 30), 442.

Megarian script, only 12 derive from the Megarid.³³ Furthermore, there are Megarian dedications known from interstate sanctuaries, including inscribed spoils at the Megarian treasuries at both Olympia and at Delphi.³⁴ But it is difficult to be absolutely certain whether private individuals or state-sanctioned bodies were responsible for the erection of these documents.

One can be reasonably certain, on the other hand, that most of the surviving inscriptions of the Archaic and Classical periods found at Megara were inscribed on private initiative (those of the fifth and fourth centuries mostly consist of individual grave markers or private dedications);³⁵ however, a few fifth-century documents were almost certainly inscribed on behalf of the wider community or refer to public transactions. These mostly relate to commemoration: a grave stele found at the necropolis on the road to Corinth, inscribed on what has been described as 'Pentelic marble' for Lacles son of Procles, seems to say that he will be buried according to the ways of the state:

Lacles son of Procles; these are the hopes that you bury me in one way or another here according to the custom of the city.³⁶

There are three other fifth-century documents concerned with state-sanctioned commemoration: one is a list of names inscribed in the *stoichêdon* style, which Jeffery suggested may record the names of lost sailors;³⁷ there is also a monument for a certain Hypsicles which was set up by 'the Megarians' (*IG* VII 3478); third, there is an Athenian-style casualty list, discovered in 1950, which, given that it was ordered by tribes as well as *epoikoi*, foreign settlers, was probably inscribed on behalf of *polis* authorities (*SEG* 39.411).³⁸ Some tendency to the public epigraphical commemoration of archaic heroes of the city is suggested by the survival of later copies of

³³ To Jeffery (n. 30), 137–8 and 442 add the stele of Pollis in the Getty collection (*SEG* 45.421), inscribed with Megarian letters but provenance unknown.

³⁴ Megarian fifth-century dedication of a *dekate* taken from the Athenians at Delphi: C. Vatin, 'L'Apollon des Mégariens à Delphes', *MEFRA* 95.2 (1983), 628–33. Pausanias (10.15.1) reported on a Megarian dedication at Delphi from the victory over Athens at Nisaea; Plutarch (*Mor.* 402A) represents Theon blaming the Megarians for erecting a statue to commemorate the time when they drove out the Athenians. The sixth-century Megarian treasury at Olympia contained an inscribed shield taken as spoils from an undatable war against Corinth (Paus. 6.19.12–5); for other finds at Olympia, see Jeffery (n. 30), 135 and 442 (no. 16 A); *SEG* 31.375.

³⁵ Other private Megarian inscriptions of the Archaic/Classical period: sixth-century: *SEG* 47.470 (grave marker); fifth-century: *SEG* 13.301, 13.305, 13.306, 13.307 (dedications), *SEG* 29.433, 41.414 (grave markers), *SEG* 37.370 (*horos*); fourth-century: *SEG* 13.304, 13.315, 13.316, 13.317, 30.435, 48.568 (dedications), *SEG* 29.434, 37.372, 41.416, 41.420, 41.421, 41.427 (grave markers).

³⁶ Jeffery (n. 30), 137 no. 3. This translation is based on the text of *SEG* 13.311 which transliterates as follows: [Λ]ακλε (?) τὸν Προκλέος ταῖδ' ἐνπίδες αἱ μέ κα ἄλ(λ)ε καὶ κ' ἄλ(λ)ε θάψεν τεδε τρόποι πό[λιος] (*CEG* 134). E. Highbarger, *The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara* (Baltimore, 1927), 23 n. 75 describes the material as Pentelic marble.

³⁷ Jeffery (n. 30), 137 no. 4 = *SEG* 13.300.

³⁸ It was inscribed in the *stoichêdon* style. Casualty lists are reminiscent of Athenian epigraphical habits, but are known outside Athens: see P. Low, 'Remembering war in fifth-century Greece: ideologies, societies and commemoration beyond Athens', *World Archaeology* 35 (2003), 98–111 at 102. There are known casualty lists from Corinth (*Corinth* VIII 1.11) and Argos (*SEG* 29.361). Other Athenian-style uses of epigraphy include the use of *ostraka* in the process of ostracism (see *SEG* 37.370) and the plucking up of *horoi* (compare *IG* VII 52.3 and Androton *FGH* 324 F 61 with [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 12.4). One sculptured dedication discovered at Megara is said to have been 'an Attic work': see *SEG* 31.383.

inscribed memorials in the shape of the second century A.D. epitaph of Orsippus who was said to have won the foot race at Olympia during the fifteenth Olympiad (*IG VII* 52, noticed by Pausanias 1.44.1) and an epigram, inscribed in the fourth century A.D., on the cenotaph of the Megarians who fell in the Persian wars (*IG VII* 53). But we would have to envisage the existence of an intermediary inscription of these verses set up in the Classical period before we suggest that fifth-century Megarians were intent on displaying the interstate achievements of Archaic Megara. The emphasis on private inscriptions, dedication and commemoration is shared with many other Peloponnesian communities of the Archaic period (see *LSAG* 112–224), excepting those of Elis or the Argolid. Megara however has no surviving inscribed treaties, or sacred or judicial regulations from the Archaic or Classical periods. Like many other communities, in the third century B.C., epigraphically speaking, Megara was more prolific than she had been previously: she published on stone ephebic documents (*IG VII* 27–31), lists of other religious and civic officials (*IG VII* 33, 39–41), an *epidosis* list (*IG VII* 42),³⁹ dedications and statue bases (*IG VII* 38, 54, 58, 60), and, for a short time (in the late fourth century, early third century, or 230s), honorific decrees (these are listed in Table 1): in other words, the Megarians were using inscribed media to praise benefactors and encourage civic virtue.⁴⁰ At Megara, epigraphy was introduced to the honorific sphere in the late fourth or mid third century but there were limitations: at no point in the city's history was it introduced to the legislative sphere of sacred or civic administration.

One striking absence (and difference from the habits of Athens) is the lack of publication of judicial or political statutes:⁴¹ neither her Archaic democracy nor her later Classical or Hellenistic administration published state regulations on stone. This may be surprising if we believe that she experienced a period of democracy in the sixth century B.C.⁴² However, her Archaic democracy is described in the literary sources as short-lived and chaotic, and there should be no expectation that it would have published the same standard of detailed (but not comprehensive) judicial and

³⁹ The inscription of ephebic documents is reminiscent of Athens but is not distinctively Athenian: for non-Athenian ephebic documents, see N. Kennell, *Ephebeia: A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Zurich and New York, 2006); the publication of *epidosis* decrees and lists of subscribers is also a Panhellenic epigraphical habit: see Migeotte (n. 23).

⁴⁰ For a list of Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions from Megara, see P.J. Smith, *The Archaeology and Epigraphy of Hellenistic and Roman Megaris, Greece* (Oxford, 2008), 20–1.

⁴¹ For a collection of inscribed state ordinances from the Archaic period, see Nomima and R. Koerner, *Inscriptliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis* (Cologne, 1993). For studies of the publication of legal inscriptions in Archaic Greece, see R. Thomas, 'Written in stone? Liberty, equality, orality and the codification of law', *BICS* 40 (1995), 59–74; K.-J. Hoelkeskamp, 'Written law in archaic Greece' *PCPhS* 38 (1992), 87–112; id., *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung um archaischen Griechenland*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 131 (Stuttgart 1999). Specifically on Cretan laws, see J. Whitley, 'Cretan laws and Cretan literacy' *AJA* 101 (1997), 635–61; id., 'Literacy and lawmaking: the case of archaic Crete', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (edd.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London, 1998), 311–31.

⁴² See Arist. *Pol.* 1302b31–2, 1304b35–9; Plut. *Mor.* 304E–F. For the case that these accounts say more about a breakdown in relations between rich and poor and the anti-democratic traditions of fourth-century political thought than the establishment of democracy, see S. Forsdyke, 'Revelry and riot in archaic Megara: democratic disorder or ritual reversal', *JHS* 125 (2005), 73–92. For a more credulous view on the existence of democracy in Archaic Megara, see E. Robinson, *The First Democracies. Early Popular Government Outside Athens*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 107 (Stuttgart, 1997), 114–7.

constitutional regulations published by exceptional communities like those of Athens (ML 14), Chios (or Erythrae: ML 8), Dreros (ML 2), or Eretria (*IG* XII 9.1273–4).⁴³

How do the decree habits of Megara compare to those of neighbours other than the spectacularly epigraphically prolific communities of neighbouring Attica? To her west lay Corinth and the Peloponnese; to her north lay Thebes and other cities of the Boeotian confederacy; to her south lay the Saronic Gulf, Salamis, Aegina, and Epidaurus. The absence of inscribed decrees from the Archaic and Classical period was common among her Peloponnesian neighbours: apart from the early documents (treaties, regulations and awards) of Elis and a few others of Peloponnesian communities set up at Olympia (*Nomima* 1.4, 21, 23, 24, 36, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 108, 109), only Epidaurus and Argos (*Nomima* 1.35, 54, 65, 78, 86–8, 100–1, 107, 110, 2.28) produced inscribed decrees and other regulations frequently even in the Hellenistic period.⁴⁴ Outside these areas, the communities of Arcadia and the Arcadian *koinon* were probably the most prolific Peloponnesian producers of inscribed decrees from the first half of the fourth century.⁴⁵ Megara's closest neighbours, Aegina and Corinth (a prolific producer of privately inscribed objects), inscribe no public documents in the Archaic or Classical period and publish less frequently than Megara in the Hellenistic period.⁴⁶

When we focus on inscriptions containing political, judicial or sacred regulations, Megara's quietness does not seem unusual in the wider Peloponnesian context. Other than those set up at Olympia, the Archaic Peloponnese outside the Argolid gives us only a few scraps of inscribed regulations from the Peloponnese (*Nomima* 1.57, 77, 2.2 (Arcadia), 1.67 (Laconia), 1.75 (Sicyon), *IPark* 1, 2, 7, 8, 20, 21 (Arcadia)). It was said that Lycurgan laws were not written down (Plutarch, *Life of Lycurgus* 13). Inscribed state regulations are more widespread in the fourth-century early Hellenistic Peloponnese (e.g. *SEG* 11.1026 (Cyparissia), *IPark passim*), but, outside the Argolid, were never a regular feature of any Peloponnesian community's administration. When we look to the north, inscribed decrees of Boeotian *poleis* are unknown before the late fourth century B.C. (other inscribed regulations are rare: see *Nomima* 69) though, on the borders with Attica, Oropus does start to publish decrees in the 330s (see *I Oropos* 1–20), and sacred regulations a little earlier (*I Oropos* 276–92), and the Boeotian *koinon* publishes from the 360s.⁴⁷ Interestingly, even in the Hellenistic period, Megara

⁴³ Moreover, when we look at the epigraphy of the Megarian colonies of the Black Sea area, there is also an absence of any publication of decrees before the early Hellenistic period: see M. Pérez Molina, *Index verborum in inscriptiones Megarae et coloniarum* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, 1990).

⁴⁴ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 67–71, 73–6. As Kotsidu's collection shows, more than half of the testimonia for Peloponnesian states honouring Hellenistic rulers derive from the Argolid or Olympia: see H. Kotsidu, *Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler* (Berlin, 2000), 105–40. The states of the Argolid were, among the Peloponnesians, also the most prolific producers of proxy decrees: see C. Marek, *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1984), 11–25. This is a picture liable to change: Marek records only one proxy decree from Philaglea in Arcadia, but in the excavations of 1996–7 of the sanctuaries of Athena and Zeus Soter, 11 proxy decrees were discovered: see *SEG* 51.512, 46.446.

⁴⁵ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 91. For a collection of 36 Arcadian inscribed legal enactments dating from the sixth century B.C. to the first century A.D., see G. Thür and H. Taeuber, *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der Griechischen Poleis: Arcadien* (Vienna, 1994).

⁴⁶ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 67, 73. For privately inscribed Corinthian objects, see *LSAG* 130–2 and R. Wachter, *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions* (Oxford, 2001), 34–157.

⁴⁷ Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 113–27. See now E. Mackil, 'A Boiotian proxy decree and relief in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and Boiotian–Lakonian relations in the 360s', *Chiron* 38 (2008), 157–94.

lacks inscribed sacred regulations, the likes of which were produced even in epigraphically quiet cities such as Corinth (*Corinth* VIII 1.1, dated to the late sixth century, is the earliest inscribed sacred calendar from the Greek world), Sicyon (*SEG* 11.244), or communities such as those in northern Arcadia (*IPark* 20), the Arcali (*Nomima* 1.67), and Cleonae (*IG* IV 1607) and Tiryns in the Argolid, producer of a spectacular seventh-century sacred law (*SEG* 30.380; see also *SEG* 11.369).⁴⁸

Megara's lack of inscribed treaties also deserves highlighting. Inscribed treaties of other Peloponnesian states are rare in the Archaic and Classical periods but are not unknown: they include those set up at Olympia (*Nomima* 1.21, 42, 51; Thuc. 5.18.10) and a couple of *synoikismos* documents (*SVA* 297; RO 14). From Sparta, the only extant decree predating the third century written on stone is a treaty of the fifth century B.C. (*SEG* 28.408 = *Nomima* 1.55), and Thucydides quotes a document stating that the inscription of the Peace of Nicias was to be set up on the Athenian acropolis, at Olympia, Delphi, the Isthmus, and at Sparta in the temple of Apollo at Amyklai (Thuc. 5.18.10). While Megara, a small city, was weak, her commanding location on the route between the Peloponnese, Attica and central Greece would have made her strategically an important city; in all likelihood, the absence of inscribed treaties must owe more to publishing habits than to non-alignment.⁴⁹

It is possible to surmise at this point that the Megarian state's use of epigraphy in the Archaic period was limited to the commemorative sphere. Like other Peloponnesian and central Greek communities, the Megarians do not appear to have attempted to comprehensively monumentalize or to bestow any form of divine protection over their constitutional form by the use of epigraphy.⁵⁰ When we look at the public uses of epigraphy among Megara's neighbours in the Peloponnese and in central Greece, we find that inscriptions are deployed occasionally, but not regularly, for the publication of decrees, regulations and alliances; the sparse evidence is not however enough to suggest any Peloponnesian or central Greek 'habit' of publishing decrees or enactments (though we note that the Argolid, Elea, and parts of Arcadia are documentary hot spots). While, even compared to other Peloponnesian states, she is a second-rate producer of public documents, Megarian epigraphical quietness is not out of tune with other Peloponnesian and Boeotian *poleis*. Her introduction of epigraphy into the honorific sphere in the fourth or third centuries, on the other hand, is something that makes her appear to deviate from what had been the norm among these neighbours.

THE MEGARIAN PUBLICATION OF DECREES

Despite the absence of epigraphical attestation, it is inconceivable that the Megarians of the Classical period lacked some form of constitutional arrangement. Such a conclusion may be drawn from a literal reading of a passage of the *Crito*:

And you yourself, if you go to one of the nearest cities, to Thebes or Megara – for both are well governed (*eunomountai*) – will go as an enemy, Socrates, to their government, and all who care for their own cities will look askance at you, and consider you as a destroyer of laws, and you will confirm the judges in their opinion, so that they will think their verdict was just. (53B–C)⁵¹

⁴⁸ For Peloponnesian sacred regulations to the first century B.C., see Sokolowski *LSCG* 56–68, *LSCG* Suppl. 22–34 and Lupu, *NGSL* 7, 8.

⁴⁹ Note that Megara does appear to have been involved in the negotiation of kinship diplomacy with other cities in the third and second centuries B.C.: see Curty (n. 23), nos 8, 11.

⁵⁰ Cf. Thomas (n. 41).

⁵¹ Translated by H. Fowler, *Plato I* (London and New York, 1917).

The Megarian *polis* of the Archaic period probably possessed decree-making mechanisms: there is literary testimony of a Megarian decree, perhaps deriving from Aristotle's lost *Constitution of the Megarians* (Plutarch, *Moralia* 295D), referring to a *dogma* in which the Megarian *dâmos* decreed that debtors be given back interest they had paid to their creditors, a practice known as *palintokia*.⁵² But there is no evidence to say how a *dogma* would have been enacted in that period of Megarian history. In the fifth and fourth centuries, despite the fact that our literary sources rarely represent the Megarian *polis* acting on the basis of decree (they are more often on the receiving end of others' decrees)⁵³ it is highly likely that the Megarians were enacting them without inscribing them. In the fourth century, it appears that they possessed a public archive of the kind into which decrees and laws, written on non-permanent media, may have been placed: this is probably the meaning of the *archeion* which Agesilaus visited on one of the *akropoleis* (Plutarch, *Life of Agesilaus* 27; Xenophon, *Hellenika* 5.4.58).⁵⁴ It may well, therefore, have been the case that the Megarians made decrees, and stored them in an archive, but were not publishing them on stone for all to see. Indeed, the Hellenistic evidence of Megarian decrees inscribed by communities other than the Megarians indicates that they were capable of making decrees without themselves inscribing them.⁵⁵

It is possible that the lack of inscribed decrees may be in tune with a legislative hesitation and introspection suggested in the anecdotes reporting that the Megarians were reluctant to grant their citizenship to foreigners: publication habits may well reflect political habits. Demosthenes, in his speech against Aristocrates, claimed that the Megarians were too conceited to make an award of citizenship to a hero of the Peloponnesian War:

Those detestable Megarians are so obsessed with their own dignity that, when the Lacedaimonians sent and ordered them to admit to their citizenship Hermo, the captain, who, serving with Lysander, captured two hundred war-galleys on the occasion of our disaster at Aegospotami, they replied that they would make him a Megarian when they saw that the Lacedaimonians had made him a Spartan.⁵⁶

Indeed, Plutarch reports that they claimed that their award to Alexander of citizenship broke with the city's traditions and that he was the first person since Heracles to receive their citizenship (Plutarch, *Moralia* 826C).⁵⁷ This anecdote is a clear

⁵² See Forsdyke (n. 42).

⁵³ Famously, the Athenians' Megarian decrees of the 430s, on which see now Cawkwell (n. 16), 111–14; for those concerning the dispute between Athens and Megara over the sacred *orgas*, see RO 58; [Dem.] 13.32; *FGrH* 324F30; *FGrH* 328F155.

⁵⁴ Pausanias (1.43.4) says that later the Megarians were using the shrine of Alcathous for archives. There was also a *bouleutêrion*, by which Mark Antony was famously underwhelmed: Plut. *Ant.* 23.3.

⁵⁵ There exist two decisions of the Megarians which were inscribed outside but, as far as we know, not within that city. One of these was a decree of the Megarians recorded on a dossier of those states accepting the *asylia* of the Asklepium of Cos (*SEG* 53. 850). Such decrees were regularly inscribed in dossiers by the beneficiary city. The other derives from Epidaurus and records the decree of the Megarians who were appointed by the Achaean League to arbitrate in a territorial dispute between Epidaurus and Corinth (*IG* IV 926 = Buck [n. 5], 99 = M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* [Cambridge, 1981], no. 136).

⁵⁶ Tr. J. Vince, *Demosthenes III* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1964). Note however that this statement is contradicted by Pausanias who claims knowledge that Hermo was indeed an honorary citizen of Megara (10.9.4).

⁵⁷ B. Kingsley, 'Harpalos in the Megarid (333–331 B.C.) and the grain shipments from Cyrene', *ZPE* 66 (1986), 165–77, at 169 and 176 suggests that the grant of citizenship to Alexander should be connected to grain shipments in 331.

suggestion that the coming of the Hellenistic era had some impact on the Megarian employment of decrees. It may be worth raising the possibility that, before the late fourth century, the political society of Megara was less open and less inviting to, or expectant of, individual participation than the political culture of a community that passed decrees prolifically or published its enactments on stone. This suggestion strikes a chord with the general assumption that Megara, in the fifth and fourth centuries, possessed an oligarchic form of government.⁵⁸ But two factors suggest that this is not a satisfactory explanation: firstly, because Megara appears to have been democratic on at least one point in the fifth century (Thuc. 4.66–72; cf. 1.103); secondly the fact that a similarly undemocratic Megara publishes decrees in the Hellenistic period. I shall now turn to look more closely at these.

Table 1 catalogues what survives of the inscribed enactments of Hellenistic Megara.

The surviving inscribed Hellenistic decrees deriving from the *polis* of the Megarians all postdate 307 B.C. and are predominantly honorific; only one concerns another subject (the construction of a fortification: *IG VII 17*). Of the honorific decrees, awards of proxeny status dominate the picture.⁶⁰ The eighteen documents here underlined appear to be part of a series passed within a short period of time: the inclusion of the eponymous *basileus* tells us these were enacted in eight different (not necessarily consecutive) years; all eighteen use similar formulae and were set up at the Olympieum. Of these, eight (those marked with an asterisk) list identical boards of six *stratâgoi*, suggesting that they were enacted within the term of their office; the change of the eponymous *basileus* shows that the generals remained in power for a number of years (probably four) and that the decrees were enacted in four separate years.⁶¹

The predominance of honorific decrees in the Megarian corpus is in tune with the epigraphical record of much of the rest of the Greek world.⁶² As already noted, it is nevertheless striking that the Megarians, even in the Hellenistic period, never inscribed documents which pertained to the organization of the sacred and secular

⁵⁸ Oligarchy in Megara (with democratic interludes): see R. Legon, 'Megaris, Corinthia and Sikyonia', 462–88 in M. Hansen and T. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004), 464.

⁵⁹ In addition to those listed here, a number of non-Megarian decrees were discovered and probably originally published at Megara: *IG VII 16* (decrees of various cities concerning the Megarian *Soteira* games), 20 (with *SEG* 31.382 and 32.424: a decree of Tanagra praising Megarian judges), 21 (decree of Orchomenus praising Megarian judges), Curty (n. 23), no. 8 (Corcyrean [?] decree for Megarians). I have also omitted decrees of the period of Roman domination: 18 (praising and erecting statue for — son of Herion, late second/early first century B.C.), 22–3 (Megarian version of Diocletian's pricing edict), 24 (grain edict of A.D. 401–2), 25 (second/third c. A.D.), 113 (a decree of the Roman period in verse). Other honours of the Roman period are inscribed on bases without decrees (e.g. *IG VII 62*, 63, 64, 65, 75, 77, 80, 82, 97–9). For a list, see Smith (n. 40), 20.

⁶⁰ With the exception of one granting citizenship (*IG VII 1*), another which is too fragmentary to determine the nature of the award (*IG VII 15*) and two which appear to honour interstate arbitrators (*IG VII 19*, 188–9).

⁶¹ The chronology of the decrees is contentious. Some of the decrees list five *stratâgoi*; others six. The arrangement of the three decrees on the block published by Heath (the decree with six *stratâgoi* is inscribed to the right of the other two) suggests that the period of six *stratâgoi* postdates the period of five *stratâgoi*: see R. Heath, 'Proxeny decrees from Megara', *ABSA* 19 (1912–13), 82–8. On the chronology of the decrees, see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 109–10. For clarification of this and related issues, I am very grateful to Paschalis Paschidis for showing me unpublished work.

⁶² Lewis (n. 26), 51–2.

TABLE 1. Inscribed Hellenistic (late fourth to mid second century B.C.) decrees of Megara (those underlined are of probably of the same series; those marked with an asterisk denote decrees passed under the same board of 6 *stratāgoi*).⁵⁹

*IG VII 1 citizenship for Zoelus of Boeotia – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Apollodorus.

*IG VII 2 proxeny for Agathon of Argos – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Apollodorus.

*IG VII 3 proxeny for Alexeus – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Apollodorus.

*IG VII 4 proxeny for Mys of Eresus – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Euclias.

*IG VII 5 proxeny for Cleon son of Cleon of Erythrae – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Euclias.

*IG VII 6 proxeny for Philon son of Cleon of Erythrae (on same stone as IG VII 5) – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Euclias.

*IG VII 7 proxeny for Hermonax of Troezen – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Themantus.

IG VII 8 proxeny for Agathocles the Boeotian – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiades.

IG VII 9 proxeny for Diocritus of Halicarnassus (on same stone as IG VII 8) – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiades.

IG VII 10 proxeny for Telesias and Peithanoridas of Phleious – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiades.

IG VII 11 proxeny for Menander of Megalopolis – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiades.

IG VII 12 proxeny for Hippias of Acarnania – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Diogenes.

IG VII 13 proxeny for Nicatas of Epidaurus (on same stone as 12) – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Diogenes.

IG VII 14 proxeny for Aristander of Halicarnassus – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. or 230s B.C. *Basileus*: Apollonides.

IG VII 15 honorific decree for Hicesius of Ephesus, stationed on Aegina by Eumenes – 1st half 2nd century B.C. *Basileus*: lost.

IG VII 3473 proxeny for Athenagoras of Perinthus – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiades.

ABSA 1912–3 no. 1 proxeny decree for Sotionus of Iasus – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiadorus.

ABSA 1912–3 no. 2 proxeny decree for Meniscus of Halicarnassus (on same stone as ABSA 1912–3 no. 1 and 3) – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: Pasiadorus.

*ABSA 1912–3 no. 3 proxeny decree for Lyciscus of Haleis (on same stone as ABSA 1912–3 nos. 1 and 2) – late 4th/early 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: Antiphilus.

AAA 1974 proxeny decree for Anchierus of Boeotia – mid 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: Damon.

Revue Archéologique 1917 no. 31 (pp. 49–54) proxeny for Callipus of Megalopolis – late 3rd c. B.C. *Basileus*: [Call]irous.

IG VII 17 decree on walls and fortifications – 192–59 B.C. *Basileus*: lost.

IG VII 19 honorific, perhaps for a judge – 2nd c. B.C.? *Basileus*: lost.

IG VII 188–9 (= Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations*, 85) honorific decree of Megara promulgated on behalf of Pagae, for Achaean and Sicyonian advocates in a case involving disputed territory (c. 192 B.C.). *Basileus*: Apollonides.

institutions of their own city: their epigraphic culture was never introduced to the legislative sphere. It is also important to note that their dealings with other states consist only of the award of honours and involvement in interstate arbitration,⁶³ and not alliances or agreements of any form.

A closer look at the wording of the decrees gives rise to comment on what is distinctive about the Megarian habits of publishing. They show some features distinct from usual documentary practice at Athens. They refer to themselves as *dogmata*, rather than the Athenian-style *psêphismata* (on this Peloponnesian characteristic, see n. 5). Like decrees of most Peloponnesian communities, but unlike those of Athens, they usually, with the exception of one decree of the period of Boeotian domination,⁶⁴ fail to name a proposer; the absence of the ‘X *eipe*’ formula makes the language sharply distinct from the Athenian documentary phraseology upon which it appears to have been modelled.⁶⁵ The absence of a named proposer means that the Megarian publishing habit offered fewer opportunities for accruing political capital through the proposal and inscription of a decree than did epigraphical publication at Athens, where the proposer was always mentioned in the formulae. But on the other hand, this made it more difficult to attach responsibility to an individual proposer in Megara: inscribed decrees in Megara do not make an audit trail a possibility as they do in Athens. This may also suggest a less democratic mode of publishing enactments: while the appearance of the proposer in the decree of the Boeotian period (it was normal Boeotian practice to name the proposer) suggests that the information was available, the ostensible anonymity of Megarian decrees meant that less immediate emphasis was placed on the significance of the individual proposer and the implications of free speech and deliberation are not broached in the Megarian documents. The documents were enacted in the name of the *boulâ* and *dâmos*, and the *dâmos* (of the Megarians) was usually said to be both the body making the reward and the recipient of the good deed (with the exception of *IG VII* 1.18, where the good deed was done on behalf of the *polis* and *kômâ* of Aegosthena). Although, Doric dialect aside, this is reminiscent of the wording of Athenian decrees of the democratic era, such a formulation does not indicate the breadth of political participation in Megara (one non-democratic slip is the recommendation that honorands are said to be *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of the *polis* (of the Megarians), rather than the *dâmos*, as was the custom at Athens).⁶⁶ This is suggested by the prosopography of Megarian

⁶³ For the evidence of Megarian arbitration, see Smith (n. 40), 145.

⁶⁴ The exception is a decree for a Megalopolitan published in *RA* (1917), no. 31 (pp. 49–54), where the first *stratâgos*, Derkiadas, proposes, if we follow the restoration ‘Δερκιάδας [ἐλεξε]’. The introduction of the proposer is in the Boeotian style, and dates the decree to the period of Boeotian domination: see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 113–25.

⁶⁵ *IG VII* 1.5–10, exceptionally, tells us that the honours for Zoelus were enacted on the grounds of the report made by the sub-*polis kômê* community of the Aegosthenitans.

⁶⁶ Enactment: see *IG VII* 3.8–9: δεδόχθαι τῷ βουλᾷ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ, ἐπανέσαι αὐτὸν ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας; *dâmos* as recipient of the reward: see *IG VII* 3.7: εὖνους καὶ χρησίμους ἔδῳ διατελεῖ τῷ δάμῳ; *dâmos* as maker of the reward: see below, n. 74. Typically, an honorand is said (*IG VII* 7.3.4) πρόξενον εἶμεν καὶ εὐεργέταν τᾶς πόλιος τᾶς Μεγαρέων or similar. *Proxenoi* were *proxenoi* of the Athenian *demos* at Athens: see A. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees. The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees* (Hildesheim, 1983), 187. In terms of enactment formulae, the second-century document *IG VII* 15 is an exception, with a college of magistrates (*sunarchiai*) making a proposal to the *aisimnatai*, but this is a decree of the period during which Megara was attached to the Achaean League: see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 111. The decree published at *RA* (1917), no. 31 (pp. 49–54), probably of the period of Boeotian domination, has Boeotian-style formulae: see nn. 64 and 83.

officials. Like Athenian documents, the Megarian versions mention important city officials: the *grammateus boulās kai dāmou* (who is responsible for writing up the document), the eponymous *basileus*, and the *stratāgoi* of the Megarians are listed on most of the decrees, sometimes above and sometimes below the substantive sections of the document. However, there is syntactical inconsistency in the style of reference to officials: for instance, the name of *grammateus* is sometimes, in the usual style of Athenian decrees, the subject of the verb *ἐγγραμμάτετε* (*ἐγγραμμάτετε βουλᾶι καὶ δάμωι*: *IG VII 10–14*; Heath 1, 2; *AAA* 1974); at other times we have simply the list-like designation *γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς καὶ δάμου* (+ name) (*IG VII 1, 3–9, 3473*; Heath 3); on one occasion a genitive participle (*IG VII 2*). Occasionally the names give us a view of the narrowness of the political class at Megara: *IG VII 1.1–2* (cf. 2.1–2, 3.1–2) mentions that Dameas son of Damoteles is *grammateus*: he was probably the father or son of the *stratāgos* Damoteles son of Dameas, a *stratāgos* mentioned on the same stones (*IG VII 1.2–3* cf. 2.2–3, 3.2–3).⁶⁷ Timon the son of Agathon, one of the board of six *stratāgoi* of *IG VII 1–7* and Heath 3, is probably the father of Agathon, son of Timon mentioned on a proxeny decree of the third century B.C. (*AAA* 1974 line 6).

The recipients of these proxeny awards derive from a range of cities across mainland Greece and western Asia Minor.⁶⁸ There are a couple of clues as to their identity as agents of Antigonid interests: three of the decrees, which were part of the series of eight listing the same board of six *stratāgoi*,⁶⁹ suggest that the honorand had some sort of a relationship with a king ‘Damatrios’ (*IG VII 1, 5, 6*). The honorand Zoelus of Boeotia (*IG VII 1*) has been identified by some with Demetrius’ mail maker mentioned by Plutarch (Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius* 21.4–5). This view suggests, for this document and the rest of the series, a date around the time of Demetrius Poliorcetes’ capture of Megara in 307 or his second period of rule over Greece from 295 to 287.⁷⁰ The identification of Zoelus is however far from certain,⁷¹ and some attempts have been made to associate the documents with Demetrius II’s capture of Megara in the period 236–229 B.C.⁷² But whatever the precise dating of these

⁶⁷ For a stemma of this family, see R. Urban, *Wachstum und Krise des achäischen Bundes. Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v. Chr.* *Historia Einzelschriften* (Weisbaden, 1979), 68 n. 324. On the population of Megara in the Hellenistic period (she could, in all likelihood, muster no more than a thousand hoplites in the third century), see R. Legon, *Megara. The Political History of a City-State to 336 BC* (London, 1981), 300–1.

⁶⁸ Of the series of 18 (those underlined in Table 1), there are two for Erythraeans (*IG VII 5, 6*), three for Halicarnassians (*IG VII 9, 14*; Heath 2), two for Boeotians (*IG VII 1, 8*), one for an Argive (*IG VII 2*), for an Eresian (*IG VII 4*), for a Troezenian (*IG VII 7*), for a Megalopolitan (*IG VII 11*), for an Acarnanian (*IG VII 12*), an Epidaurian (*IG VII 13*), a Perinthian (*IG VII 3473*), for a pair of Phleousians (*IG VII 10*), for a man of Iasus (Heath 1), for a man of Haleis (Heath 3), and one for a man of unknown city (*IG VII 3*). Smith (n. 40), 128 comments on the absence of *proxenoi* from the Megarian colonies and the fact that the majority of them originate from Doric cities.

⁶⁹ Those marked with an asterisk on Table 1.

⁷⁰ For this view, see Urban (n. 67), 66–70 and Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4) 111–12.

⁷¹ It was disputed by M. Feyel, *Polybe et l’histoire de Béotie au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*. BÉFAR 152, (Paris, 1942), 86. Furthermore, Paschalis Paschidis has pointed out to me that, as R. Billows, *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Los Angeles and London, 1990), 442–3) observes, Plutarch’s Zoelus was apparently a craftsman, suggesting a social status incompatible with that of a garrison commander.

⁷² Feyel (n. 71) preferred Demetrius II. As Paschalis Paschidis observes, Urban (n. 67), in the course of refuting Feyel’s dating, ignores Feyel’s point that it is highly likely that Demetrius II captured Megara given the fact that he was able to hand over Eleusis to the Athenians.

documents, and accordingly the precise commencement of the honorific employment of decrees by the Megarian state, it is clear that the set of documents reflects Megarian attempts to cement relations with important individuals abroad and to ensure, at a time of upheaval, that their interests were represented in cities across Greece and Asia Minor.⁷³

Finally, it is worth observing that, like Athenian honorific decrees of this period, they declared stated intentions, saying that the decrees were set up at the Olympieum 'so that everyone might see that the *dâmos* of the Megarians honours anyone doing good either by word or by deed on behalf of the city or the *kômâ*', or 'so that it may be clear that the *dâmos* of the Megarians honours those who have *eunoia* and are useful to it'.⁷⁴ Such passages were designed to emphasize that the Megarians adhere to norms of interstate reciprocity and generosity like any other city. This is the clearest textual expression of distinctively Megarian identity, albeit in a rather formulaic way reminiscent of the Athenian mode of documentary exhortation.⁷⁵

The only other expression of ethnicity lies in occasionally Doric tendencies of the orthography and vocabulary.⁷⁶ Nowhere in their extant decrees do the Megarians attempt to use for political purposes reminiscences about the colonial past of their community, though there is evidence for other states evoking *syngeneia* with the Megarians in the Hellenistic period.⁷⁷ The Megarians, it seems, want to appear quietly gracious to their new benefactors. This feeling is intensified by the fact that while the decrees usually say something formulaic or very compressed about both the rewards bestowed upon the honorand,⁷⁸ and his deed (usually mentioning his *eunoia*), they sometimes go so far as saying that he has provided *chreiai* to the 'perpetually needy' Megarians (*IG* VII 12.7–11),⁷⁹ as if trying to emphasize the helplessness of their own community.

Among the extant Megarian inscriptions there are no surviving enactments of the five sub-*polis* communities attested as *kômai* by Plutarch,⁸⁰ which Aristotle equated with the (epigraphically prolific) demes of Athens (*Poetics* 1448a29–39). The only other epigraphically active communities of the Megarid were their north-western ports on the Corinthian gulf, Aegosthena and Pagae (*IG* VII 188–222). There are no extant decrees of Pagae until the age of Roman supremacy (see *IG* VII 190 [with *SEG* 52.500], 193). Aegosthena appears not to have published her decrees on stone until the

⁷³ Two later decrees suggest dealings with other monarchs: Antigonus (*RA* 1917); Eumenes (*IG* VII 15).

⁷⁴ *IG* VII 1.15–17: ὅπως εἰδῶντι πάντες ὅτι ὁ δᾶμος [ὁ Μ]εγαρέων τιμῇ τοὺς ἀγαθὸν τι πράσσοντας ἢ λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ ὑπὲρ τὰς πόλεις ἢ ὑπὲρ τὰν κωμῶν; *IG* VII 2.14–16: [ὅπως φα]νερὸν ᾗ ὅτι ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Μεγαρέων [τιμῇ τοὺς [εἰ]ϋ[νους] καὶ χρησίμους αὐτῷ.

⁷⁵ For the language of Athenian exhortation in her decrees, see A. Henry, 'The hortatory intention in Attic state decrees', *ZPE* 112 (1996), 105–19; on the phenomenon beyond Athens, see W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*. Vol. 1 (Leipzig 1902), 504–8.

⁷⁶ Most pronounced at *IG* VII 2.10–11: εἰμεν αὐτῷ γὰς καὶ οἰκίας ἐ[π]α[ρ]χά: 'there is to be for him the right of possession of land and house', equating to Attic *enktesis*.

⁷⁷ Curty (n. 23), no. 8: (probably a decree of Corcyra praising Megarians and reminding them of their *syngeneia*, found at Megara); Curty 11 (Acraiphians appeal to the Megarians).

⁷⁸ For a list of the privileges granted in Megarian proxeny decrees: Marek (n. 44), 25 and Smith (n. 40), 128.

⁷⁹ *IG* VII 12.7–11: ἐπειδὴ Ἰππίας Περικλέος Ἀκαρνὰν ἐξ Ἀστακῶν διατελεῖ εὖνους ἐὼν τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Μεγαρέων καὶ χρείας αἰὶ τῷ δεομένῳ τῶν πολιτῶν παρέχ[ε]ται φιλοτίμως. Similar phraseology is to be found at *IG* VII 9.4–5, 10.8–10, 12.9–10, 14.9–10.

⁸⁰ Plutarch (*Mor.* 295B) lists the *kômai* as Heraeis, Piraeis, Megareis, Cynosureis and Tripodisci; on these and the existence of the three Doric *phylai*, see C. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study* (Philadelphia, 1987), 94–7.

last quarter of the third century. Until those dates, the epigraphy suggests the absolute subordination of both communities to the decree-making mechanisms of Megara. This is suggested in *IG VII 1*, the honorific decree for Zoelus, enacted by the Megarians: Zoelus was granted Megarian rewards (citizenship and *proedria* at games in that city), but his good deed appears to have been related to his command of Demetrius' soldiers at Aegosthena (who, it must be presumed, supported Megarian suzerainty of Aegosthena), and the decree was passed allegedly on the request of the Aegosthenitans. It appears therefore, that Aegosthena lacked its own honorific voice and had to rely on that of Megara. The same applies to Pagae: *IG VII 188–9*, deriving from the area of Pagae, are two fragments, joined by Robert, now interpreted as an honorific decree of the Megarians of c. 192 B.C. for Achaean and Sicyonian advocates promulgated on behalf of Pagae in a case involving disputed territory between Pagae and Aegosthena over Panormus. The dispute appears to have been resolved in favour of Pagae which at that time was still joined to Megara; the Aegosthenitans, at that time dominated by the Boeotians, lost out. It seems that Pagae too was subordinated to Megarian decree-making mechanisms.⁸¹

Of the extant Aegosthenitan inscriptions, six are decrees, of which four can be dated to the period of Boeotian domination, from 224 to 192.⁸² Interestingly, the Megarians appear to have inscribed few, if any, decrees in the same period.⁸³ These four decrees suggest that the Aegosthenitans developed an ostensibly distinct epigraphical culture from that of Megara. Three of them are proxeny awards for local individuals (for a Chalean of Boeotia, a Sicyonian and for an individual lacking an ethnic: *IG VII 208, 213, 219*), and each of these contains Boeotian linguistic peculiarities;⁸⁴ the proposer was named in the Boeotian style.⁸⁵ The other, an

⁸¹ On the status of Aegosthena and Pagae, see Legon (n. 58), 462–3 and 465. On *IG VII 188–9*, see S. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 BC* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1996), 233–5, no. 85. The epigraphy of the Athenian demes suggests some meaningful political activity: for instance, the *chorégia* was retained at Aixone when it had been abolished in the polis of Athens by Demetrius of Phalerum: see *SEG 36.186*. On the political activity of the Athenian demes, see R. Osborne, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge, 1985), 79–92.

⁸² *IG VII 207, 208, 213, 219*. Aegosthena and Pagae were granted freedom from Megara when she was incorporated in the Boeotian *koinon* in 224 (Polybius 20.6.7–12): see R. Étienne and D. Knoepfler, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.* *BCH Supplement 3* (Paris, 1976), 323–31. L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta II* (Amsterdam, 1969), 1267 argues that Megara was in the Achaean Confederacy during the years 243–224 and 192–146 and in the Boeotian league in the intermediary period.

⁸³ It is possible that the fragmentary decree at *RA* (1917), no. 31 (pp. 49–54) should be dated to the period of Boeotian domination, given the Boeotian-style inclusion of a proposer and the Boeotian-style formula '[προβεβωλε]μένον εἶμεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὰν βουλᾶν καὶ τὸν δάμον': for the observation that this is distinctively Boeotian, see Rhodes with Lewis (n. 4), 124. The Megarians did, however, inscribe ephebic documents in the period of Boeotian domination: *IG VII 27, 28* (for the identification of these, see n. 84).

⁸⁴ Such as the formulaic expression *προβεβωλευμένον εἶμεν αὐτοῖς*: see *IG VII 208.2*; cf. 213.2. See H. Maquieira, 'Presencia de Beotismos en las inscripciones de Egostena', in J. Zaragoza and A. González Senmartí (edd.), *Homenatge a Josep Alsina* (Taragona, 1992), 85–9, summarized at *SEG 46.514*. Other formulae, such as dating by archon ἐν Ὀρχηστῷ suggest a document enacted under the Boeotian confederation (e.g. *IG VII 27, 28, 209–12, 213, 215–8, 220–2*). Onchestus was a site in Boeotia and one of the two federal shrines of the Boeotian League: see C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Los Angeles, 1985), 35–6. The Megarians wrote Onchestus into their mythology, claiming that their king Nisus married the daughter of Onchestus, and that she was the sister of Megareus: Plut. *Mor.* 295A.

⁸⁵ *IG VII 208.1–5*: Νικίας Διονυσίου ἔλ[ε]ξε· προβεβωλευμένον εἶμεν αὐτοῖς, ἐπειδὴ Πολέμα[ρ]χος Μένωνος Χαλεὺς εὐεργέτας ἑὸν διατελὶ τὰς πόλιος Αἰγιοσθενιτάν, δεδόχθαι τῷ δάμῳ.

honorific decree for the Sipheies of Boeotia (*IG VII 207*), is of a sort unparalleled in the dossier of Megarian documents. Composed in a heavily Boeotianizing dialect, it both emphasizes the ‘pre-existing goodwill from our ancestors between the city of the Sipheies and the *polis* of the Aigosthenitans’ (*IG VII 207.2–3*), the *homonoia* between the two communities (*IG VII 207.8–10*), and states that the Sipheies who come to Aegosthena to participate in the common sacrifices will be treated as if they were citizens (*IG VII 207.11–14*).⁸⁶ Both the dialect and the content of all decrees very clearly assert the Aigosthenitans’ political inclinations in this period of alliance with the Boeotian *koinon*. This set of documents does not assert independence from the Boeotian *koinon*, for it is well established that communities within that organization issued their own proxeny decrees alongside federal proxeny decrees.⁸⁷ But it suggests political deviation from their Megarian former masters: the enactments recorded their proposer, were enacted by a *dâmos* without mention of a *boulâ*, they described themselves as *psâphismata* (the publication of which is said to be the responsibility of the polemarchs [‘when the *psâphisma* is made authoritative’]), and they were published at the shrine of the hero Melampus.⁸⁸ Separatism is also expressed through the physical form of these documents: three decrees and five ephebic documents were inscribed consecutively on the front face of one free-standing tapering stele (207–14, of which 207, 208, 213 are decrees), the side of which is inscribed with four more ephebic documents (215–18).⁸⁹ As will become clear below, such stelae were not the usual form of publication in Megara.

Of the two other decrees of Aegosthena, one (a proxeny decree for a Megarian) dates to the period of the Achaean domination of 192–46 (*IG VII 223*), and another (a proxeny decree for a Thespian) to c. 100 B.C. (*SEG 49.500*). Despite its formulaic resemblance to a Megarian decree enacted in the same era (*IG VII 15*, mentioning *sunarchiai* with a probouleutic role), the former still expresses a spirit of independence: the decree was enacted ‘in the year of the *basileus* in Aegosthena Herakon’ (*IG VII 223.2–3*); he was invited to *proedria* at the Melampodeum, granted a share of

⁸⁶ Dialect: see Maquieira (n. 84), 87–9. *IG VII 207. 2–14*: ἐπιδή ἐστι τῇ πόλι Σιφείων προ[ύ]παρχωσα εὐνοία ἐκ προγόνων, κῆ ἐν προεδρίαν καλῖ ἡ πόλις Ἑγοσθενιτῶν ὁπόττοι κα παρίωνθι Σιφείων, κατὰ ταυτὰ δὲ κῆ τοῖ Σιφεῖες τὰς αὐτὰς τιμὰς ἐκτεθήκανθι Ἑγοσθενίτης, κῆ ἔ[π]ι τὰς κοινὰς. συνόδως καλέονθι τὼς παργυνμένως· ὅπως< > ὦν φανερόν ἔει ὅτι τὰν ὁμόνοιαν διαφυλάττι τὰν ἐκ τῶν προγόνων παρδοθείσαν ἡ πόλις Ἑγοσθενιτῶν πὸτ τὰν πόλιν Σιφείων, δεδόχθη τοῖ δάμοι, ὁπόττοι κα παργυνύωνθι Σιφείων ἐν τὰς κοινὰς θυσίας ἄς δαῖζοι ἡ πό[λ]ις, ὑπαρχέμεν αὐτοῖς, καθάπερ κῆ τοῖς πολίτης.

⁸⁷ J. Fossey, ‘Boiotian decrees of proxenia’, in J. Fossey (ed.), *Boiotia Antiqua IV* (Amsterdam, 1991), 35–59, at 36; P. Rhodes, ‘Epigraphical evidence: laws and decrees’, in M. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1995), 91–112, at 105–6. *Poleis* were not the only communities awarding *proxenia*: see M. Hansen and T. Nielsen, ‘Proxenois as evidence for polis identity’, in id. (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004), at 98–102, at 99.

⁸⁸ *IG VII 208.7–10*: τ[ο]ὶ δὲ πολέμαρχοι, ἐπεὶ κα τὸ ψάφισμα κυρωθῆ[ν]ι, ἀνγραφάντω εἰς στάλαν ἐν τοῖ Μελαμποδεῖοι. On the origin, identity and religious significance of the cult of Melampus, see C. Antonetti and P. Lévêque, ‘Au carrefour de la Mégaride. Devins et oracles’, *Kernos* 3 (1990), 200–5.

⁸⁹ This tapering stele is now the lintel of the church of Panagia built inside the ruins of an early Christian basilica at Aegosthena: it is whitewashed but visible in the picture at Travlos (n. 28), 286; for more bibliography on the topography of Aegosthena, see Travlos (n. 28), 261. Another stone held at least one more decree (*IG VII 219*) and three ephebic documents (*IG VII 220–2*) and a third stone was dedicated to the honorific decree for a Megarian (*IG VII 223*). The horizontal incisions between each line on *IG VII 207–18* are also not known on Megarian inscriptions.

meat at the festival of Melampus, and the right of pasture at Aegosthena. These were honours of a sort that the Megarians had never given to their honorands, and one wonders what political complexities the honorand would have faced, flattered by a community which had seceded from his home city. It appears that the Aegosthenitans were making a clear statement about their own autonomy and difference from the Megarians through their publication of decrees. But, given the proximity to Aegosthena of the community and the individuals they were honouring, it seems that they were asserting their legislative capacity only to neighbouring communities: this audience, they may have recognized, was the only one that would be even vaguely interested.⁹⁰

Thus far, this analysis of the inscriptions of the Megarid has given rise to four points: (1) a survey of the surviving Megarian inscriptions of the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods suggested that the Megarian state's use of epigraphy initially was restricted to employment in commemorative contexts, but that it was introduced into the honorific sphere at the end of the fourth or the middle of the third century B.C. (2) Megara's decree habit was not seriously out of line with that of her Peloponnesian and central Greek neighbours. (3) The Megarian publication of decrees, when it developed, was most strikingly different from that of Athens in the absence of a named proposer, which suggests not just a different publication habit but a different culture of enactment. (4) The divergences between the style of publications of Megara and Aegosthena, in particular those of the period of Boeotian domination, may be read as a former dependency's assertion of an identity distinct from that of Megara. In order to deepen an understanding of the decree culture of Megara, it is instructive to examine more closely the outward appearance and physical deployment of the proxy decrees of Megara.

MATERIAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS OF MEGARIAN DECREES

There are two major difficulties in attempting to understand the physical form of Megarian decrees: most of those extant (see Table 1) were discovered, often in modern contexts, before the first half of the nineteenth century and were published in works some of which say less than is desirable about physical aspects of the documents. To make matters worse, most of them were lost by the time of the definitive publication of Megarian inscriptions in Dittenberger's *IG VII* in 1892.

The first Megarian decree to be published in modern times was the proxy decree for Menander of Megalopolis (*IG VII* 11), in the eighteenth century by Chandler (II 28), having been recorded by British travellers earlier that century.⁹¹ But the majority of the decrees of Megara came to light in the mid nineteenth century: twelve new proxy decrees were published in the 1840s and early 1850s,⁹² and editors reported that most of them were inscribed on rectangular grey blocks of marble which derived from an ancient wall or structure. The statement of publication on the stones

⁹⁰ Rivalry between the Megarians and the Aegosthenitans is suggested in the Megarian decree (of c. 192 B.C.) on behalf of Pagae honouring Achaean and Sicyonian advocates in a dispute with the Aegosthenitans over the ownership of the harbour Panormus: Ager (n. 81), 85.

⁹¹ On the expedition of James Dawkins, John Bouverie and Robert Wood, see *DNB* s.v. Robert Wood 1717–1771 and I. Macgregor Morris, '“Shrines of the mighty”: rediscovering the battlefields of the Persian Wars', in E. Bridges, E. Hall and P.J. Rhodes (edd.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars. Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford, 2007), 231–64, at 239–44.

⁹² These were later published as *IG VII* 2–6, 8–10, 12, 13, 14, 3473.

themselves gave a clue as to the location of this wall: it said they were to be set up 'on a stele at the Olympieum', in other words the Megarian temple of Olympian Zeus. Pausanias (1.40.4), who noted that it was 'worthy of seeing', suggests that this was among the most impressive buildings in Megara, and contained, in the second century A.D., an unfinished ivory and gold Zeus, personifications of the seasons (*hōrai*) and fates (*moirai*), and an Athenian trireme's ram captured by the Megarians.

The first major publication of Megarian epigraphy was that of Ross in 1844.⁹³ Later witnesses gave contradictory opinions on the physical context of the stones. Pittakis, writing in 1853, gave some description of the physical situation of the blocks, and appears to have observed a curved *exedra*-style construction.⁹⁴ Another potentially valuable detail in his report was that this area was excavated owing to the discovery, in 1820, of statues in this precise location.⁹⁵ Rangabé, writing in 1855, gave a slightly different account, reporting that the wall was to be found among the hovels and stables of the city, was 7–8 feet high, ran from west to east and had a corner surviving; he suggested that this was to be identified as the retaining wall of the Olympieum.⁹⁶ It is unclear whether the wall survived as late as 1859 when Conze published the decree for Hermonax of Troezen, inscribed on what he described as *ein grauer marmor*, which he claimed he had found in a donkey stable in front of a private house (*IG VII 7*).⁹⁷ But most of the wall may have disappeared into the lime kilns by 1883 when Korolkow published the citizenship decree for Zoelus of Boeotia which was built into the house of another Megarian (*IG VII 1*). A block of grey stone containing three more proxeny decrees, assumed to have derived from the same structure, was published by Heath in 1913. It was discovered in the ruins of a medieval fortress on the hill of Palaiokastros, which may be identified with ancient Nisaea, the port of the Megarians.⁹⁸ The document now sits in the backyard of the Megara museum and is the only surviving document of this series; the moulding around the top of the block suggests it provided the coping stone. What the reports, limited as they are, suggest is that the eighteen decrees underlined in Table 1 were inscribed on similar blocks which, until the mid-nineteenth century, made up a wall at the Olympieum in central Megara.⁹⁹ While it is impossible to be certain whether the wall was a retaining wall of the Olympieum or an *exedra* close to the building, the stated place of publication ('at the Olympieum') suggests the former. The discovery of the

⁹³ See L. Ross, *Monatsberichte der Koenigliche Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin* (1844), 156–62. H. Reinganum's *Das alte Megaris. Ein Beitrag zur Alterthumskunde Griechenlands* (Berlin, 1825) suggests contemporary scholarly interest in the city (see esp. pp. xiii–xiv; for inscriptions, see 144); see also M. Blanchard, 'Recherches sur la ville de Mégare en Achaïe', *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions* 16 (1742), 120–40.

⁹⁴ K. Pittakis, *ArchEph* (1853), 804–5 suggests that the decrees derived from 'an almost circular wall' of ten feet high, which he identified with the *thrinakos*, a stone coping, which Pausanias reported as encircling the tumulus of Ino (1.42.7); cf. *ibid.* nos. 1328–38.

⁹⁵ These were later identified as *Nikai*; for this identification, and the suggestion that Pittakis justified excavation of the site on the basis of these previous discoveries, see A. Kaloyeropoulou, 'Un nouveau décret de proxénie de Mégare', *AAA* 7 (1974), 138–48 at 143 n. 16.

⁹⁶ A. Rangabé, *Antiquités helléniques ou répertoire d'inscriptions et d'autres antiquités découvertes depuis l'affranchissement de la Grèce*. Vol. 2 (Athens, 1855), 294; cf. *ibid.* nos. 693–702.

⁹⁷ A. Conze, *Philologus* 14 (1859), 151–3. For other nineteenth-century observers of the wall, see Muller (1984, n. 28), 256–60.

⁹⁸ This is the identification of Legon (n. 67), 32; Heath (n. 61), the publisher of the inscriptions, identified the site as that of ancient Minoa.

⁹⁹ Other decoration was minimal. A triangular decoration is reproduced in *IG VII 1* and reported by Pittakis (n. 94), 810–12 on *IG VII 5* and 6; Heath's decrees are divided by vertical incisions. *IG VII 15* was crowned with a pediment and acroteria.

blocks at a location to the north of the agora of the Megarians, between the two *akropoleis* of Caria and Alcathea, suggests that the Megarians appear to have deemed this space an honorific quarter of their city.¹⁰⁰ In the area was also the Artemisium, the only other attested place of publication for a decree of Megara.¹⁰¹

Other, now lost, ephebic documents from Megara, dating to the period of the Boeotian domination from the 220s perhaps to the 190s, were published in the nineteenth century and may have derived from the same wall.¹⁰² It may well be the case, therefore, that after the Megarians had stopped using this wall as the publication place for proxeny decrees, they continued to exploit the capital it offered by inscribing lists of minor civic honorands. Certainly this would be in tune with the economy of Megarian public epigraphy and with the practice at Aegosthena. There is other evidence of the reuse of the wall for other purposes: one of the proxeny decrees (*IG* VII 10) bore, to its right, an apparently privately commissioned document relating to the establishment of a *temenos* and a festival for Poseidon at Aegosthena (*IG* VII 43).

It is necessary to address the possibility, however, that the Megarians usually published their proxeny decrees twice and what we possess are the archive copies (perhaps those on an *exedra*),¹⁰³ rather than the stelae 'at the Olympieum' referred to in the texts. It is the case, after all, that at Oropus and other places a stele containing a detailed decree could complement the publication of a decree also inscribed on a recycled statue base (*I Oropos* 33–4).¹⁰⁴ Moreover, two of our documents, those for Cleon and Philon the sons of Cleon of Erythrae, appear to command dual publication:

The *grammateus* is to write up this *dogma* on a stele and set it up at the Olympieum, and to write him up also on the stele where the other *proxenoi* are written up.¹⁰⁵

However, there is no reason to believe that the first stele here referred to is anything other than the block upon which these words survive, and there is no good reason to believe that the second publication referred to anything more than a list of *proxenoi* and their ethnics, the likes of which existed in Delphi, Chios and other Greek cities.¹⁰⁶

Inscribing 'at the Olympieum' suggests that the Megarian process of publishing decrees used both the honorific capital, as well as the economy, of an already existing structure.¹⁰⁷ The Megarian decision to use the wall of the Olympieum as a place to

¹⁰⁰ This is the kind of context in which the Megarians may have set up also the sculptural group representing Alexander and Hephaestion which is said by Stewart to have derived from Megara. On this sculptural group, see A. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics* (Berkeley, 1993), 116–21, 438–9.

¹⁰¹ P. Monceaux, *Les proxénies grecques* (Paris, 1886), 166 mentioned a decree (which I have been unable to identify) for judges from Megara which was to be written up 'ἐν τει ξενίῳ', at a *xenion*, or hotel.

¹⁰² *IG* VII 27–32 are ephebic documents published on two stones.

¹⁰³ As Kaloyeropoulou (n. 95), 144 suggests.

¹⁰⁴ See J. Ma, 'Hellenistic honorific statues and their inscriptions', in Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby, *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 2007), 203–20, at 216–9.

¹⁰⁵ *IG* VII 5.10–14 (cf. 6.14–15): ἀγγράψαι] δὲ τὸ δόγμα τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δάμου [ἐν στάλα καὶ] ἀνθέμεν εἰς τὸ 'Ολυμπιεόν, ἀγγράψαι δὲ αὐτόγ καὶ εἰς στάλαν ἐνθαπερ καὶ οἱ [ἄλλοι πρόξενοι.

¹⁰⁶ References to central lists of proxeny decrees in abbreviated form by M. Hansen and T. Nielsen (n. 87). 100. Note also the *exedra* at Delphi: *FD* III IV 427 (with reconstruction at *BCH* 73 [1949] pl. v) listing proxeny decrees in an abbreviated form and a chronological list of *proxenoi* (*SGDI* 2581 of the second century B.C.; cf. Rhodes with Lewis [n. 4], 5–6).

¹⁰⁷ Iasus used the same device to heighten the honour of an honorific decree: *I Iasos* 85 was carved on a wall, probably that of their *bouleutêrion*.

honour their benefactors did not provoke the publication of free-standing decrees or laws.¹⁰⁸ Indeed the only decree of Megara of the Hellenistic period which definitely appears to have been published on a free-standing stela of its own in the Hellenistic period was a third-century proxeny award for Anchierus of Boeotia set up in the nearby Artemisium.¹⁰⁹ Of course, as far as proxeny decrees are concerned, this is in resounding contrast to the decree habits of Athens and Eretria, where *proxenoi* usually were granted their own stela even in the second century B.C.¹¹⁰ The location of the documents implies manipulation of religious space, the nature of which is sharpened by comparisons from other Greek states. Priene is one example of a community that tied together sacred and documentary space most closely when, in the early third century, she started to write up present and past decrees of the city and edicts of the monarchs on the *anta* and sidewall of the front end of the temple of Athena Polias.¹¹¹ While the decrees of Athens were most frequently set up, as the words of their publication clauses stated, *en têi akropolei*, inside the sacred area that was the Acropolis,¹¹² the proxeny decrees of Megara were written up on a wall of the Olympieum. Sacred space is being used in a comparable way, to heighten either the value of the honours bestowed or the impact of their publication for the image of the city, but the Megarians do this by inscribing the honours precisely on the boundaries of that sacred space.

By inscribing decrees for their benefactors on a wall and depriving them of free-standing stelae, the Megarians have transformed, and indeed made mundane, what at least in Athens and Eretria was a specialist and honorific transaction. The documents do not jostle for space like free-standing Athenian stelae but are piled up, proclaiming to the reader the generosity of the city and its adherence to normative expressions of interstate relations while also warning of the extent of its network of

¹⁰⁸ For the same suggestion, *mutatis mutandis*, in the consideration of the spatialization of the ancient statue habit – that the erection of statues attracts the erection of more statues, see J. Ma, ‘Observations on honorific statues at Oropos (and elsewhere)’, *ZPE* 160 (2006), 89–96.

¹⁰⁹ The decree published at *RA* (1917) is a fragment on stone too thick to have been a stela (*RA* [1917], 49 n. 2). *IG* VII appears to have described stelae as ‘tabulae’, meaning that *IG* VII 19 (honours for a judge) may have been published originally thus. Other decrees found at Megara on stelae include one of the Roman period (*IG* VII 18), and those of other cities: *IG* VII 20 (decree of Tanagra) and 21 (decree of Orchomenus) may have been published on stelae.

¹¹⁰ For illustrations of fourth-century Athenian proxeny decrees, see E. Culasso Gastaldi, *Le prossenie ateniesi del IV secolo a. C.* (Alessandria, 2004). Most inscribed Athenian decrees for foreigners were written on stelae: see S. Lambert, ‘Athenian state laws and decrees 352/1–322/1: III Decrees honouring foreigners’, *ZPE* 158 (2006), 115–58 at 117. The Athenians did however use objects other than stelae when honouring their own citizens: the block containing *SEG* 28.52 probably formed part of a larger construction. Note also *Ag.* 15.44, a prytany dedication of Antiochus of 334/2, composed of a thin block superimposed upon a large base; *Ag.* 15.72, the bouleutic list of 281/0, stood as a large three-block monument; *Ag.* 15.221 and 222 are inscribed on recycled *klêrotêria*; *IG* II² 223 was a dossier of decrees inscribed on a base. The vast majority of Eretrian proxeny decrees were published on free-standing stelae: D. Knoepfler, *Décrets érétréens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Eretria: fouilles et recherches, 11 (Lausanne, 2001), 426–7.

¹¹¹ S. Sherwin-White, ‘Ancient archives: the edict of Alexander to Priene, a reappraisal’, *JHS* 105 (1985), 69–89, at 70. Drerius (ML 2) is another good example of the use of a containing wall as a place of publication; see also A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Vienna, 1909), 264–71, Jeffery (n. 30), 55, and now H. van Effenterre and M. van Effenterre, ‘Ecrire sur les murs’ in H.-J. Gehrke (ed.), *Rechtskodifizierung und soziale Normen im interkulturellen Vergleich* (Tübingen, 1994), 87–96.

¹¹² See P. Liddel, ‘The places of publication of Athenian state decrees from the fifth century BC to the third century AD’ *ZPE* 143 (2003), 79–93.

friends and benefactors. The worthiness of the benefactor is rather underplayed: one might compare the quietness of these decrees with the proclamation ordered by a Megarian decree of the Roman period, which says that the benefactor is to be announced at all the games in which the city partakes (*IG VII* 18.20–5) and that his statue and decree are to be set up at the most prominent place in the city (*IG VII* 18.17–18, 27–8) or the early second-century decree of Orchomenus deriving from Megara, set up at the ‘most prominent place in the agora’ (*IG VII* 21.29), which arranges for a proclamation of the decree at the Dionysia (*IG VII* 21.34–41). At Megara, serial publication of decrees allowed the city to accrue capital at the expense of the honorand: the honorand’s name would be lost in a mass of honours for others, but the city would profit.

But maybe, following an Athenian tradition, this is unfair to the Megarians?¹¹³ A very different reading of the Megarian inscribing policy might say that writing a decree on a wall adds a higher degree of permanency to an inscribed enactment: whereas a stele can be demolished or easily thrown down a well, or even turned to face a wall when its display becomes politically inconvenient (Plutarch, *Life of Pericles* 30.1), it is harder to do that to the blocks of a wall, especially one which clearly, in the case of the Olympieum, has both monumental and religious connotations.¹¹⁴ Indeed, while it is possible to delete the words of an inscription on such a wall, the ancient Greek method of erasure (chiselling away at the obsolete text) made it more difficult to erase the memory of the inscription having been there.

Nevertheless, the Megarians’ proxeny habits fit into a broader pattern of the documentary activity of smaller cities. The habit of publishing proxeny decrees on a wall was anticipated at the city of Arcesine on Amorgos: according to the editor of *IG XII*, they were inscribed on the walls of the Heraeum (*IG XII* 7.8–11); the economy of publication in Megara matches both the Aegosthenitan decision to cram one stone with multiple proxeny awards and also the practice at Tanagra, which suddenly appears to have started inscribing proxeny decrees in 245 B.C. as a response to the reconfiguration of power in central Greece after the defeat of the Boeotian League in 245 B.C. (Plutarch, *Life of Aratus* 16; Polybius 20.4.5).¹¹⁵ Moreover, if we look beyond the publication of proxeny awards, the habit of writing state ordinances on walls is known from more prolific cities, in shape of the wall of the Stoa Basileus in the Athenian agora, or the inscribed law codes of Drerus (ML 2) or Gortyn (ML 41), or the wall containing the edicts of Alexander at Priene.¹¹⁶

My final section relates to the question of why the Megarians were so slow to use epigraphy for the publication of decrees. The possibility that this has something to do with the oligarchic nature of their *polis* institutions has already been raised. But there are other potential explanations: one is a lack of good marble or ready supplies of stone of the standard required for a state ordinance. Pausanias reports on the shelly stone of Megara (1.44.9). But one only has to look as far as the monument for Lacles (see n. 36) and the fifth-century casualty list (*SEG* 39.411) to see that the Megarians

¹¹³ On Athenian stereotypes of Megara and the Megarians and their link to Athenian imperial ideology, see M. Florence, ‘Wild neighbours: Megarian ethnic identity in fifth-century Athenian comedy’, *Syllecta Classica* 14 (2003), 37–58.

¹¹⁴ Note that it has recently been suggested that the Greek impulse was to preserve treaties not in force: see S. Bolmarcich, ‘The afterlife of a treaty’, *CQ* 57 (2007), 477–89.

¹¹⁵ J. Fossey, ‘Τὰ Ψηφίσματα Προξενίας τῆς Τανάγρας’, in J. Fossey (ed.), *Epigraphica Boiotica I* (Amsterdam, 1991), 27–43.

¹¹⁶ Sherwin-White (n. 111).

were able to find good-quality stone when they wanted it. And so it is necessary to think beyond mere practicalities when explaining the Megarian decree habit.

GEO-POLITICAL CONTEXTS

Given both her geographical proximity to Attica, and the appearance of Megarian interests in inscribed Athenian decrees of the fifth and fourth centuries,¹¹⁷ the paucity of inscribed enactments in Megara cannot be explained by ignorance of other communities' publication habits. The thrift of the Megarians' publication on the walls of the Olympieum suggests an economic aspect to the question: the inscription of decrees was expensive even in Athens, with cutters' fees of between 30 and 50 *drachmai* reported in the last quarter of the fourth century.¹¹⁸ It may have been a question of entrenched administrative habit rather than outright poverty: Megara's financial administration may not have set aside a budget for the publication of inscriptions,¹¹⁹ and indeed none of the proxeny decrees state anything to suggest arrangements for payment of inscribing costs.¹²⁰

In the first place it is necessary to recall the wider political culture of other Peloponnesian and central Greek communities. As noted above, the absence of epigraphical tendency in Megarian legislative culture makes her political culture appear to have more in common with the *poleis* of the Peloponnese (excluding the Argolid and Elis) and central Greece than those of Athens or the Attic demes. Until its dissolution in 366, Megara was a member of the Peloponnesian League. While that organization is not always thought of as one with the primary intention of interference in the internal structures of its members,¹²¹ it is significant that, as was noted above, many members were reluctant to publish their enactments on stone. The Arcadians appear to have increased their rate of epigraphical publication after the disintegration of the League in the 360s (*IPArk* 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 17).¹²² Perhaps it was the case that membership of that organization precluded the necessity of having to cultivate friendships abroad through the epigraphic medium of alliances or honours? Alternatively, epigraphical quietness may also suggest that many states of the Peloponnese found it difficult to formulate an independent foreign policy of any meaningful kind: this condition would have been magnified in the case of Megara, a state sandwiched between Athens to the east and the Sparta-dominated Peloponnesian League to its south-west. On the other hand, it may have been a question of

¹¹⁷ See e.g. the decree about the sacred *orgas* (RO 58); or a fourth-century honorific decree for Megarians: *IG* II² 231 with S. Lambert, 'The only extant decree of Demosthenes', *ZPE* 137 (2003), 55–68; Megarian citizens were appointed *proxenoi* by Athens (*SEG* 40.57) and by Delphi in the fourth century (*FD* III.1.1612).

¹¹⁸ This probably represented the cutter's fees alone and not the costs of the marble as W. Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 164 suggests. Other cities may have been more costly: at Delos one cutter was paid a total of 100 drachmas at one drachma per 300 letters (*ID* 161 with Hamilton [n. 27], 2).

¹¹⁹ This explanation would have been attractive to those fourth-century Athenians who claimed that the Megarians were stingy: K. Kapparis, *Apollodoros Against Neaira* [*D.59*] (Berlin and New York, 2001), 243.

¹²⁰ Arrangements for payment are accounted for in the Aegosthenitan decree (*IG* VII 213.23–5) and the Orchomenian decree from Megara (*IG* VII 21.29–30).

¹²¹ G. de Ste Croix (n. 5), 101–21.

¹²² It is just possible that the fifth-century publications of Tegea (*IPArk* 1, 2) may coincide with Tegea's secession from the League in the period 479–65: see T.H. Nielsen, *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Göttingen, 2002), 395. However, this does not explain two Mantinean documents at around the same time: see *IPArk* 6, 7 with Nielsen, 389.

identity: the decision of Megarian public administration not to inscribe on stone may be seen as a public statement of distinctiveness from Athenian political culture and alignment with what was the norm in the Peloponnese.

For the fullest conclusion it is necessary to return to the changing political world of the Greek mainland in the early Hellenistic period. There is adequate evidence from epigraphy (*Ag.* 16.122, a decree for Adeimantus of Lampsacus), and literary sources (Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius* 10 and Diodorus Siculus 20.46) that the Athenian response to Demetrius Poliorcetes, and indeed to later Antigonids, was heavily reliant on enacting and publishing honorific decrees for them and their supporters; the hyperactivity of the assembly is suggested in the rash of surviving inscribed honorific decrees after 307 B.C.¹²³ Athens was joined by the Eretrians, who published a decree for Adeimantus (*IG* XII 9.198) and also enacted commemoration of Antigonid liberation at the Dionysia (*IG* XII 9.192); the fact that 23 of the 55 known proxeny decrees of Eretria of the period 430 to 150 are concentrated in the period of Demetrius Poliorcetes from 310 to 285 suggests the epigraphical blossoming of the honorific culture of that city in that period.¹²⁴

But whereas in Eretria and Athens the onset of the Antigonids gave rise to an acceleration in a publication habit which had started with the beginnings of democracy in the late sixth century, among the Megarians it appears to have introduced a new (albeit short-lived) epigraphical aspect to their decree culture. It appears to have led them to adapt, for probably a short time, an honorific response to the friends of the Hellenistic king on a par with that of the Athenians and Eretrians. This brief flourish made Megara's epigraphic habit seem strikingly unlike those of her Peloponnesian neighbours, and briefly she resembled Athens (or other producers of proxeny decrees, such as Oropus, Eretria or the Boeotian League): epigraphical quietness was the norm in the Peloponnese, and publication would have made the Megarians stand out.¹²⁵ Boeotian Tanagra in the second half of the third century (see above and n. 115) offers another example of a community which went through a brief period of publication which was out of tune with the earlier habits of itself and its neighbours.

In the same way as the ascendancy of Alexander over the Greek world led the Megarians to break with tradition and to grant citizenship to a foreigner, Antigonid power led them to use the epigraphical medium for proxeny decrees. Epigraphy in Megara was politicized and introduced to the honorific sphere in a flourish as never before in response to a great shift among the great powers of the day. This follows a broader pattern of epigraphic publication accelerating in response to power shifts: in the *polis* of Arcesine on Amorgos, the marriage of the honorific and the epigraphical culture happened in the mid fourth century, as a response to the agents of the second Athenian confederacy (*IG* XII 7.5).

¹²³ See I. Kralli, 'Athens and the Hellenistic kings (338–261 B.C.): the language of the decrees', *CQ* 50 (2000), 113–32. Rash of decrees: see S. Tracy, 'Athenian politicians and inscriptions of the years 307–302', *Hesperia* 69 (2000), 227–33. Plutarch may have been aware of prolific decree culture of Athens under the Antigonids when he commented in his life of Demetrius that honorific decrees might reflect an underlying hatred of an honorand (Plut. *Dem.* 30).

¹²⁴ Knoepfler (n. 108), 147–8, noting that Eretria, like Athens, tried to impress Demetrius with honours. For a comprehensive study of the honours passed by Greek cities for Hellenistic rulers, see Kotsidu (n. 44).

¹²⁵ The spate of publication means that Megara is among the most prolific Peloponnesian producers of proxeny decrees: see Marek (n. 44), 25.

Regardless of their attempts at emulation, the epigraphy of Megarian decree culture, however, bears striking differences from that of Athens or Eretria particularly in the absence of named proposers, and the muted and serialized presentation of the decrees. It is also significant that, beyond this particular set of proxeny decrees, Megara never became a prolific inscriber of its enactments: in the period of Roman domination, the Megarians honoured benefactors by setting up statue bases, not stelae recording honorific decrees.¹²⁶ The fragmentary record of decrees from the second century B.C. (see Table 1) suggests that this short burst of publications at the Olympieum did not provoke the further publication of decrees on any form of stone. The habit of inscribing decrees becomes rare again after the encounter with the Antigonids:¹²⁷ the flourish of epigraphical publication was periodic, not habitual. In this, she once again resembled Tanagra in the second half of the third century.

This brings us to the conclusion that the political culture and, more specifically, the decree culture of Megara underwent a change as a result of power shifts at a higher level: that shift was the arrival of Macedonian monarchy and the eclipse of the *polis*. This would not have the same transformative implications for Megara as it would have had for a once powerful and influential city like Athens; indeed, the archaeological evidence suggests that the number of sites in the Megarid remained roughly constant between the Classical and Hellenistic periods.¹²⁸ As Smith points out, Megara's position as a route hub and a commercial centre may have meant that she maintained her significance and prosperity in the Hellenistic period.¹²⁹ But it is clear that there was something about the onset of Hellenistic monarchy that made the Megarians feel that it necessitated the publication of transactions with representatives of monarchical power: perhaps it was a feeling that external powers would pay attention to a state who honoured its benefactors publicly in religious spaces; perhaps it was a desire to imitate Athenian methods of diplomacy now that their perennial rivalry with that state had become obsolete. This conclusion (and that which was drawn earlier on Aegosthena) would certainly militate against Shipley's recent suggestion that the continuity of epigraphical publication in the Hellenistic Peloponnese illustrates that local politics were not disrupted by external developments.¹³⁰ As we have seen, Megarian epigraphical publication suggests not the continuity of *polis* traditions and institutions but a temporary reconfiguration of their decree culture which might even have reflected a heightened public awareness of political institutions and an opening out of political culture: changes in publishing and honorific habits may have gone hand in hand with changes in political culture.

It is clear that the Megarians, by starting to publish honorific decrees on stone, were doing their best to use the epigraphical medium to make friends in a world where the medium-sized *polis* had little or no diplomatic leverage. But the explosion of published decrees in Megara also suggests that a feeling for localism was alive in an age when broader forces reduced the significance of the *polis*. Perhaps, therefore, the

¹²⁶ See Smith (n. 40), 133.

¹²⁷ For Megarian decrees of the Roman era and beyond, see n. 59.

¹²⁸ According to Smith (n. 40), 80, the number of sites increased from 42 to 43 between the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

¹²⁹ Smith (n. 40), 133. Megara's considerable involvement in interstate arbitration may also suggest her continued significance in the eyes of others during the Hellenistic period. See Smith (n. 40), 145 and Ager (n. 81), 281 n. 3.

¹³⁰ Shipley (n. 24), 330.

emergence of an honorific decree culture in this city may be indicative of a reformulation of local political identity across the Greek world at a time when its viability and significance were freshly and seriously undermined.

University of Manchester

PETER LIDDEL
peter.liddel@manchester.ac.uk