FROM THE COAST OF IONIA TO MOUNT ATHOS

Decrees from Iasos in the Royal Library in Copenhagen and the archives of the Monastery of Xeropotamou

By the end of the 18th century inscriptions with decrees from the city of Iasos were known to have ended up in Chios, the reason being that such marbles were a favourite ballast for ships.¹ These decrees were initially discovered by the antiquarian Richard Chandler² who, funded by the Society of Dilettanti³ and accompanied by architect Nicholas Revett and painter William Pars, spent the years 1764–1766 travelling in ancient Ionia to look for antiquities. While in Chios (5–18 September 1764),⁴ he found abandoned on the shore near the capital three stones brought in this way from the Asian mainland. These three blocks of marble were, in his opinion, part of a pilaster from the boulē at Iasos, and inscribed on them were ten proxeny decrees.⁵ Chandler published those decrees, together with the rest of his harvest from the island, in 1774.⁶ This edition served as the foundation for the subsequent editor Augustus Böckh, who published them in the second volume of his Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (1843),⁷ and the last editor of the repertorium of inscriptions from Iasos, Wolfgang Blümel, who included them in the series Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien (1985).⁸ Chandler’s text was also used by editors of isolated inscriptions

---


² See R. Chandler, Inscriptiones antiquae, pleraeque nondum editae in Asia Minori et Graecia. Praesertim Athenis collectae cum Appendice, Oxonii 1774 (hereafter: Chandler, Inscriptiones) and idem, Travels in Asia Minor and Greece: or an account of a tour made at the expense of the society of Dilettanti, London 1817 vol. 1, 61 and 211.


⁴ For Chandler’s time in Chios see R. Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor and Greece, op. cit., 57–59, 62–63 and 89.

⁵ See Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor and Greece, op. cit., 61 and 211.

⁶ See Chandler, Inscriptiones 22–25 nos LXIX–LXI. Block LXIX was inscribed on three sides with two decrees on the second. Block L contained two decrees. Block LXI was also inscribed on three sides, again with two decrees on the second.


⁸ See Ι.Ιasos nos 30–33, 38–39, 41, 44–46. The inscriptions corresponding to each block are: Block A: Chandler, Inscriptiones LXIX 1 = CIG 2672 = Ι.Ιasos 30; Chandler, Inscriptiones LIX 2 ll. 1–4 = CIG 2673 a = Ι.Ιasos 44; Chandler, Inscriptiones LIX 2 ll. 5–14 = CIG 2673 b = Ι.Ιasos 45; LIX 3 = CIG 2674 = Ι.Ιasos 41. Block B: Chandler, Inscriptiones LXX 1. 1–5 = CIG 2675 a = Ι.Ιasos 31; Chandler, Inscriptiones LXII 6–14 = CIG 2675 b = Ι.Ιasos 32. Block C: Chandler, Inscriptiones LXI 1 = CIG 2676 = Ι.Ιasos 33; Chandler, Inscriptiones LXI 2 ll. 1–7 = CIG 2677 a = Ι.Ιasos 38; Chandler, Inscriptiones LXI 2 ll. 8–13 = CIG 2677 b = Ι.Ιasos 39; Chandler, Inscriptiones LXI 3 = CIG 2678 = Ι.Ιasos 46.
from the three blocks, including Louis Robert,9 A. J. Heisserer10 and most recently Roberta Fabiani.11

However, while the texts of the decrees may have found their due place in the corpora, the same is not true of the stones; they endured a long and unanticipated journey, and had their own unfortunate fate, as we shall see. The story begins in the same year that Chandler found them. A few weeks before he came to Chios, and specifically on July 25, a scholarly monk from the Athonite monastery of Xeropotamou named Kaisarios Dapontes came to the island with a fragment of the Holy Cross on a mission to collect money for the construction of the monastery’s new church.12 Dapontes remained in Chios until December 4, when he removed to Samos. He returned to Chios on May 9, 1765, and four months later (September 11) to Mount Athos, as he records in his poetic work Garden of Graces.13 The details of his travels are also known to us from surviving registers and other archival material in the archives of the Monastery of Xeropotamou: thus, for example, in register number 6, recording his expenditures in Chios (f. 6r), Dapontes notes among other things an outlay of 4 piastres for “three marbles with old Greek writing which I sent to the monastery” [4 γρ(όσια): εἰς τρία μάρμαρα μὲ γράμματα ἑλληνικὰ παλαιὰ τὰ ὁποία τὰ ἁπελίες εἰς τὸ μοναστήρι] (see photo no. 1).14 Plainly, Dapontes is referring here to the three blocks that Chandler found.

Thirty-six years would go by before we hear anything more of Dapontes’ marbles. On April 15, 1801, Joseph Dacre Carlyle (1759–1804) and Philip Hunt (1772–1838) visited the Monastery of Xeropotamou.15 Carlyle noted in his diary that while they were waiting at the monastery’s boat-yard for the mules that would take them to the monastery they saw the remains of an ancient Greek inscription. Although they were unable, due to its poor condition, to determine where it came from, they concluded that it had been transported there from a distance. Carlyle’s information was confirmed some years later (1819), with considerable extra detail, by Philip Hunt, who noted that in the harbour (i.e. the monastery boatyard) there was a fragment of Parian marble with an inscription containing a decree of the council and assembly of Iasos in Asia Mi-

---

9 See L. Robert, Sur les inscriptions de Theangela, Ant. Class. 4 (1935) 167–168 (these are Chandler, Inscriptiones LX II 6–14 = CIG 2675 b = I.Iasos 32 and Chandler, Inscriptiones LXI 1 = CIG 2676 = I. Iasos 33). See also idem, Collection Froehner. I Inscriptions grecques, Paris 1936, 75–76, which is essentially a reprise of the preceding article.
12 For the so-called zeteia on which Kaisarios Dapontes was engaged, see M. Πολυβίου, Ἡ ζητεία τοῦ Καισαρίου Δαπόντε γιὰ τὴν ἀνοικοδόμηση τοῦ Καθολικοῦ τῆς μονῆς Ξηροποτάμου, Κληρονομία 24 (1992) [1994] 1803–203.
13 Γ. Σαββίδης (ed.), Κήπος Χαρίτων: τοὐτέστι Βιβλίον περιέχον τὴν περίοδον τοῦ Τιμίου Ἑλίου τοῦ Ἰωσοπού Σταυροῦ, τοῦ ἐν τῇ Ιερᾶ καὶ βασιλικῆ Μονῆ τοῦ Ξηροποτάμου, τῆς οὔσῃ ἐν τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ Ὄρει τοῦ Ἀθωνος καὶ ἄλλα διάφορα. Συντεθέντα παρὰ Κωνσταντίνου Δαπόντε τοῦ μετονομασθέντος Κωνσταντίνου Δαπόντε, Athens 1995, 133 ll. 63–64, 186 ll. 335–337, 195 ll. 1–10 and 427.
14 Π. Γουναρίδης, Ἀρχείο τῆς Ἱ.Μονῆς Ξηροποτάμου. Ἐπιτομὲς μεταβυζαντινῶν ἑγγράφων (Ἁθωνικὰ σύμμεικτα 5), Athens 1993 codex 6.
15 They had arrived on Mount Athos on March 3, 1801, see The Library Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres etc. no. 53 (Saturday 3.1.1818) 51 b. For their journey to Mount Athos see A. Angelou, J. D. Carlyle’s Journal of Mount Athos (1801), Έρειντιστ 3 (1965) 33–75, here 57–58, and E. Λίτσας, Η βιβλιοθήκη και τα χειρόγραφα της μονῆς Ξηροποτάμου (Β΄ έκδ.), Τεκμήριον 10 (2012) 130 n. 26.
nor, voting privileges for some benefactors.\textsuperscript{16} This information about one stone raises questions as to the fate of Dapontes’ other two marbles, all the more so since the two men were just as interested in the monastery’s antiquities as its manuscripts.\textsuperscript{17} The most likely explanation, based on what we know of the stones’ subsequent history, is that the other two blocks were stored somewhere separately and not in the boatyard.

Until the end of the 19th century the inscriptions from Iasos at the Monastery of Xeropotamou went largely unnoticed by scholars and visitors to Mount Athos; this was the case with Leake,\textsuperscript{18} Uspenskij,\textsuperscript{19} Kern,\textsuperscript{20} and Dimitsas.\textsuperscript{21} The one exception was Emmanuel Miller, the man who removed the \textit{Incantadas} from Thessaloniki.\textsuperscript{22} “Les moines du Mont Athos”, he wrote in an article published in the \textit{Revue Archéologique}, “vont chercher sur la côte de l’Asie Mineure des marbres épigraphiques pour leurs constructions. En 1863, pendant que je me trouvais dans le couvent de Xéropotami, j’ai vu entre les mains des maçons quatre beaux marbres épigraphiques provenant d’Iasos, sur la côte de Carie: se sont ceux qui figurent dans le recueil de Boeckh sous les no 2672–2675. Ils font aujourd’hui partie d’une construction de Xéropotami”.\textsuperscript{23} While this information is inaccurate\textsuperscript{24} as regards both the origin and the number of the stones, it is nonetheless interesting to learn that he saw masons using the marbles from Iasos in a monastery building.

Miller’s information has now been partially confirmed thanks to new archival finds relating to the work of the Danish archaeologist and philologist Karl Frederick Kinch on Mount Athos twenty-two years after Miller’s visit there. Kinch (1853–1921) was one of the few archaeologists to work in Ottoman Macedonia in the final decades of the 19th century, and particularly between 1885–1893, when he made five research trips to the region. While his name is associated primarily with the discovery and revealing of the Kinch Tomb at Naoussa and the publication and interpretation of the Arch of Galerius in Thessaloniki,\textsuperscript{25} he also visited monasteries on Mount Athos in November 1885, where he copied ancient Greek inscriptions that he found


\textsuperscript{17} This is clear from the fact that they spotted the carved stones in the masonry of the monastery buildings, see Angelou, J. D. Carlyle’s \textit{Journal}, op. cit., 58.

\textsuperscript{18} W. M. Leake, \textit{Travels in Northern Greece}, London 1835, vol. 3.

\textsuperscript{19} P. Uspenskij, \textit{Istoria Afous. I Afom juzyčeskij}, Kiev 1877.


\textsuperscript{21} М. Δήμιτρος, Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φθεγγομένοις καὶ ἐν μνημείοις σωζόμενοις, Athens 1896, 633–641.

\textsuperscript{22} For Em. Miller and his mission for Napoleon III in Macedonia see Απ. Βακαλόπουλος, Ένας Γάλλος Ἐλγίν στη Θεσσαλονίκη: νέες μαρτυρίες για την ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης κατά τον περασμένο αιώνα, Μακεδονικά 25 (1985–1986) 24–32.

\textsuperscript{23} See Inscriptions grecques découvertes à Thasos, RA 37 (1879) 282–290, here 290.

\textsuperscript{24} G. Cousin – Ch. Diehl, \textit{Inscriptions de Iasos et de Bargyilia}, \textit{BCH} 13 (1889) 25 n. 2 also give incorrect information regarding the location of the stones, which they say were in the Monastery of Vatopedi.

\textsuperscript{25} For Kinch and his work see P. O. Juhel – Π. Μ. Νίγδελης, \textit{Un Danois en Macédoine à la fin du 19e siècle}, Thessaloniki (Μακεδονικά Επιγραφικά 1), Thessaloniki 2015, esp. 1–42. The book includes the text of 123 inscriptions, 47 of them previously unpublished, taken from transcriptions and notes in Kinch’s papers (Royal Library, Copenhagen).
there. Thus, on November 1, 1885, we find him in the Monastery of Esphigmenou and at the end of that month at Koutloumousiou (see below). Among his papers, which are preserved in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, are transcriptions of inscriptions from the monasteries of St Paul, Vatopedi and Great Lavra.

Kinch’s connection with the Monastery of Xeropotamou and the Iasos inscriptions has been demonstrated, as mentioned above, by new archival finds: from a note in his archive we learn that he stayed at the Monastery of Xeropotamou on November 14 and 15 (see photo no. 2). This stay is confirmed by a letter of his found in the Monastery’s archives and by two sheets of graph paper from his archive. The letter and the two sheets of graph paper contain transcriptions, in minuscule and majuscule lettering respectively, of the decrees from Iasos that were written on the blocks that Kaisarios Dapontes bought and transported to the monastery. While at the monastery, Kinch managed to persuade the monks to let him see and copy the inscriptions. On November 25 of the same year he wrote, now from the Monastery of Koutloumousiou, a brief letter of thanks to the fathers of the Monastery of Xeropotamou, where he transcribed “the most essential text of the inscriptions being kept in the Holy monastery of Xeropotamou and brought there from the city of Iasos in Caria” (τὸ οὐσιωδέστερον κείμενον τῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ μονῇ τοῦ Ἡσσιγμένου ὑπαρχούσων ἐπιγραφῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰασοῦ πόλεως τῆς Ἰάσων εἰς τὸ Ἁγίον Ὄρος μετενεχθεῖσον). The letter contained the texts of six inscriptions in minuscule transcription (see Appendix A and photos nr 4–5). This transcription was based on precise transcriptions produced in majuscule on the two sheets of graph paper (see Appendix B and photos nos 6–7). Together, the transcriptions in the letter and in the sheets of graph paper of the Royal Library in Copenhagen preserve eight of the ten decrees that Chandler transcribed. The transcriptions in the Royal Library are more complete, because they include all the decrees in the letter as well as three additional fragments (a–c) from two of the decrees on Chandler’s third block. The decrees from the two other blocks present identical losses (lines 7 ff.), which suggests to us that in 1885, when Kinch saw them, parts of them had been removed and used by the masons as building materials.

26 We already knew that Kinch had visited the monastery, but not precisely when. For his activity at the Monastery of Esphigmenou see P. Νίγδελης, Από την Ιστορία της Ακτής της Χαλκιδικής. Με αφορμή δύο επιγραφές των αυτοκρατορικών χρόνων, HORIZ 17–21 (2004–2009) 462–467, esp. 462, cf. Νίγδελης, in: Juhel–Νίγδελης, Un Danois en Macédoine, op. cit., catalogue of inscriptions no. 70. Taken together, the note “Esphigmenou 1 Nov. 1885” (see photo no. 3) in his archive and his letter to the fathers of the Monastery of Koutloumousiou dated 25 November (see photo nos 4–5) leave no doubt that Kinch spent November of 1885 in monasteries on Mount Athos. Consequently, the reservations expressed by P. Juhel, in: Juhel–Νίγδελης, Un Danois en Macédoine, op. cit., 5 as to Kinch’s whereabouts in November 1885 must be abandoned.


28 The letter was discovered in 2012 during the cataloguing of documents kept in the monastery’s modern (1807–1924) files.

29 The file was found by Pierre Juhel in the Royal Library in Copenhagen.

30 The superiors of the monastery in that year were: archimandrites Nathanael and Agathangelos, priors Philotheos, Nikodemos, Akakios and Gennadios, hierodeacon Eulogios and the prior and secretary of the monastery Eugenios. See indicatively Κώδικας Ληψοδοσίας 1883–1901 I. Μονής Ξηροποτάμου, 79–80.

31 He had done the same thing a few days earlier with the fathers of the Monastery of Esphigmenou, to whom he sent a transcription from an important sarcophagus in the monastery storehouse, see Νίγδελης, Από την Ιστορία της Ακτής της Χαλκιδικής, op. cit., 462–467, esp. 462.
stone. This tallies with what Miller reported, but we cannot exclude the possibility that some of the textual losses in Kinch’s transcriptions, compared to those of Chandler, may be due to the weathering of the stones between 1765 and 1885. The condition of the three marbles, two of which were stated to have been left at the monastery boatyard, confirms Carlyle’s information (see above).

Kinch was the last scholar to see the three blocks from Iasos; later visitors to the monastery, for example Smyrnakes,32 Avezou33 and Edson,34 were unaware of them. Louis Robert, on the other hand, who had published inscriptions from Iasos (including some from Chandler’s blocks), was spurred by Miller’s account to look for the inscriptions, first alone (in June 1932) and later with the assistance of L. Lemerle (in 1934), but was unsuccessful.35 Our own efforts were equally ineffective. It is quite possible that whatever remained in 1863 was used as building stone in 1888 when the west wing of the monastery, which had been destroyed by fire, was repaired36 (today, ten or so blocks of white marble can be seen in the lintels on the inner side of the first floor) or during other construction work, as often occurred with new building construction on Mount Athos, when material from older buildings was re-used.37 It is also quite possible, however, that they were removed from the monastery in some other way.

In Appendix A below we publish the text of the letter (from the archives of the Monastery of Xeropotamou), and in Appendix B our proposed transcription, in minuscule, of the text of the decrees from Iasos, based on the transcription in the Royal Library in Copenhagen and following the numbering of the inscriptions in the letter. To Appendix B we also add an apparatus criticus with all the readings. The paper concludes with a commentary on inscriptions I.Iasos 41 (= no. 3 in the letter) and I.Iasos 30 (= no. 4 in the letter) based on the new readings made possible by Kinch’s transcriptions.

32 See Γ. Σμυρνάκης, Τὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος, Athens 1903, 7–16 and 542–552
34 The inscriptions known to him at that time (1936) from that and other Athonite monasteries are recorded in his Notebooks, which are now kept in the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study and in the Inscriptiones Graecae of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Edson’s bibliographical update was based on the schedae that were given to him by the department of Inscriptiones Graecae of the then Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin. Charles Edson visited the monastery on 12 December 1937, looking for an inscription that C. Franke had seen there in 1888 (or 1899), but was unsuccessful. See Π. Νιγδέλης, Προετοιμάζοντας το corpus της Μακεδονίας: ένα επιγραφικό ταξίδι του Charles Edson στο Άγιο Όρος, in: Σ. Αθανασιάδης – Χρ. Χειλάς (eds), Η ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὅρει Ἄθως, ή αγία, βασιλική, πατριαρχικὴ καὶ σταυροπηγικὴ σεβασμία μονὴ τοῦ Ξηροποτάμου (424–1925), Thessaloniki 19712, 126.
Ἐν Κουτλουμοσίῳ 25.11.1885
Σεβασμιώτατοι κύριοι.
Τὸ οὐσιωδέστερον κείμενον τῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ μονῇ τοῦ Ξηροποτάμου ὑπάρχουσῶν ἐπιγραφῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰασοῦ πόλεως τῆς Καρίας εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος μετενεχθεισῶν ἔχει ὡς ἑξῆς:

1. ἐπεστάτει, Διονυσόδωρος Ἰατροκλέους ἐγραμμάτευεν, ἐδόξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἰατροκλέους εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Εὐπόλεμος Πωτάτου Μακεδὼν ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς ἔστιν περὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἰασέων καὶ πολλοίς τῶι πολιτῶι εὐθύμως χρείας παρέσχηται, ἐπηνηθάν [τῷ [αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ [δῆμου καὶ εἶναι Εὐπόλεμον [παραστάτη] καὶ εὐεργέτη] τῆς [πόλεως τῆς Ἰασέων]

2. ὑπάρχειν δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοις αὐτοῦ, ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἀεὶ τοὺς ἐστῶτας· τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγραφῆναι εἰς παραστάδα, ἐπιμεληθῆναι δὲ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τὸν νεωποίην.

3. Ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἡγύλλου τοῦ Θεοδώρου, μηνὸς Ἡπεροδίου μετὰ Υδαλλίου, ἐγραμμάτευεν, πρυτανο ... ἐπειδὴ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Λεοντίσιος καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡραίου ...όνιοι ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ Μιννίων Θεοδότου[ι]

4. Ῥογὸς καὶ Μιννίων Θεοδότο[ι] καὶ Κάγαθοι ἐγενέσθαι

---

38 The letter is written in blue ink with a fine nib on slightly brownish graph paper measuring 258 x 200 mm (written surface 232 x 175 mm on f. 1r and 225 x 170 mm on f. 1v). The hand is squarish, neat, sloping to the right. The number 115 is written in pencil in a modern hand in the upper right-hand corner (from the numbering of the sheets in the file) and below that in [ ] (also in pencil, but in another hand) the current serial number 1348. It is preserved in file 50 ε, sub-file 1.
περὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πολιτῶν ἰδίᾳ εὖ πεποιήκασιν καὶ ύπέρ τῆς μικρῆς 
θαλάσσης διαλεχθέντες

5

πρόξενον καὶ πολίτην, μετέχειν δὲ πάντων, ὅτι καὶ άλλοι πολίται μετέχουν, εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς
[άγ]λοιν πάσην καὶ ἀτέλειαν, ὅτι ἢ πόλις κυρία ἐστίν, καὶ εἰς πλοῦν καὶ ἐπὶ πλοῦν, ὧν καὶ ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ
[ψήφισμα τόδε] Πάντα ταῦτα οὖν ψηφίσματα προξενείας καὶ πολιτείας ἐστίν.

Δράττομαι τῆς εὐκαιρίας, ἵνα ἐκφράσω πάλιν τὸν μέγαν μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς σεβασμὸν καὶ τὴν εὐγνωμοσύνην μου διὰ τὴν ἐμοὶ παρ᾽ ὑμῖν εὐθύμως παρεσχημένη φιλοξενίαν.

Κ. Φ. Κίγκ

APPENDIX B

Det Kongelige Bibliotek, NSK 3256 III 4o. – File K. F. Kinch.

PAGINA I (= fig. 6)
Upper corner right-hand side (concerns inscription no. 1):
A. h(øjre) S(ide) | Bog(staverne) h(er) let indmejslede | Bogstaver, Linier (under?) | uden Krumning, krøller | Lidt krøllet, Kort, Bredde || ΠΝΜ. | Bredde 0,59 ½ Tykkelse 0,10 ¼. | Bog-
st(aver) højde 0,01 | Mellemrummet mell(em) Linierne lidt for | stort. || B h(øjre) S(ide)

[Α. right side. | Letters here lightly cut. | Letters, (lower?) strokes | unrounded, apices | slightly curly, narrow. || ΠΝΜ. | Width 0.59 ½ thickness 0.10 ¼. | Letter height 0.01. | Line space rather | large. || Β right side].

Middle right side (concerns inscription no. 2):
B. v(enstre) Side | Laengde 0.63, hvoraf 0.10 til v(enstre) | ubestrev | ne, optagne af en 1 ½ cm bred | Rand ||

[B. left side | Length 0.63, of which 0.10 on left | cannot be described, (the text) is written in a broad band 1 ½ cm39].

Lower corner left side (concerns inscription no. 3):
A. Front: mindre Bogst(aver) end B Front | ΠΑ | utydelig | Γ

[A. Front: Smaller letters than the those on B Front | ΠΑ | utydelig | Γ]

39 The last part of the note may concern the new text that emerged from Kinch’s transcription and not the text I. Iasos 41.
Lower corner right side (concerns inscription no. 6 fragment A):

Brudstykke, sam(m)e kalsten | L(aengde) 26 + 12. [Fragment, same limestone | L(ength) 26 +12].

1 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 24–25 no. LX vs. 6–14 = CIG 2675 b = I.Iasos 32.

επεστάτει, Διονυσόδωρος Ἰατροκλέους ἐγραμμάτευεν· ἔδοξεν τὴ βουλή καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἰατροκλέους εἶπεν· ἕπειδὴ ἕπολεμον Πιωτάλου Μακεδών ἄνηρ ἀγάθος ἐστιν περὶ τὴν Ἰασέων καὶ πολλοῖς τῶι πολιτῶι εὐθύμως χρείας παρέχεσθαι, ἐπηνήσθαι [τε αὐτῶι] ὑπὸ τοῦ [δήμου καὶ εἰναὶ ἕπολεμον] [πρὸξ[ν]οι καὶ [εὐερ]γέτην τῆς [πόλεως τῆς] Ἰασέων ἐπηνήσθαι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ πολι[τείαν] [----]

In apographo Kinchiano non exstant vs. 1–2 apographi Chandleriani. V. 3 ΠΩΤΑΛΟΥ lapis secundum Kinch, qui ΠΩΤΑΛΟΥ in epistula nr. 1 transcripsit || v. 4 [ἐ]στιν CIG et Liasos. TΩΝ Chandler, TΩΜ Kinch || v. 5 ΤΩΝ ΤΩΜ Chandler, [καὶ] εὐεργέτην τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἰασέων δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ πολι[τείαν] CIG et Liasos, [πόλεως τῆς] Ἰασέων .... Kinch epistula nr. 1.

2 vs. 1–4 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 22–24 no. LIX 2 vs. 1–4 = CIG 2673 a = I.Iasos 44 = Fabiani, Ricongiungimento, op. cit. (note 11) 380 = ead., Decr et 315 no. 15.

Vs. 5–6 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 22–24 no. LIX 2 vs. 5–6 = CIG 2673 b = I.Iasos 45.

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἡγύλλου τοῦ Θεοδώρου, μηνὸς Αφροδισιῶνος ἐκ ἑκατόν Κοίρας Μέλα

Vs. 1–4. V. 1 **ΙΔΗΝΚΑΙΔΗΛ************ΑΤΑ*ΡΑ Chandler, [βου]λὴν καὶ δή[μον πρῶτῳ μετ]ά τὰ [ι]ε[ρά, ὑπάρχειν δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τοῖς [ἐκ]-γόνοις αὐτοῦ, ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἀεὶ τοὺς [----]-τῶτας· τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγραφῆναι εἰς παραστάδα, ἐπ[ι]-

4 μεληθῆναι δὲ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῶν νεωποιοῦν.

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἡγύλλου τοῦ Θεοδώρου, μηνὸς Αφροδισιῶνος ἐκ ἑκατόν Κοίρας Μέλα

Vs. 5–7. V. 6 in fine ΜΕΛΑΙ lapis secundum Chandler, Μέλα[νος] CIG, Μέλα[νος] I.Iasos, ΜΕΛΑ lapis secundum Kinch, qui Μέλ in epistula nr. 2 transcripsit || In apographo Kinchiano non exstant vs. 7–14 apographi Chandleriani.

3 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 24 no. LIX 3 vs. 1–5 = CIG 2674 = I.Iasos 41 = Fabiani, Ricongiungimento, op. cit. (note 11) 376 = ead., Decr et 312 no. 8.

40 The reading εὐθύμως is supported by Kinch's transcription, but the expression εὐθύμως χρείας παρέχεσθαι τινι does not, as far as I know, occur in the inscriptions.
ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμα τόδε τοὺς νεωπόις εἰς ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ μετ' Ὑδαλλίονα μηνὸς Ἀφροδισιῶνος ἕκτῃ ἱσταμένου· ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ Δήμῳ Εὐκράτης Μένωνος ἐπεστάτει, Ἀριστέας Δημοκρίτου· ἐγραμμάτευεν, πρυτάνεων γνώμη· ἐπειδὴ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Διόδωρος καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡραίου ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ Κινχ legit, sed vestigia litterarum non transcripsit in epistula nr. 3. Ceteri edd. ignorant

|| v. 2 ΕΠΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΗΡΟΥΠΡΑΙΩΛΙΩΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ Chandler, ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπολλώνιου? τοῦ --- μηνὸς Ι.Ιασω| CIG, ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπολλώνιος τοῦ --- μηνὸς

|| v. 3 ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΚΤΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΥ Chandler, Ἀφροδισιῶνος ἕκτῃ ἱσταμένου· ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ Δήμῳ Ι.Ιασω| ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΚΤΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΗΡΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ

|| v. 4 ΔΗΜΩΙ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ Chandler, δήμῳ· Εὐκράτης Μένωνος ἐπεστάτει, Ἀριστέας Δημοκρίτου καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡραίου ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ Κινχ legit, sed vestigia litterarum non transcripsit in epistula nr. 3. Ceteri edd. ignorant

|| v. 5 ΕΠΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΗΡΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ Chandler, ἐγραμμάτευεν, πρυτάνεων γνώμη • ἐπειδὴ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Διόδωρος καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡραίου ἄνδρες καλοὶ in epistula nr. 3 legit || v. 6 ΕΡΜΑΜΑΤΕΥΕΝΙΨΥΡ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΥ Chandler, ἐγραμμάτευεν, πρυτάνεων γνώμη • ἐπειδὴ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Διόδωρος καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡραίου ἄνδρες καλοὶ in epistula nr. 3 legit || v. 7 ΕΡΜΑΜΑΤΕΥΕΝΙΨΥΡ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΥ

In apographo Kinchiano non existant vs. 6–8 apographi Chandleriani. De lectionibus Fabiani vide commentarium (Scholia).


5 = Chandler, *Inscriptiones* 25 no. LXI 2 vs. 1–7 = *CIG* 2677 a = *I. Iasos* 38.

[τα καιρὸν και κοινῆ περὶ πάντας τοὺς πολίτας εἶναι αὐτὸν πρόξενον και πολίτην μετέχοντα πάντων, ὡν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι [πολίται μετέχουσιν, εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ και προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν πᾶσιν καιροι εἰσπλοῦν καὶ ἔκπλουν καὶ ἐν εἰρήνηι καὶ ἐμ πολέμωι, ἀσυλεὶ καὶ ἀσπονδεί, ὑπάρχειν δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοις αὐτοῦ, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν νεωποίην ἐν τῇ παραστάδι πρὸ τοῦ ἀρχείου]

V. 1 KA**ΟΝΚΑΙΚΟΙΝΗΙΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΑΣΤΟΥΣΠΟΛΙΤΑΣ****ΑΥΤΟΝ Chandler, καικαιρον και κοινη περι παντως των πολιτων ειναι αυτων προξενον και πολιτην μεταχοντα παντων, ὧν καὶ οι άλλοι καιροι εισπλουν καὶ εεκπλουν καὶ εν ειρηνει καὶ εμ πολεμωι, ασυλει καὶ ασπονδει, ιαπαρχειν δε ταυτα και τοις εκγονοις αυτου, αναγραψαι δε το ψηφισμα τον νεωποιν εν τη παραστατι προ του αρχειου
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A

HΣΕΧΕΙΠΕΡΙΤ

TΗΝΥΙΟΔΗΜΟΤ

ΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΝΜΕΤΕΧΟΝΤΙΠΑΝΩΝ

4

ΝΑΙΔΕΑΥΤΙΚΑΙΕΙΣΠΙΟΥΝΚΑΙΕΚΓ

ΥΛΕΙΚΑΙΣ ΓΟΙ

C

ΔΕΤΑΥΤΑΚΙΟΙΣΕΙΤΟΙΟΙΟΙΣΑΙΝΕΙΩΠΙΑΣΤΟΨΗΦΙΣΜΑΕΝΤΗΙΑΓ


REMARKS

A) Inscription no. 3 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 24 no. LIX 3 vs. 5–14 = CIG 2674 = I.Iasos 41 = Fabiani, Ricongiungimento, op. cit. (note 11) 376.

Kinch’s transcription is more complete than Chandler’s, firstly because it permits the conclusion that this side of the block (Chandler LIX 2) contained another decree of which only the last line is extant: [ἀν]αγράψατε τί δὲ το ψήφισμα εἰς νεωποίας εἰς vel ἐν ---?41]. Other decrees from the city use the same concluding formula, e.g. I.Iasos 42 ll. 8–9 τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα ἀναγράψατε τοὺς νεωποίας εἰς τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον, I.Iasos 46 ll. 7–8 ἀναγράψατε τοὺς νεωποίας τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ and I.Iasos 47 ll. 4–5 ἀναγράψατε τί δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς νεωποίας.

Kinch’s transcription is also more complete as regards the rest of the text in Chandler’s transcription, which is reproduced by Böckh (CIG 2674) and Blümel (I.Iasos 41). Recently that text was re-edited by Fabiani in the addendum to G. Maddoli’s “Epigrafi di Iasos. Nuovi Supplementi I”, PdP 62 (2007) 376. The improved re-edition was made possible thanks to a) the discovery of two new proxeny decrees that were published by Maddoli (the names of the persons honoured are Ξενίων [-----] ---δεὐς42 and Π[α]υσίμαχος Ἰατροκλέους respectively),43 and b) the rediscovery and the publication by D. Bosnakis and K. Hallof of the Iasian proxeny decree no. 58 which had been thought lost and was found in Kos (the name of the person honoured is Θεοκλῆς Ἀ[……..] Ἀράδιος).44 In the praescriptum of the two new decrees the date is given in the same way and the epistates of the pryaneis is the same person: more specifically, both are dated Ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ μετ’ Εὐθαλιῶν, μηνὸς Ἀφροδισιῶνος, ἕκτηι ἱσταμένου and the epistates

41 After the letters ΠΟΙΑ there is an approximately 12-letter gap that could reasonably be filled by a place name.

42 See Maddoli, Epigrafi di Iasos ..., op. cit., 295–296 no. 18.2 (decreto onorario per Xenion [di Alabanda?]).

43 See Maddoli, Epigrafi di Iasos ..., op. cit., 301 no. 19.2 (decreto onorario per Pausimachos figlio di iatrocles).

is Εὐκράτης Μένωνος (the name is either preserved complete or can be safely restored given the same dating). The names Εὐκράτης Μένωνος should, according to Chr. Habicht (whom Fabiani follows) be restored in line 2 of the decree rediscovered in Kos, in the sense that the reference is to the Iasian [Εὐκράτης Μένωνος who was honoured as prokson and benefactor at Miletos in 265/4 BC.45 On the basis of these similarities in the three texts, and having re-edited text no. 58 with emendations,46 Fabiani thought that the praescriptum of decree no. 41 of the corpus should also be restored as follows:

ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπόλλωνός τοῦ μετ’ Εὐθαλλίωνα, μηνός]

Ἀφροδισιῶν οὗ ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι

δήμῳ Εὐκράτης [Μένωνος ἐπεστάτει, Ἀριστέας Ἱερονίκου]

έγραμματευν̣, πρυτάνε̣[ων γνώμη · ἐπειδή

The text she proposes is clearly a step forward compared to the text of the older editions and is confirmed by Kinch’s transcription save at two points: a) the name of the magistrate (l. 1), where Kinch reads the otherwise unattested name Ὑδαλλίων,47 and b) the name of the secretary of the boule, where the Danish archaeologist completes the patronym of the equally unknown in the prosopography of the city Ἀριστέας Δημοκ[λέους]. These remarks show that Εὐκράτης Μένωνος served as epistates of the prytaneis for two separate years and that the related completions in lines 1 and 3 must be abandoned.48

The proposal for the awarding of proksony privileges comes from the prytaneis and Böckh’s completion of the relevant line 5 (πρυτ[άνεων γνώμη]), which is followed by Blümel and Fabiani, is sound since it is supported by parallels.49 Kinch’s transcription in his letter to the fathers of the Monastery of Xeropotamou, on the other hand, is faulty.

The most interesting new information to emerge from Kinch’s transcription is the ethonym of the honorees. In his commentaries on the inscriptions Blümel had already quite properly noted that the patronym should have been followed by an ethonym.46 Kinch reads …ΔΟΝΙΟΙ and hastily transcribed it in his letter as …όνιοι ἄνδρες. The surviving letters and the small gap be-

---

45 See Chr. Habicht apud Bosnakis–Hallof, op. cit., 221 (the editors simply cite the completion in their commentary; they do not adopt it in the text they publish). For the list of proksonoi and benefactors see Milet I 3 no. 96 II l. 5–6 [οἱδε] πρόξενοι καὶ εὐεργ[έ]ται / [Εὐκράτης Μένωνος / [Κ]ρα̣το̣ντίδης Παυσανίο̣[υ] / Ἀρτεμίδωρος Σκύλα̣κος …]

46 See Fabiani in Maddoli, Epigrafi di Iasos ..., op. cit., 376 and 379–382, where she proposes linking this decree with the fragment I.Iasos 44.

47 The name Ἰδάλιον occurs in Theocritus, Eid. 15 l. 100. Given the care with which Kinch transcribed the inscription it would be risky to suppose that he mistakenly wrote ΥΔΑΛΛΙΟΝΑ for ΔΑΛΛΙΟΝΑ. The name Δαλλίων occurs for example in a votive inscription of 80/79 BC, É. Bernard, Inscriptions grecques d’Hermopolis Magna et de sa nécropole (Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, Bibliothèque d’étude 123) Paris 1999, 5 l. 9 (Δαλλίων Ἀείανου).

48 This leads to reservations about the completion of the names of the magistrate and the secretary on the decree deriving from the merger of decrees I.Iasos 58 (= Bosnakis–Hallof, op. cit., 219–221 no. 10 B) and I.Iasos 44.


50 I.Iasos 41: “In der Lücke muß das Ethnikon gestanden haben”.

---
fore them, corresponding to just one or two letters, readily support the completion [Σι]δόνιοι.51 That other persons from Sidon were active in Iasos may be inferred from the fact that another Sidonian, a certain Ἡρακλείδης Ζηνοδότου, was a member of a funerary association of foreigners to Iasos, which existed after 167 BC and probably between 160 and 140 BC.52

Finally, as regards the dating of the decree, the identification of the epistates Εὐκράτης Μένωνος with the benefactor and proxenos of Miletos in the list of 265/4 BC, taken together with the shape of the letters, and especially the epsilon (with its shorter middle stroke), the kappa (with the shorter lower oblique stroke) the nu (with the left stroke longer than the right), the pi (asymmetrical, with the left stroke shorter), the sigma (with the horizontal strokes diverging), and the size of the omicron and the omega (roughly the same height as the other letters),53 make a dating in the first half or even in the second quarter of the 3rd century BC more likely than the end of the 4th.

B) Inscription no. 4 = Chandler, Inscriptiones 22–23 no. LΙX 1 = CIG 2672 = I.Iasos 30 = Fabiani, Ricon- giungimento, op. cit. (note 11) 382–383.

In the article cited Fabiani showed that the praescriptum of the decree I.Iasos 24 is actually the praescriptum of the headless decree I.Iasos 30, that is, of inscription no. 4 in Kinch’s letter. She herself published the decree as follows:

"[Ἕδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ]
μηνὸς Ποσιδεῶ[νος, ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου]
Γόργου του Θεοδό[του, ἕκτη ἱσταμένου]
4 Θεόδοτος Δημητ[ρίου ἐπεστάτει]
ἀρχόντων γνώ[μη -------------τοῦ]
'Αρτεμιδώρου, Α[-------------τοῦ]
8 Σανναίου, Παντ[-------------τοῦ]
'Αριστοκράτεος[ς -------------]
[------------------------ ἐγραμμάτευε?]
[ἐπειδή Γόργος καὶ Μιννίων Θεοδότου]
12 [οἱ οἱ κ[αλ]oi κάγαθοι γεγένηται κλπ"

Thanks to the traces of letters preserved in Kinch’s transcription before line 1 of the decree I.Iasos 30 it is now clear that the restoration in line 10 of the decree, where Fabiani has [---- ἐγραμμάτευε?], is not possible and that it should be corrected to read: [Ἑδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ βικαί καὶ τῷ δήμῳ]. This in turn means that the decree began with the month in which it was voted, i.e. μηνὸς Ποσιδεῶ[νος, ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου] / Γόργου του Θεοδό[του, ἕκτη ἱσταμένου]. That the

51 The spelling of the ethnonym should not surprise, since it is attested in both literary and inscriptional sources.

52 See I.Iasos 408 l. 19, with the related discussion on the interpretation and dating of the inscription and most recently F. Delrieux, Les étrangers dans l’épigraphie iasienne du IIe siècle a.C., in A. Bresson – R. Descat (eds), Les cités d’Asie Mineure occidentale au IIe siècle a.C., Paris 2001, 137–155, here 140 and 154.

praescriptum of decrees from Iasos could be composed in this way (with some variants) is clear from other decrees from the city, e.g. the decree honouring the Athenians Glaucus and Aristonicus, sons of Theopropus,54 or the one honouring Theucles son of Thersias from Meliboea, in Thessaly, both from the end of the 4th or the first half of the 3rd century BC.55

Özet


Bu makalede, söz konusu blokların Khios’dan Athos’a olan yolculuklarının öyküsü ve buna ilişkin yeni bilgiler verilir ve bu bilgiler bariz ve net niteliktedir. Tabii ki, bu bilgiler, bir araştırmacı veya araştırmacılar tarafından her zaman yeterli ve net niteliktedir. Ancak, bu bilgiler, bilgilerin doğruluğunu ve net olduğunu söylemek için geniş bir araştırmanın yapılmasını gerektirir.

54 I.Iasos 42: μηνὸς Ἀδωνιῶνος· ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀνδρονικίδου τοῦ Ἰσοδίκου, γραμματέως / δὲ Κλεανδρίδα τοῦ Κλεάνδρου· Φορμίων Μελάνθου ἐπεστάτει· / ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι· Δημείας Ἀριστέως εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Γλαῦκος καὶ Ἀριστόνικος Θεοπρόπου Ἀθηναῖοι etc.

55 I.Iasos 54: μηνὸς Ἀφροδισιῶνος· ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου / Ἀπολλοφάνεως τοῦ Ἀπολλᾶ· ἐπειδὴ ἔστη Ιασωποῖον / Ξένων Άριστονίτου ἐπεστάτει, Πανταλέων / Κλεανδρίδα ἐπειδὴ Θεοκλῆς Θερατίου // Μελιβοίους etc.
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Fig. 1. Archive of Monastery Xeropotamou
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Fig. 3. Royal Library of Copenhagen
Συνθήκη Χρονίδος

Προς κοινοβούλιον στην ανάμεσα λ αιτούς για τη δημόσια παραμονή του, για τον ιερό συναγερμό που έγινε το Ιούλιο του έτους της συνθήκης.

Στοιχείο, Διευθυντής Συναγερμού Ξενάγοντος,

Προφ. Κατερίνα Κατερίνα Κατερίνα

Στην πλευρά Ευγενίας Τσιπού Μητροπολίτου Δικαίου


- Εξαντλήστε το ραβίν και το ρούμι


Το μοναστήρι του Ιερού Μοναστηριού Χεροποτάμου

odzi antiparousias kuriou xerophtamou

3. 

odzi antiparousias kuriou xerophtamou
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