



THE PRYTANEION DECREE (IG I³ 131) AND *SITĒSIS* FOR ATHLETES*

ABSTRACT

*In the 150 years since Schöll's seminal work, the Prytaneion Decree has been studied frequently. Of the groups of honourees mentioned in the decree, the agonistic victors have received the least attention. Most scholars have simply attributed them, without further discussion, to the sphere of war or to the sphere of religion. In this article, athletics is understood as a sphere of action with its own logic: the passages on athletes in the decree are examined in detail and situated within the debate in classical Athens about whether victors of the Panhellenic Games should be honoured by the polis and to what extent. The strange duplication in the decree, which first regulates honours for agonistic victors in general and, in a second paragraph, honours for hippic victors, is related to some texts that viewed hippic victories more critically than gymnastic ones. A precise dating of the decree is not possible, but there were several events in the fifth century that might have created the desire among Athenians for a general regulation of *sitēsis* for athletes.*

Keywords: *sitēsis*; athletics; honour; fifth-century Athens; Prytaneion Decree; democracy

Among the highest honours Greek *poleis* could bestow was *sitēsis*, the permanent right to dine at public expense.¹ The earliest epigraphic evidence for this reward is an honorary inscription from Cyzicus of the late sixth century,² and Xenophanes' polemic against lavish honours for Olympic champions (West, *IEG* F 2) shows that *sitēsis* was

* The following reflections were developed in the context of the research project 'More than Fame and Glory' (Universität Mannheim), funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). I thank Renate Morsellino for collecting sources, Christof Schuler and the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik (München) for the opportunity to present and discuss my ideas. Christoph Begass, Alberto Esu, Alexander Meeus and Marco Tentori Montalto provided important comments on an earlier version. I also thank *CQ*'s readers for their suggestions and Sam Ellis for linguistic corrections.

¹ Works repeatedly cited only by the name(s) of the author(s): J. Blok and E. van 't Wout, 'Table arrangements: *sitēsis* as a polis institution (*IG* I³ 131)', in F. van den Eijnde, J. Blok and R. Strootman (edd.), *Feasting and Polis Institutions* (Leiden and Boston, 2018), 181–204; M. Domingo Gygax, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Energetism* (Cambridge, 2016); D.G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden, 1987); E.J. Morrissey, 'Victors in the Prytaneion Decree (*IG* I³ 77)', *GRBS* 19 (1978), 121–5; M.J. Osborne, 'Entertainment in the prytaneion at Athens', *ZPE* 41 (1981), 153–70; M. Ostwald, 'The Prytaneion Decree re-examined', *AJPh* 72 (1951), 24–46; Z. Papakonstantinou, *Sport and Identity in Ancient Greece* (London and New York, 2019); C. Rivolta, 'Il decreto del prytaneo e la concessione della *sitēsis* nel V secolo', *Erga-Logoi* 2 (2014), 79–91; R. Schöll, 'Die Speisung im Prytaneion zu Athen', *Hermes* 6 (1872), 14–54; P. Schmitt Pantel, 'Le repas au prytanée et à la tholos dans l'Athènes classique: *sitēsis*, *trophē*, *misthos*, réflexions sur le mode de nourriture démocratique', *Annali. Archeologia e storia antica* 2 (1980), 55–68; W.E. Thompson, 'The Prytaneion Decree', *AJPh* 92 (1971), 226–37; H.T. Wade-Gery, 'Attic inscriptions of the 5th century: the Prytaneion Decree', *BSA* 33 (1932–1933), 122–7.

² H. van Effenterre and F. Ruzé (edd.), *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec I* (Rome, 1994), §32.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

widely established in the early fifth century. Both the inscription and the elegy mention *sitêsis* together with other honours, and this is also the case in the majority of other testimonies from different regions and epochs: *sitêsis* is usually connected to the right of occupying a seat of honour (*prohedria*), to the erection of an honorary statue, and sometimes also to the exemption from taxes (*ateleia*). In classical Athens, *sitêsis* took place in the Prytaneion, which was located southeast of the Acropolis, whereas the *prytaneis* and other magistrates ate in the Tholos.

The earliest epigraphic evidence for *sitêsis* in Athens is the so-called Prytaneion Decree, which contains regulations for several groups of recipients.³ Unfortunately, the stone is broken on the left and bottom, which makes the reconstruction of the text a difficult task. This challenge was first taken up by Schöll in 1872 in a fundamental article, and since then numerous epigraphists have improved our understanding of the text, among others Hiller von Gaertringen, Morrissey, Thompson and, most recently, Lambert. Debates about the content of the decree have focussed on the Eleusinian cult officials, on the question of the *exêgêtai* and, in the last decade, on a connection between the decree and *sitêsis* for Cleon.

Far less attention has been paid to the two passages of the inscription that refer to victors of the Panhellenic *agônes*. The text has been satisfactorily supplemented in the relevant lines, but fundamental questions have hardly been raised, let alone clarified. The biggest problem is a curious duplication in the inscription, which has one paragraph concerning Panhellenic victors and another concerning Panhellenic victors in the hippic disciplines. Furthermore, the inscription refers to an older stele on which honours for Panhellenic victors must already have been recorded; this raises the questions to what extent the Prytaneion Decree modified or reaffirmed these regulations and what motives underlay this modification or reaffirmation.

The following remarks address these questions. After brief comments on the other groups of honorands and on the date of the inscription, a detailed analysis of the lines on Panhellenic victors will follow. The next section will turn from the inscription for a while and focus instead on literary sources, to show that there was a controversial debate in classical Athens about whether and to what extent public honours should be given to Panhellenic victors. Against this background, this article will attempt to explain the relevant passages of the Prytaneion Decree in their historical context.

CONTENT AND DATE

The text of the inscription is reproduced here in the latest reading by Lambert (*AIO* 1137):

[. 15] ἔγραμ[μάτευσ vac.]
 [ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῆι καὶ τῷ δέμ]οι. Ἐρχθεις ἐπ[ρυτάνευσ, .]-
 [- - - - 7 - 9 - - - ἔγραμμάτευσ, - - 2 - 4 -]θιππος ἐπεστῆτε, [. . .]ικλῆς [ε]-
 [ἵπε· ἔναι τὸν σίτεσιν τὸν] ἐμ πρυτανείοι πρότον μὲν τοῖ[ν]

³ Athens, *EM* 6561. *IG* I³ 131 (M.H. Jameson); *IG* I² 77 (F. Hiller von Gaertringen); *IG* I 8 (A. Kirchhoff); *AIO* 1137; R. Koerner, *Inscriptliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis*, ed. by K. Hallof (Cologne / Weimar / Vienna, 1993), 13; P. Mauritsch, W. Petermandl, H.W. Pleket, I. Weiler (edd.), *Quellen zum antiken Sport* (Darmstadt, 2012), Q 210; S. Cardinali, L. Pizzoli and M. Tentori Montalto, 'Decreto ateniese per la concessione di un pasto nel pritanoeo', *Axon* (forthcoming).

5 [Ἀνάκων? 12 κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια· ἔπειτα τοῖς [h]αρμ-
 [οδίο καὶ τοῖς Ἀριστογεῖ]τ[ονος ἡδ[ς] ἄν ἐι ἐγγύτατα γένος,
 [ἀεὶ ἡο περισβύτατος?, ἔναι κ]αὶ αὐτοῖσι τὲν σίτ[ε]σι[ν, κ]α[ι] ε[ἶ]
 [. 21]ν παρὰ Ἀθηναίον κατὰ τὰ [λ]εγομ-
 [ένα 17]ν ἡο Ἀπόλλων ἀνῆλ[εν] ἐ[χ]οσεγομ-
 10 [νος 18]ς σίτεσιν καὶ τὸ λ[οι]πὸν ἡδ[ς] ἄν
 [ἀνῆλεῖ, σίτεσιν ἔναι καὶ] αὐτοῖσι κατὰ ταυτά. κα[ὶ] ἡοπόσ]-
 [οι νενικέκασι Ὀλυμπίασι] ἔ Πυθο[ῖ] ἔ ἡισθμοῖ[ι] ἔ Ν[ε]μέ[ε]||[αι ἔ νικ]-
 [έσσοσι τὸ λοιπὸν, ἔναι αὐτ]οῖσι τὲν σίτεσιν ἐν πρυτανει[ο]-
 [ι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δορεῖας? π]ρὸς τῆι σιτέσει κατὰ τὰ [ἐν τ]ῆ[ι σ]-
 15 [τέλει γεγραμμένα τῆι ἐ]γ[ὶ] τῆι πρυτανείῳ. ἡο[π]όσο[φ]ι δὲ ἡάρ]-
 [ματι τελείοι ἔ ἡίπποι κ]έλετι νενικ[κ]έκασι Ὀ[λ]υμπ[ῖ]ασι ἔ Π]-
 [υθοῖ ἔ ἡισθμοῖ ἔ Νεμέαι ἔ] νικέσσοσι τὸ λοιπὸν[ν], ἔναι [καὶ αὐ]-
 [τοῖσι σίτεσιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν τ]ῆ[ι στέλε]ι[ι] γεγραμ[μ]ένα Ε[. . . 5 . . .]
 [. 22]ι περὶ τὸ στρατ[. 11]
 20 [. 23] ΔΟΡΕ[.]ΑΝΚ [. 14]
 [. 24]ΝΑΕ[. 18]

Notwithstanding the lacunose state of the text, the structure of the decree is easy to understand. After the prescript we find different groups of honourees with specific regulations for each group. Some groups are easy to identify, while others raise difficult problems. It is obvious that the first group was named at the beginning of line 5, but there are different options on how to restore the text. Some scholars have considered cult officials of the Eleusinian mysteries, but this restoration ‘lässt sich mehr rathen als beweisen’, as already noted by Schöll.⁴ This first group, and whoever belonged to it, is demarcated from the others by πρῶτον μὲν, indicating that they received their meals before the others.

The second group (lines 5–9) poses fewer problems. Karl Keil’s restoration of the descendants of Harmodius and Aristogeiton has found general acceptance,⁵ especially since *sitēsis* for this group is also attested in other sources.⁶ The next passage (lines 9–11) refers to individuals chosen by Apollo, but the details remain obscure. A great debate has ensued over the question of whether the *exēgētai* are meant here or not;⁷ as alternatives, the descendants of the Delphian Cleomantis⁸ or *manteis* have been suggested.⁹ The fourth and fifth groups include two different sets of Panhellenic victors, which will be discussed in detail below.

The rest of the stone is badly damaged: in the following lines only a few letters are legible. Because of the logic of the decree, other groups of people and/or some general

⁴ Schöll, 32; Ostwald, 24–46, at 28–32. Blok and van ‘t Wout, 187 and 195–7 suggest that the Anakes are meant here; *contra* K. Trampedach, ‘Citizens and outsiders both: diviners and other divinatory specialists in Athens (5th–4th cent. B.C.)’, in L. Cecchet and C. Lasagni (edd.), *Citizens and Non-Citizens in the Ancient Greek World* (forthcoming).

⁵ Schöll, 32–3; for the text see Ostwald, Thompson, 229–35.

⁶ Isae. 5.47; Din. *Demosth.* 101.

⁷ H. Bloch, ‘The exegetes of Athens and the Prytaneion Decree’, *AJPh* 74 (1953), 407–18 argued vehemently for this solution (see also Schöll, 35–7; Wade-Gery, 125–6; F. Jacoby, *Athis* [Oxford, 1949], 237–8; Koerner [n. 3], 47; M. Valdés Guía, ‘La Exégesis en Atenas arcaica y clásica’, *Mediteraneo Antico* 5 [2002], 185–245, at 237), while Ostwald took the opposite view (35–45; see also Schmitt Pantel, 58).

⁸ S.C. Humphreys, *The Strangeness of Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 2004), 104, with reference to Lycurg. *Leoc.* 87; Cf. S.C. Humphreys, ‘The Athenian *exegetai*’, in A. Kavoulaki (ed.), Πλειών. *Papers in Memory of Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood* (Rethymno, 2018), 85–96, at 91–4.

⁹ Blok and van ‘t Wout, 193 with reference to Ar. *Pax* 1084–5.

regulations must have followed in the last part of the decree. Some scholars have taken the letters ΠΕΡΙΤΟΣΤΡΑΤ that are preserved in line 19 as an indication for the *stratēgoi* as a sixth group of recipients.¹⁰ In connection with the honours for Cleon, which are ridiculed as a running gag in Aristophanes' *Knights* of 424, far-reaching conclusions for the date and the function of the decree have been drawn from this restoration, especially in recent scholarship (see below). As an alternative, other scholars have restored the *stratēgeion* here; in this case, the passage in question would refer to the place where the stele was set up.¹¹

While most scholarly attention has been devoted to questions of detail, an overall interpretation of the inscription has rarely been attempted. It is beyond doubt that the decree awarded different groups of people with *sitēsis*, but its background and intention are highly controversial. Three different approaches have been presented, which could be labelled as the aristocratic, the democratic and the religious interpretations. The aristocratic one was advocated by Schmitt Pantel: in her view, the abolition of tyranny was remembered as an achievement of the aristocracy, which meant that the Athenians attributed Harmodius and Aristogeiton to the pre-democratic past of the *polis*. And as the cult of Eleusis and the seers of Apollo also referred to the past, *sitēsis*, as it is regulated in the Prytaneion Decree, should be understood as a traditional aristocratic form of honour, a kind of counterpart to the democratic *misthos*.¹² Rivolta, on the other hand, takes a diametrically opposite point of view, interpreting the Prytaneion Decree as a measure to adapt *sitēsis* to the 'radical democracy' of Cleon's time. Finally, Blok and van 't Wout proposed a religious interpretation of the inscription: in the crisis of the Archidamian War, the Athenians would have wanted to increase the security of Athens by honouring those persons who enjoyed divine support.¹³

The last two interpretations are linked to a specific dating proposal, which leads to the question of chronology. For a long time, the *communis opinio* set the inscription in the decade before the Peloponnesian War.¹⁴ In more recent publications, however, a date between 429 and 425 seems to gain the upper hand.¹⁵ The range of proposals extends even further, but the high dating to 445–440 and the low dating to 423–421 have not been supported in recent times.¹⁶ The four-stroke sigma, the old dative on *-oisi* and other palaeographic and grammatical features are compatible with any of these dating possibilities. Nor does the 'handwriting' give any precise clue: Tracy has

¹⁰ See already Schöll, 40; wide-ranging suggestions for the text are provided by Osborne, 164.

¹¹ Hiller von Gaertringen in *IG I² 77*; R. Haensch, 'Amtslokal und Staatlichkeit in den griechischen *Poleis*', *Hermes* 131 (2003), 172–95, at 180.

¹² Schmitt Pantel, 59, 65–7 (cf. P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* [Paris, 1992], 225–6); contra P. Gauthier, *Bulletin Épigraphique* (1993), 482 n. 169.

¹³ Blok and van 't Wout, especially 200–1. For the 'talismanic power' of athletic victors, see L. Kurke, 'The economy of *kudos*', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (edd.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge, 1993), 131–63.

¹⁴ E.g. Wade-Gery, 123–6; Schmitt Pantel, 58; Kyle, 145–7; D.M. MacDowell, 'Hereditary *sitesis* in fourth-century Athens', *ZPE* 162 (2007), 111–13, at 111; D. Pritchard, 'Public honours for Panhellenic sporting victors in democratic Athens', *Nikephoros* 25 (2012), 209–20, at 210; M.H. Jameson in *IG I³ 131* ('c. a. 440–432?').

¹⁵ Rivolta; Blok and van 't Wout, 183–5; cf. Domingo Gygas, 132 n. 135.

¹⁶ 445–440: Jacoby (n. 7), 238. 423–421: H.B. Mattingly, 'Athens, Delphi and Eleusis in the late 420s', *PACA* 9 (1966), 61–76 (contra W.E. Thompson, 'The date of the Prytaneion Decree', *PACA* 13 [1975], 1–8); later, however, Mattingly no longer advocated this dating and argued for an approach shortly before Aristophanes' *Knights* (H.B. Mattingly, 'Some fifth-century Attic epigraphic hands', *ZPE* 83 [1990], 110–22, at 114–15).

assigned a total of nine extant inscriptions to the stonemason of the Prytaneion Decree, one of which is firmly dated to 424/3, while the others have been placed sometime between 435 and 409.¹⁷ Similarly, the formal structure of the decree offers little clear evidence for precise dating. Blok and van 't Wout (183–5) see an argument for the 420s in the long prescript with all the standard elements except the Archon, but this feature does not rule out an earlier dating.

Historical clues are also ambiguous. The name of the proposer had seven letters, the last four of which are readable as *-ikles*, and it is no wonder that many scholars have seen Perikles at work, which would give us a *terminus ante quem* of 429.¹⁸ But the attribution to Perikles is far from certain—with Antikles, Charikles and Archikles there are several possible alternatives.¹⁹ Likewise, the general character of the decree does not give any information about its chronological position: according to Wade-Gery its content points to a time of peace, whilst according to Rivolta and to Blok and van 't Wout it points to a time of war.²⁰ And according to Jacoby and Mattingly the Assembly's decision is only understandable in a phase of good relations between Athens and Delphi; this led Jacoby to a date in the second half of the 440s, and Mattingly to the last years of the Archidamian War, that is, 423–421.²¹ All these approaches, however, have a tendency to circular reasoning, in the sense that a certain interpretation supports the dating proposal and vice versa.

The more recent preference to place the inscription during the Archidamian War is based primarily on the restoration of the *stratēgoi* in line 19. Aristophanes' *Knights* alludes several times to Cleon's *sitēsis*; the basis for this honour, the argument goes, was the Prytaneion Decree. Thus, the Lenaia of 424 is seen as *terminus ante quem*, and the mockery could be explained best if the decree had been passed only a short time before.²² This suggestion presupposes a restoration that is by no means certain (see above), but it also encounters a further problem, which has not been identified in the scholarly debate so far. If the victorious *stratēgoi* formed the sixth group of honorands, they would differ fundamentally from the other five. For the other passages name groups that received *sitēsis* 'automatically' because of a certain affiliation or certain achievements: anyone who was an Olympic victor or the eldest of Harmodius' descendants was invited to the meals at the Prytaneion; no decision by the Assembly or any other institution was needed. In the case of victorious generals, such an automatism is inconceivable: before the people rewarded a *stratēgos*, they had to discuss the importance of a battle and the contribution of the commander in question. Each award of *sitēsis* to a *stratēgos*, therefore, needed a separate popular decision, as the relevant cases show, and Demosthenes' speech against Leptines provides clear evidence that, in the fourth century, generals were honoured by individual

¹⁷ S.V. Tracy, *Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century B.C.: The Rise of the Professional Letter Cutter* (Berlin and Boston, 2016), 113–20.

¹⁸ E.g. Wade-Gery, 123; Kyle, 145–7; Valdés Guía (n. 7), 235.

¹⁹ Mattingly (n. 16 [1966]), 64.

²⁰ Wade-Gery, 123–6; Rivolta, 86; Blok and van 't Wout, 201.

²¹ Jacoby (n. 7), 237–8; Mattingly (n. 16 [1966]), 64–5. For the relationship between Athens and Delphi during the Pentecontaetia and the Archidamian War, see the detailed account of A. Giuliani, *La città e l'oracolo: i rapporti tra Atene e Delfi in età arcaica e classica* (Milan, 2001), 79–137.

²² Mattingly (n. 16 [1990]), 114–15; Rivolta, 84–7; Blok and van 't Wout, 198. Allusions to Cleon's *sitēsis* are found throughout the play (167, 280–1, 574, 709, 766, 1404–5); Cf. Schmitt Pantel (n. 12), 225–6; Domingo Gyax, 181–2.

psêphismata, not by a general law.²³ This means that the Prytaneion Decree could only have opened up the possibility for honouring *stratêgoi*. However, it is hardly conceivable that such a self-empowerment of the Assembly was necessary, especially in the fifth century, when there was no formalized distinction between situational *psêphismata* and general *nomoi*. Rather, the Assembly could decide to honour a man if it wanted to and did not need previous authorization to do so.²⁴ Thus, adding *stratêgoi* in line 19 and drawing a connection to the *Knights* would require, first, an abrupt change of direction in the decree and, second, a provision that does not fit well within the constitutional framework of Athens in the fifth century. This is not entirely impossible, but it demands a great deal from the few letters that have survived.

The overview of the various arguments that have been put forward has demonstrated the obstacles for a precise dating of the Prytaneion Decree. All approaches to the 430s and 420s seem possible and plausible; the years after 425 should not be excluded either, because one could also see a different connection between the honour for Cleon and the Prytaneion Decree: possibly many Athenians felt the need to regulate *sitêsis* after they had seen Cleon awarded with it.²⁵ But this too is speculative; it is better to agree with Jameson's cautious statement 'De tempore parum constat'.²⁶ Any interpretation that holds only on the assumption of one particular dating proposal and not with another is methodologically problematic. Rather, an interpretation that is compatible with different chronological approaches is to be preferred.

AGONISTIC VICTORS IN THE PRYTANEION DECREE

The two passages on agonistic victors have not played a relevant role in the aforementioned interpretations of the decree. In the religious interpretation of Blok and van 't Wout, athletics is reduced to its connection with religious ritual. Schmitt Pantel, on the other hand, stresses the parallels between athletics and war: Panhellenic festivals, the argument goes (Schmitt Pantel, 59), were the expression of competition between Greek *poleis*, without bloodshed, but sharing the symbolic structure of battle. This approach is broadly elaborated by Pritchard, who resolutely opposes a religious interpretation of athletic honours: the people of Athens, in his view, perceived athletes as a kind of soldiers, therefore they honoured the best of

²³ Dem. 20.58–60, 63–4, 84, 70–1. In the same speech (20.120) Demosthenes emphasizes the sovereignty of the people in awarding honours individually. Leptines proposed a new law for the abolishment of the *ateleia*, not the abolition of an existing law that made the *ateleia* possible.

²⁴ A general regulation of *sitêsis* for *stratêgoi* is attested in 229/8, two centuries after the Prytaneion Decree (IG II/III² 832; II/III³ 1, 1135). In the fifth century, in contrast, we can observe a situational honouring of *stratêgoi* with a crown (e.g. Andoc. 2.17–18) without prior legal regulation. Most recently, F. Forster (*Die Polis im Wandel. Ehrendekrete für eigene Bürger im Kontext der hellenistischen Polisgesellschaft* [Göttingen, 2018], 91–5) has argued that the *megistai timai* in the fourth century were not regulated by a law; he emphasizes the flexibility of the Assembly. If this is true, a general legal regulation of *sitêsis* in the fifth century becomes entirely unlikely. For the process of legislation in fifth-century Athens, see A. Esu, 'Adeia in fifth-century Athens', *JHS* 141 (2021), 153–78, 160–2, with bibliography.

²⁵ This idea is supported by the fact that, after Cleon, more than half a century passed before another general was honoured with *sitêsis* (Iphicrates in 371).

²⁶ In his commentary on IG I³ 131.

them as they honoured outstanding fighters.²⁷ These approaches correspond to the tendency among classical scholars to understand Greek athletics not in its own logic but merely as a sub-phenomenon of other fields of action, alternatively religion or war. Moreover, both positions have in common that they do not differentiate between the two passages on agonistic victors in the decree.

Back to the text: today, after 150 years of meticulous epigraphic research, there is a broad consensus about the restorations in the relevant section of the inscription. The gap in lines 12/13 was alternatively supplemented with τὸς γυμνικὸς ἀγὼνας, but Morrissey raised striking objections to this restoration,²⁸ and the insertion of future victors fits better in terms of language and content. In line 14, καὶ ἄλλας ἰδία τιμάς has been suggested as an alternative to καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δορεϊάς,²⁹ which does not significantly affect the meaning of the provision. In this lacuna, there must have been a reference to other honours beside *sitêsis*, probably the *prohedria*, and possibly also a monetary reward.³⁰ In line 15, *sitêsis* cannot be inserted before the Prytaneion because of Thompson's argument that, with such an addition, the article in ἐν τῷ πρυτανεῖοι would be contrary to Athenian custom.³¹ In lines 15 and 16, some have restored two hippic disciplines, *xynoris teleia* and *polike*, but these were not included in the Olympic programme until respectively 408 and 264. Preuner's suggestion to restore the general formula for chariot and horse races (*ἡάρματι τελείοι ἔ ἵπποι κέλετι*) is plausible and has found general acceptance.³² The restoration of the four Panhellenic festivals in lines 16/17 goes back to Hiller von Gaertringen and is also no longer controversial, precisely because of the striking parallel with the first passage on agonistic victors.³³ Finally, Thompson (236) does not let the passage on Panhellenic victors end with γεγραμ[μ]ένῃ, but continues with περὶ τῶν γυμνικῶν ἀγόνων. Such a reference to gymnastic disciplines would solve the problem of the duplication of the provisions (see below), but Thompson's restoration leads to a very unconventional grammatical structure, and the letter after γεγραμ[μ]ένῃ is to be read as an epsilon.

The epigraphic analysis results in the following text; for better clarity, the passages are juxtaposed and those words that appear in only one of them are highlighted:

Group 4	κα[ῖ] ἠοπόσοι	νευικέκασι
Group 5	ἠο[π]όσο[ι] δὲ	ἡάρματι τελείοι ἔ ἵπποι κέλετι
		νευι[κ]έκασι

²⁷ Pritchard (n. 14); cf. D. Pritchard, *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 2013), 84–92.

²⁸ Morrissey, against Ostwald, 26. Morrissey pointed out that usually the disciplines would be mentioned before the *agôn*, and a dative would be needed here rather than the accusative; moreover, the restoration of a verb in line 12 would cause difficulties with Ostwald's addition.

²⁹ M.H. Jameson in *IG* I³ 131.

³⁰ Pritchard (n. 14), 210; Domingo Gygas, 132. *prohedria* is commonly mentioned together with *sitêsis*; monetary rewards for victorious athletes are attested in Athens and other *poleis* (Plut. *Sol.* 23.3; Diog. Laert. 1.55; J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* [Berlin, 1972], 253–4; Xenophan. F 2 G–P mentions a valuable gift of the *polis* for Olympic victors).

³¹ Thompson, 235. For the formula τὸ λοιπὸν ('in future') in lines 13 and 15, see E.M. Harris, 'Pheidippides the legislator: a note on Aristophanes' *Clouds*', *ZPE* 140 (2002), 3–5.

³² E. Preuner, 'Zum attischen Gesetz über die Speisung im Prytaneion', *Hermes* 61 (1926), 470–4.

³³ *IG* I³ 77; Cf. also Ostwald, 45. Thompson, 236–7 is sceptical, but does not provide an alternative proposal.

Ὀλυμπίασι] ἔ Πυθο[[[ἰ ἔ ἡισθμοῖ]]] ἔ Ν[[[εμέ]]][αι ἔ νικ|έσοσι τὸ λοιπόν
 Ὀ[λ]υμπ[ίασι ἔ Π]υθοῖ ἔ ἡισθμοῖ ἔ Νεμέαι ἔ] νικέσοσι τὸ λοιπό[ν]

ἔναντι αὐτ[ό]ρισι τὲν σίτεσιν ἐν πρυτανεῖον καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δορυεῖας πρὸς τῆσι σιτέσει
 νε[ῖ]οι
 ἔναντι [καὶ] αὐ[τ]οῖσι σίτεσιν

κατὰ τὰ [ἐν] τῆ[ι] σ[τ]έλει γεγραμμένα τῆ[ι] ἐ[ν] τῷ πρυτανεῖον.
 κατὰ τὰ ἐν τῆ[ι] στέλε[ι] γεγραμ[μ]ένα.

And those who [have been victorious at the Olympic Games] or the Pythian Games or the Isthmian Games or the Nemean [Games or will be victorious in future, for] them let there be *sitêsis* in the Prytaneion and [the other grants?] beside *sitêsis*, in accordance with [what is written on the stele in] the Prytaneion.

Those who have been victorious [with a horse-drawn chariot or with] a riding horse at the Olympic Games [or the Pythian Games or the Isthmian Games or the Nemean Games or] will be victorious in future, also [for them let there be *sitêsis* in accordance with] what is written on the stele. (translation according to *AIO* 1137)

The minor differences between the two passages are not difficult to explain. At the beginning of the second passage, δέ establishes a connection to the previous passage, as does καί in line 17. The reference to the repository of the stele is not repeated in the second passage because it would have been redundant. Thus, the significant remaining differences are the mention of the hippic disciplines in the second passage and the (restored!) reference to additional honours in the first. Since the attempts to insert a specification of the disciplines in the first passage have failed, only plausibility arguments can help to reconstruct which winners are meant here, and to explain why the first group was awarded with additional honours, whereas the second was not. These issues were controversially discussed in the 1970s: first, Thompson suggested that hippic victors were named separately because for them the reception of *sitêsis* was a novelty of the decree, but Morrissey raised striking objections to this view. According to his proposal, the hippic victories were regulated in a separate clause because there had been a controversial discussion in Athens about their value. Against this, Thompson again objected that the hippic victories were more highly valued and awarded with honours that were not attributed for successes in other disciplines.³⁴ Since then, no new positions or arguments have been added.

First, it seems unlikely that the decree referred to the musical competitions. They were not part of the Olympic programme, so they cannot be meant exclusively in the first section. And it is improbable that they were even included in this group, for the simple reason that, while there are numerous testimonies for *sitêsis* given to gymnastic and hippic victors in classical Athens, we have none for musical victors.³⁵ If the first

³⁴ Thompson; Morrissey; W.E. Thompson, 'More on the Prytaneion Decree', *GRBS* 20 (1979), 325–9.

³⁵ A passage of Aristophanes' *Frogs* (763–6) about *sitêsis* for everybody who is the best in his *technê* is not to be understood as proof for this honour given to musicians, as Schöll already noted (38 n. 1). Schmitt Pantel (n. 12), 226 sees here criticism against honouring agonistic victors at work.

passage included hippic victors, we would have to find an explanation why they were treated separately in the following paragraph. Such a duplication would only make sense if the hippic victors received greater honours than those mentioned in the first passage, but it seems to be the other way around. Therefore, the most plausible possibility remains to limit the first passage to gymnastic victors alone. What remains is the question of why the Athenians did not specify this in the text. Perhaps they considered it sufficient to name the second group, namely the hippic victors, in the most precise way, so that for the first passage no more determination was considered necessary. We should also have in mind that a stele already existed on which the groups might have been defined with greater clarity. On all accounts, the references to the existing stele that are included in both passages are of the utmost importance, because they clearly prove the existence of previous regulations for honouring agonistic victors, and the inscriptions with these regulations were kept in the Prytaneion itself.

On this basis two questions emerge. Did the Prytaneion Decree simply reaffirm existing regulations or did it modify them? And why did the Athenians consider it necessary to reaffirm or modify the existing regulations for agonistic champions? In order to find a solution, we have to move our attention to the literary record. *sitêsis* for victorious Athenian athletes is attested in numerous texts, the difference being that these mostly name only Olympic victors, while the inscription mentions the winners of all four Panhellenic competitions. This should not surprise us: the decree must be more precise in content, while the literary texts may use the most important competition *pars pro toto*.

HONOURS FOR AGONISTIC VICTORS IN CLASSICAL ATHENS

In archaic and classical Greece, the value of agonistic victories for the *polis* was a controversial issue. On the one hand, we often find statements that athletic champions brought great benefit for the community as the splendour of their agonistic victories also radiated to the *polis*. There was good reason for the common formula that ‘the victor crowned his *polis*’, and in recompense the citizens should praise and honour their best athletes. This idea finds its most elaborate expression in the epinician odes of Pindar and Bacchylides. Furthermore, Domingo Gygax, in his study about the emergence of euergetism, has demonstrated that athletes were the first of the citizens to be awarded by the *polis* with lavish honours, precisely because their victories were seen as achievements for the *polis*.³⁶ On the other hand, we find abrasive criticism denying any benefit of athletics for the *polis*, most eloquently formulated by Tyrtaios and Xenophanes. While the former (West, *IEG* F 12) listed athletic prowess as one of many ‘Homeric’ qualities not worthy of praise, Xenophanes (West, *IEG* F 2) explicitly attacked the practice of honouring agonistic victors. After listing all the rewards, Xenophanes succinctly states that ‘the strength of men and horses’ does not solve the problems of the *polis*; therefore, wise men like himself, instead of Olympic champions, should rather be held in high honour. Such private statements did not have any noteworthy consequences; on the contrary, Xenophanes’ catalogue of honours demonstrates just how highly esteemed athletic victors were among the citizens.

³⁶ Domingo Gygax, especially 63–72.

Opposing statements on the value of athletic success can also be found for democratic Athens,³⁷ and it is only here that the mass of sources is sufficient to reveal nuances. This is especially true for the differentiation between gymnastic and hippic disciplines, which is relevant for understanding the Prytaneion Decree. What should be noted first is that the sharpest anti-athletic polemic of classical Athens is directed against the gymnastic athletes. In a fragment from the satyr play *Autolykus*, which is quoted by Athenaeus in the same paragraph as Xenophanes' elegy, Euripides caricatures the athletes as a completely useless bunch:³⁸ gluttony, military uselessness, exaggerated pride with simultaneous inability to deal with aging or other problems—what Euripides presents here is the arsenal that will continue to characterize anti-athletic statements in the centuries to come.³⁹ The athletes, useless as they are in battle or in their household, should not be recipients of honours. It remains unclear to what extent these verses, which are close in time to the Prytaneion Decree,⁴⁰ reflect the poet's own opinion, especially since it cannot be determined which stage character is speaking here.⁴¹ Kyle (130) is probably right when he sees 'conventional farce ... rather than heartfelt criticism' at work, but what matters more is how many Athenians shared the critical attitude presented by the poet. David Pritchard wipes the verses off the table, declaring that none of the theatregoers shared such a view on athletes and that Euripides used the verses only to paint *Autolykus* as a negative, unsympathetic figure.⁴² Such an assertion has no basis and ignores the other testimonies from the same period that are less radical in their criticism of athletes but comparable in thrust. Euripides' contemporary Achaëus, for example, also caricatured the excessive food intake of athletes.⁴³ And the 'Old Oligarch' complained that the Athenians discredited those who practised athletics in the gymnasias;⁴⁴ here, of course, the argument is not solely about the victors of Panhellenic competitions but about athletic training in general. In view of these contemporaneous sources, it can be assumed that, whatever Euripides' personal opinion of athletes was,⁴⁵ the opinion he was processing in his *Autolykus* was circulating in Athens.

³⁷ An approach to study the relationship between sport and democracy is provided by P. Christesen, *Sport and Democracy in the Ancient and Modern Worlds* (Cambridge and New York, 2012), 164–83.

³⁸ Eur. fr. 15/16 Kannicht. The most detailed analysis of the verses is provided by N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos: ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten* (Stuttgart, 1998), 56–85. For a recent discussion, see M. Giuseppetti, 'Wink or twitch? Euripides' *Autolykus* (fr. 282) and the ideologies of fragmentation', in A. Lamari, F. Montanari and A. Novokhatko (edd.), *Fragmentation in Ancient Greek Drama* (Berlin and Boston, 2020), 275–98.

³⁹ Cf. Z. Papakonstantinou, 'Ancient critics of Greek sport', in P. Christesen and D.G. Kyle (edd.), *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Malden and Oxford, 2014), 320–31.

⁴⁰ Based on the metrical structure of the verses (the number of dissolved trimeters), Pechstein (n. 38), 40 argues for a date in the early or middle 420s.

⁴¹ Cf. Giuseppetti (n. 38), 292–5.

⁴² Pritchard (n. 27 [2013]), 140.

⁴³ F 3–4 (Ath. *Deipn.* 414c–d); Cf. D.F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play* (Meisenheim, 1980), 69–70; Papakonstantinou, 129. Achaëus was known above all for his satyr plays, so that this fragment can probably also be assigned to this genre.

⁴⁴ [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.13; on this passage, see Kyle, 134; C. Mann, *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland* (Göttingen, 2001), 115.

⁴⁵ Pechstein (n. 38), 77–85 also sees implicit criticism of athletes in some passages from Euripides' tragedies, but this remains speculative.

Critical remarks about gymnic athletes are also found in the fourth century. Timocles comicus refers to *sitêsis* when comparing athletes with *parasitoi*.⁴⁶ Athletes do not contribute anything, but nevertheless get the meal in the Prytaneion—here again the topos of gluttonous athletes is addressed. Part of the comic ridicule is reducing *sitêsis* to the intake of food, while the honour aspect—so central to Greek sport—is left out. This passage is not isolated: numerous fourth-century comedies bear agonistic titles and, although little is known about their content, we may assume they included mockery of athletes.⁴⁷ Moreover, Lycurgus praises the Athenians for setting up statues in the Agora for generals and tyrannicides; these people, the statesman explains, deserved such an honour much more than the athletes whose statues could be seen in other *poleis*.⁴⁸ Finally, Isocrates, when criticizing the honours for agonistic victors, referred *expressis verbis* to the gymnic disciplines; according to the rhetor, a strong and fast body was an ephemeral phenomenon, while scientific achievements were enduring and therefore to be preferred (Isoc. *Ep.* 8.5.).

The public awards for hippic victors also did not go unchallenged. Most famous is the passage at the end of Plato's *Apology* (36d–37a), when Socrates is considering what penalty for him would be appropriate: he himself, Socrates emphasizes, deserved *sitêsis* much more than hippic Olympic champions did, and he also needed it more—what echoes here is the material aspect of the free meals in the Prytaneion. The ostraca against Megacles, with allusions to his *hippotrophia*,⁴⁹ testify that victories with horses were by no means a source of enthusiasm among all Athenians, and Pindar, in his seventh *Pythian* (486), saw in the resulting envy one reason for Megacles' ostracism. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* of 423, equestrian sport is derided as an expensive aristocratic luxury;⁵⁰ here, however, it is less a matter of lacking benefit to the *polis* than of individual harm to those who overburden themselves financially with this 'hobby'. And finally, Alcibiades' offensive handling of his Olympic victory with the quadriga demonstrates that a hippic success could be presented as an achievement for the *polis*. In this respect, Athenian opinions differed—in the fifth century, it was a double-edged sword to claim political leadership with reference to hippic victories.⁵¹

All the critical statements about gymnic and hippic victories contrast with ample evidence of a more positive evaluation of agonistic success. In a pseudo-Demosthenic speech the speaker recalls his grandfather, who 'crowned the *polis*' with his Olympic victory in the boys' stadium race and was rightly held in honour for it ([Dem.] 58.66). This remark was obviously meant to engage the judges for the athlete and also for his grandson; it is used here as proof of being a good citizen. Another example for a positive perception of athletes is reported by Pausanias: when an Olympic victor could not afford the expenses to set up a victory statue in the Altis, the Athenians did so from the *polis* treasury (Paus. 6.13.11). And when in 332 the Athenian pentathlete Callippus faced accusations of bribery in Olympia, the *polis* showed solidarity with its athlete, sent Hypereides to Olympia to speak on Callippus' behalf, and boycotted the Olympic Games for a time (Paus. 5.21.5–7).

⁴⁶ Timocles comicus F 18 (Ath. *Deipn.* 237d–f) lines 17–21, with commentary by K. Apostolakis, *Timokles* (Göttingen, 2019), 79–90.

⁴⁷ Examples are Ἀποβάτης, Παγκρατιαστής, Πένταθλος, Ἴσθμιονική; see W.G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary* (Cambridge, 1996), 105–6.

⁴⁸ Lycurg. *Leoc.* 51. See Domingo Gygas, 125.

⁴⁹ S. Brenne, *Die Ostraka vom Kerameikos*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 2019), §3221, §4213, §5186b.

⁵⁰ *Ar. Nub.* 14–32, 60–74, 83–4, 124–5, etc.

⁵¹ Cf. Kyle, 163–8; Mann (n. 44), 86–113; Papakonstantinou, 43–51.

It is a striking fact that the Platonic Socrates explicitly refers to equestrian sports and enumerates their disciplines in more detail than would have been necessary. On the one hand, this is due to the social status of the owners of noble racehorses, who were all very wealthy people, while athletes who did not belong to the social elite could compete in the gymnastic disciplines, at least since the late fifth century.⁵² But one can furthermore infer from the passage that hippic victories were considered particularly useless in the sense of the *polis*. This is also indicated by other sources of this time, for example the pseudo-Andocidean speech *On Alcibiades*:

he was rewarded with free entertainment in the Prytaneum; and not content with that, he is for ever taking credit for his victory, as though he had not so much brought Athens into disgrace as won her a garland of honour.⁵³

The honour of *sitêsis* Alcibiades had received, therefore, appeared completely unjustified in view of the great damage he had brought upon the *polis*. In the following paragraph Callias is mentioned for comparison:

In fact, it will be a public disgrace, if you show tolerance towards a man who has achieved his success only with the help of your money, when in ostracizing Callias, son of Didymias, who won victories at all the great games by his personal prowess, you took no account whatsoever of his achievement, although it was by his own efforts that he brought glory to Athens.⁵⁴

Callias was an outstanding pankratiast: he triumphed at Olympia, twice at the Pythia, five times at the Isthmia and four times at the Nemea, and furthermore at least once at the Panathenaea. This record makes him the most successful fifth-century Athenian in the agonistic field and the only pre-Hellenistic *periodonikês* from Athens. Victory monuments of Callias are attested on the Athenian Acropolis and in Olympia.⁵⁵ Moreover, his family was famous for its wealth and renown, and he obviously also possessed political weight, otherwise it becomes hard to explain why he was ostracized. In terms both of his socio-political status and of his agonistic successes, he is the closest parallel to Alcibiades. But he had, it is said here, won his victories with his body (*τῷ σώματι*), that is, by training hard and accepting blows and injuries. This made his victories, according to the speaker, superior to the hippic triumphs of Alcibiades. A key term in this context is *ponos/ponoi*, which is used here and in many other sources to denote the toils an athlete, and especially a boxer or pankratiast, had to undergo

⁵² See Kyle, 113–18, with prosopography. Recent scholarship on this issue is discussed in D.G. Kyle, ‘Sport, society, and politics in Athens’, in P. Christesen and D.G. Kyle (edd.), *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Malden and Oxford, 2014), 159–75, at 166–8.

⁵³ [Andoc.] 4.31 σίτησιν ἐν Πρυτανείῳ ἔλαβε, καὶ προσέτι πολλῇ τῇ νίκῃ χρῆται, ὥσπερ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡταμακῶς ἢ ἔστεφανωκῶς τὴν πόλιν (transl. K.J. Maidment).

⁵⁴ [Andoc.] 4.32 αἰσχιστον δὲ φανήσεσθε ποιούντες, εἰ τοῦτον μὲν ἀγαπάτε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑμετέρων χρημάτων ταῦτα κατεργασάμενον, Καλλίαν δὲ τὸν Διδυμίου, τῷ σώματι νικήσαντα πάντας τοὺς στεφανηφόρους ἀγῶνας, ἐξωστρακίσατε πρὸς τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἀποβλέψαντες, ὅς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ πόνων ἐτίμησε τὴν πόλιν (transl. K.J. Maidment). For commentary, see F. Gazzano, *Pseudo-Andocide. Contro Alcibiade* (Genova, 1999), 140–3.

⁵⁵ IG I³ 893; IvO 146; *P.Oxy.* 222, col. 1 line 26 (which dates the Olympic victory firmly to 472). On Callias’ athletic career, see Kyle, 202–3 A 29; L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome, 1953), §15; <http://connectedcontests.org/database/persons/453> (last accessed 1 October 2022). On the ostracism of Callias, see L. Piccirilli, ‘L’ostracismo di Callia, figlio di Didimia’, *Klio* 78 (1996), 325–8.

before he could achieve a glorious victory.⁵⁶ If we take into account Euripides' epinician ode on the occasion of Alcibiades' Olympic victory, in which the poet praises the victor for having triumphed *ἄπονητί*, that is, 'effortlessly', the contrast fashioned by Ps.-Andocides becomes even sharper. The hippic victory of Alcibiades, according to the rhetor's logic, was no achievement of his own at all, but the gymnastic successes of Callias were. The latter should therefore be honoured by the *polis* and, if even Callias had been ostracized by the citizens, this fate should befall Alcibiades all the more.

CONCLUSIONS

Let us now return to the Prytaneion Decree. This decree cannot be understood from an agonistic perspective alone. But since the honours for the descendants of the tyrannicides are quite easy to understand and the other groups cannot be clearly determined, it is appropriate to take the honours for agonistic victors as a starting point, or at least we should not exclude them from an interpretation. In the inscription, the two groups of athletes are the only ones for which reference is made to existing written regulations. And they differ from the others in yet another respect: victors were not awarded *sitêsis* on the basis of a specific affiliation but on the basis of a one-time event taking place far outside the borders of Attica. If we distinguish between recipients *ex officio* and recipients who got *sitêsis* by decree *ex beneficio*,⁵⁷ the agonistic victors do not belong to either category: they did not exercise any office, nor did they receive the honour by *ad hominem* decisions of the Assembly. And we have recognized one further difference, as there was a controversial discussion whether it was justified to award them with *sitêsis*.

As is well known, the Athenians of the fifth century were not very generous with public honours for individual citizens. This reluctance to honour individuals led to a certain tension over how to deal with agonistic victors. Because of the paramount importance of athletics in Greek culture, the opinion was widespread that those who won at Olympia or in other major Panhellenic competitions were outstanding men and deserved glory and honour. This estimation applied both to the gymnastic and to the hippic disciplines. Visible expressions of this honour were the public garlanding with flowers and leaves (*phyllobolia*), the performance of epinician odes, or the victor statues at the competition site and in the home *polis*.⁵⁸ It was a Panhellenic phenomenon that extended to the entire Greek world regardless of the political organization of each *polis*.

Owing to the radical concept of political equality in democratic Athens and to the reluctance to elevate individuals too much, the challenge arose of how to deal with citizens who were successful on the agonistic field. Unlike other *poleis*, the Athenians did not erect statues of athletes in the Agora,⁵⁹ but there was a monumental presence of victors in the public space. Both the preserved bases and the literary record

⁵⁶ See Pritchard (n. 27), 48–9.

⁵⁷ These categories are usually applied to *sitêsis* (Osborne, 158; A.S. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees* [Hildesheim, 1983], 271–5).

⁵⁸ E. Kefalidou, *Νικητής. Εικονογραφική Μελέτη του Αρχαίου Ελληνικού Αθλητισμού* (Thessaloniki, 1996), 81–96; P. Kyriakou, 'Epidoxon kydos: crown victory and its rewards', *C&M* 58 (2007), 119–58; Domingo Gyax, 63–72, 114–24. A comprehensive analysis of the rewards for athletic victors is a *desideratum*, but Tentori Montalto is currently writing a monograph to fill this gap.

⁵⁹ For a detailed discussion of this phenomenon, see Domingo Gyax, 124–31.

attest numerous agonistic dedications on the Acropolis, and not only for the Archaic period but also for the Classical period.⁶⁰ Of particular interest are the monuments of Callias' family, who, in addition to the aforementioned pankratiast, also had Olympic champions in hippic disciplines in their ranks, both in the sixth and in the fifth centuries.⁶¹ Their victory monuments on the Acropolis highlight the family's prominent position and were undoubtedly to be understood as a demonstration of aristocratic status.⁶² This family is also involved in a story told at the beginning of Xenophon's *Symposium*: when a particularly beautiful boy named Autolykus won the pankration at the Panathenaea of 422, his admirer Callias (III) took him first to the hippodrome to watch the horse and chariot races, and then to his home in the Piraeus for a banquet—a private contribution of a meal in recompense of an athletic victory. Later, a statue of Autolykus was erected in the Prytaneion, the very building where *sitêsis* took place.⁶³

Thus, the Athenians did not prevent gymnastic or hippic victors from having their successes remembered by monuments. What they did, however, was to set rules for the honours the winners were to receive from the *polis*. In his fundamental work on Athenian athletics, Kyle (32–55 and *passim*) has described a development from aristocratic competition to 'civic athletics' that began as early as the Peisistratids. Kyle focusses on the founding of festivals, particularly the Panathenaea. Another facet of 'civic athletics', I propose, is the regulation of honours. This process, too, began in the Archaic period with a Solonian law, which, however, remains unclear in its specific provisions and general purpose.⁶⁴ With the Prytaneion Decree, and earlier with the predecessor stele, the Athenians established fixed rules for *sitêsis*; by doing so they did not replace the monuments erected by the victors, but added a *polis*-related reward. Thus, they created equality at this level, while the expense of epinician odes or dedications was limited by the financial resources of each victor. And by bestowing higher honours on gymnastic successes than on hippic ones—if the interpretation presented above regarding the two groups is correct—they cast certain reservations into an institutional form, reservations about equestrian sport as an activity of the wealthy. In this sense, the Prytaneion Decree forms a testimony to the complex relationship between sport and democracy in classical Athens.

Universität Mannheim

CHRISTIAN MANN
mann@uni-mannheim.de

⁶⁰ For an overview of agonistic monuments in Athens, see Domingo Gygax, 124–31; Papakonstantinou, 42–54. Grave stelae in the Kerameikos referred to the athletic successes of the deceased.

⁶¹ On the family, see J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families: 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971), 254–70 (ad 7826); on agonistic successes, see Kyle, A 29–31.

⁶² Papakonstantinou, 46, 50–1, 54, 59.

⁶³ Xen. *Symp.* 1.2; Ath. *Deipn.* 187f–188a, 216d–e; Paus. 1.18.3, 9.32.8. On the date of Autolykus' statue, see Domingo Gygax, 128–9.

⁶⁴ F 89 Leão – Rhodes; see Kyle, 21–2; Mann (n. 44), 68–81; Papakonstantinou, 69–70.