

R. DEVELIN

ONCE MORE ABOUT IG II² 207

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 73 (1988) 75–81

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ONCE MORE ABOUT IG II² 207

R.A.Moysey in dealing with this inscription in ZPE 69 (1987), 93-100 has overlooked M.J.Osborne's arguments in their latest form, namely as applied to D 12 in Naturalization in Athens I (Brussels 1981) 52-54 and II (1982) 61-80. Moysey takes issue against Osborne's earlier suggestion of 361/0 as the date indicated by an emended archon dating, but Osborne has now abandoned that in favour of the period 364-362, with the suggestion that the archon may be that of 364/3, Timokrates. Osborne's arguments for this period carry a good deal of persuasion. He can see parallels in IG II² 110 (Tod 143) for Menelaos of Pelagonia and 141 (Tod 139), dated by Moysey himself to c. 364, and identifies the war mentioned at 207 c 19 as that against the Chalkideans and Amphipolis.

It is not for me to rehearse all Osborne's discussion, in the light of which it becomes unnecessary to address in detail all of Moysey's points. I do wish, however, to make a number of observations which might be helpful, while not pretending to provide a solution.

Moysey uses the text from IG, which means that it is, so far as concerns fragment a, based upon that of Rangabé. He seems aware of the problem, but Osborne is quite correct in printing the text of Pittakys. Rangabé had nothing but the latter to go on and yet came up with considerable and unexplained differences, in spite of which subsequent editors have founded their texts on his version. I quote Osborne 1.53: "Since Rangabé's version, with its inexplicable divergencies from the text of Pittakys, is not an independent text, this is quite unjustifiable." We must, therefore, work from Pittakys' transcription of this fragment and in doing so realize that it has, in Osborne's words, "manifest faults," and as a consequence it may well contain faults which are not manifest. So we leave Rangabé aside and deal first with items leading from this fragment, after presenting the text of the inscription, the first part from Osborne, based on Pittakys, the second the IG text as printed at Osborne II.63.

Ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· Πανδιονίς <ἐ>πρυτάνειε - - - (secretary)
 - - (epistates) - - -]
 Φλυεύς ἐπεστάται· Πολυκράτης Πολυκράτους [(demonic) εἶπεν·
 πρέσβεις οἱ τε Ἀθηναί<ω>ν καὶ οἱ παρὰ <Ὁ>ρόντου ἤκοντες
 τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ]
 τῇ Ἀθηναί<ω>ν· ΠΟΙΕΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΔΗΜΟΝ ΛΕΙΓΕΤΑΙ [- - - - ·
 ἐπαινεῖσαι Ὀρόντην ὅτι ἐστίν]
 5 ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς περὶ τὸν δῆμον [τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ πρόθυμος ποιεῖν
 ἀγαθὸν ὅτι ἂν δύνηται καὶ νῦν]
 ν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν χρόνῳ <καὶ> εἶναι Ὀρόντην Ἀθηναίων καὶ
 ἐγγόνους αὐτοῦ, καὶ γρά]

<ψασθαι αὐτὸν φυλῆς καὶ δήμου καὶ φρατρίας ἥστινος ἂν βούληται
 εἶναι· δοῦναι δὲ καὶ τήν>
 ψῆφον περὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς πρυτάνεις ἐν τῇ <πρώτῃ> ἐκκλησίᾳ [τῷ δήμῳ·
 καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐ]-
 τὸν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ χιλίων δραχμῶν· [- - - - -]
 10 τοῦ στεφάνου· βουλευσασθαι ΠΙΝΑ - - - - - ὀπόθεν - - - - -]
 πάντα ΜΙΝΗΙΗΦ - - - - - Ὀρόντου πρὸς τὸ - - - - - ΟΠΟ - - - - -
 ΧΩΝΟΙΦ[- - - - -]
 [τοὺς θε]μοθέτας τοὺς ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος - - - - - ΒΟΥ-
 ΛΕΥΟΝ - - - - - ΑΧΟΛΙΟ [- - - - - τῶν]
 Ἀθηναίων ἢ τῶν συμμάχων μὴ ΛΙΠΟΜΕΝ - - - - - [Ὀρ]<ό>ντου
 ἀρχ[- - - - -]
 δήμου τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίους δι[κα]ς δοῦναι ἐν τοῖς συμβόλ-
 [οις - - - - -]
 15 ΤΙΘ εἰσὶν ἐκ τῆς Ὀρόντου ἀρχῆς ΕΤ - - - - - συμμ<α>χ-
 [- - - - -]
 ἐξεῖναι τῷ ἐγκ<λ>ήματι ΩΙΛΛΟΕΠ - - - - - ΑΝ - - - - - [- -
 - - - - -]
 [- -]σιν· τήν δὲ βουλὴν τήν [- - - - -]
 [- -] καὶ τῷ δήμῳ [- - - - -]

- 1 [- - - - - ^{c. 54-55} - - - - -]ΩΣ..Α[- - - - - ^{c. 8-9} - - - - -]
 2 [- - - - - ^{c. 52} - - - - -]Ο.ΙΑΙΩ[.ΠΟΥ[- - - - - ^{c. 7} - - - - -]
 3 [- - - - - ^{c. 50} - - - - -]α πλοίων [- - - - - ^{c. 10} - - - - -]
 4 [- - - - - ^{c. 41} - - - - -]ΟΝΟ..ΙΩ.. φίλοι καὶ ἀύμαχοι ^{c. 2} - - - - -] (a)
 5 [- - - - - ^{c. 21-22} - - - - -] ἐπειδὴ ἐπιμελεῖται Ὀρόντης ὅπως ἂν παραλάβῃ ὁ [δῆμος ὁ Ἀθ]-
 6 [ηναίων - - - - - ^{c. 33-34} - - - - -]Σ καὶ τὰ σύμβολα δειχθῆ καὶ [- - - - - ^{c. 8} - - - - -]
 7 [- - - - - ^{c. 23-24} - - - - -] ΣΙΤ[- - - - - ^{c. 14} - - - - -] ἐλεῖσθαι τὸν δῆμον αὐτίκα μ[ά]λα ^{c. 3} - - - - -]
 8 [- - - - - ^{c. 15} - - - - -] τοῖς δὲ αἰρεθέντας τὸ ἀργύριον λαβόντας ὅθεν ἂν ὁ δῆμος [ψηφίσι]-
 9 [ηται ἰέναι ὡς Ὀρόντην καὶ ἀποδεῖξαι [τὰ σύμβολα] ἐν τῷ Θαραηλιῶνι μηνί καὶ ἀπάγειν ἀπ' Ὀρ]-
 10 [όντου τὸν σίτον κατὰ τὰ ἐν τῷδε τῷ ψηφίσματι] γεγραμμένα καὶ ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν ὅτι ἂν [δύνων]-
 11 [ται ποιεῖν· τὸ δὲ] ἀργύριον εἶναι εἰς τῆν παρὰ τὴν τοῦ σίτου ἐκ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν· [κομι]-
 12 [σάντων δὲ τὸν σίτον] τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τῷ μετὰ Χάρητος καὶ Χαριδήμου καὶ Φωκίωνος πεμ]-
 13 [πομένῳ· κελευσάντων δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἤδη τὰ χρήματα τῶν συντάξεων τῶν ἐλ Λέσβῳ [εἰσπράτ]-
 14 [τοντας - - - - - ^{c. 11} - - - - -]ΟΝ τε [Χάρητος καὶ Χ]αριδήμου καὶ Φωκίωνος τὰ τε παρὰ τῆς πόλ[εως]
 15 [- - - - - ^{c. 18-19} - - - - -] ΟΣΑ[- - - - - ^{c. 11} - - - - -]ΗΣ λαβόντας παραλαβεῖν τὸν σίτον μετὰ ταῖν]
 16 [πρέσβων - - - - - ^{c. 10} - - - - -] ἐπιστ[ί]σονται ὡς τῆχιστα καὶ γένηται μισθὸς τοῖς στρατι[ώ]ταις
 17 [- - - - - ^{c. 15} - - - - -] τῆς κ[ο]μιδῆς γένηται, ἐνδείξει τοὺς ταμίας καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τῷ δήμῳ,
 18 [ψηφίσασθαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον ὅ] τι ἂμ βούληται· ἔαν δὲ οἱ ταμῖαι μὴ ποιῶσιν τὰ ἐν τῷδε τῷ ψηφίσ[μα]-
 19 [τι γεγραμμένα (?) ὀφειλέτο ἕκαστος Χ δραχμὰς ὡς δικακωλόντας τὸν πόλεμον πολεμείσθαι.
 20 [(?) ὅπως δὲ τὰ χρήματα πρὸς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἀσφαλῶς κομιζήται ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοὺς ΜΕΝ[- -]
 21 [- - - - - ^{c. 32} - - - - -] τοὺς συμμάχους Χάρητα καὶ Χαριδήμον τοὺς α[τ]-
 22 [ρατηγούς - - - - - ^{c. 24} - - - - -] ταμῖαι καὶ τὰ χρήματα ὡς Ὀρόντην καὶ πλοῖα παρὰ
 23 [- - - - - ^{c. 30} - - - - -] Πρόξενον τ[ὸν] στρατηγὸν μετὰ τῶν πρέσβων κα[.]
 24 [- - - - - ^{c. 24-25} - - - - -] τὸν ταμῖαν τοῦ δήμου τὰ [ἐ]κρόδια τῶν πρέσβων ἑκάστῳ π[ρ]
 25 [(?) ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ· ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς πεμφθέν]-
 26 [τας - - - - -] τοὺς δὲ πρέσβεις [- - - - - ^{c. 4-5}] στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ στεφάν-
 27 [ωι - - - - -] Εὐωνυμία, [- - - - - ^{c. 4}] Ν Λυκόφρονος Ἀχαρνέα, Φ [- - - - - ^{c. 2}]
 28 [- - - - -] ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ^{c. 5} - - - - -] ΝΟΥΣΜΕΡΟΠΑ[- -]
 29 [- - - - -] ΑΜΥΤ[- - - - -]

(1) Someone from Phyla ἐπετάται (line 2). Otherwise the last possible attested use of this word is IG II² 227, if properly dated to 342/1. That decree, however, is extremely fragmentary, only the last letter of the archon's name in the genitive survives, he becomes Sosigenes because of the place which the secretary's demotic gives him in the tribal cycle, and the word ἐπετάται is totally restored, with a query, presumably because at the end of the previous line the letters TIM begin the name of the presiding bouleutes, whose name would otherwise follow the formula τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν. Prior to that we have II² 224 and 225, from the same day in 343/2 and with the presiding officer signalled by both formulae. The point, however, is that we cannot on purely formulaic grounds rule out the possibility that II² 207 a could belong around 340, a year or two after the last datable use of ἐπετάται.

(2) The reason for all this, of course, is that at line 12 "in the copy of Pittakys the phrase ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος is absolutely clear" (Osborne I.54). Nikomachos was archon in 341/0. Although we cannot take Pittakys on trust, I would presume that the first duty is to see if this year will do. And indeed there may be an Orontes available, the son or grandson of the earlier satrap. As far as fragment a goes, this is fine, but if we are, as seems likely, to associate it in some way with fragments b, c, and d, then it becomes awkward. The earlier Orontes had been associated with Mysia and some such region is implied in the second part of the inscription, which involves the purchase of corn and activities concerning allied contributions in Lesbos. For 341/0 Moysey raises three objections. That based on the presidency formula we have dealt with. Nor is the fact that Charidemos, who appears in the second part, is not known to have been general in that year much of an obstacle. That leaves us with the problem that "the Persian satrap Rhosakes was probably ruling over Mysia by 344" (Moysey 96). This derives from Diodoros 16.47.2, under the archon year 350/49, but recounting events generally agreed to date to 344. However, what we have no evidence for is when Rhosakes ceased to be satrap of Ionia and Lydia. It is true that the younger Orontes is not known to have held any position in that area at any time; the Orontes in 207 a has an arche (line 15), which does not suggest a subordinate position. Diodoros does go on to say, however, at 16.52.2 that as a reward, Artaxerxes made Mentor satrap of the Asiatic coast; we subsequently find him dealing with Hermias of Atarneus, on the mainland opposite Lesbos. The term "satrap" may be inaccurate,¹⁾ but what are the implications for Rhosakes' position? When he appears at the Granikos for his death in 334/3, his brother Spithridates is satrap of Ionia.²⁾ What this

1) H.Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (München 1926) 2.251.

2) Diodoros calls the latter Spithrobates and the former's name is actually Rhosakes: for sources and discussion see Berve nos 687 and 715.

seems to show is that if we want an Orantes other than the earlier satrap geographically available in about 340, there is room for the possibility.

So it is not such an easy matter after all to reject Pittakys' archon. But what is he doing there and does he provide a date for the inscription? For what we have is a reference to [τοὺς θε]σμοθέτας τοὺς ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος. The archon's name, which is not in evidence elsewhere, could have provided a date for future reference, but I put forward for consideration that it may be a reference to something the thesmothetai did in a previous year. Evidently Orontes had been a good man and done his good things in previous time as well as just now (the common formula at lines 5-6). We have to wonder what the thesmothetai are doing here and their role may have been in regard to the symbola. After their mention there ensues after a space δί[κα]ς δοῦναι ἐν τοῖς συμβόλ[οις]; Ath. Pol. 59.6 tells us the thesmothetai were responsible for ratifying symbola and for introducing τὰς δίκας τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν συμβόλων. Following on from the possibility of a backward reference, we can say that in the years after 341/0 Athens was at war with Philip. Of the generals mentioned Phokion and Chares served in 341/0, 340/39, 339/8 and 338/7, Proxenos in 339/8, Charidemos in 338/7; there is ample room for the latter two in a previous year.³⁾

Let me stress that I am not as such arguing for this date and it must always be borne in mind that it means conjuring up a position for a younger Orontes. I would wish to endorse, however, Osborne's remark that the "reading" out of which Rangabé came up with Kallimachos the archon of 349/8 has nothing in the way of epigraphical credentials.⁴⁾ Yet this does not rule it out if it is to be assumed that Pittakys was wrong. On the latter assumption we can list the alternative archons with some visual similarity to Nikomachos' name: Kallimachos 349/8, Nikophemos 361/0, Timokrates 364/3.

(3) The proposer in line 2 has his father's name, whichever version you use. In Pittakys' text he is Polykrates son of Polykrates and so I suppose he may have read the same name twice, changing the case to suit the sense, or assumed that what he was reading was a father's name. But as it stands, this lays the inscription open to Hansen's point against Osborne that the use of father's name on existing evidence rules out a date before 354/3.⁵⁾ Moysey is unaware of this, so I feel it should be mentioned as an item of some importance.

(4) We now continue associating data in the two parts of the inscription. We note the conjunction of Chares, Charidemos and Phokion in command of a force, seemingly in the north Aegean. Proxenos need not have been there, as

3) The evidence for these and other generalships mentioned will be found in my forthcoming Athenian Officials 684-321 B.C. (Cambridge University Press).

4) I venture the suspicion that Rangabé, who had fragments b and c may have wanted the archon to be Kallimachos because of the known coincidence' of generals in his year.

5) M.H.Hansen, "The Number of Rhetores in the Athenian Ecclesia, 355-322 B.C.," GRBS 25 (1984), 134n.31

he is noticed "with the ambassadors." In 364/3 Timotheos was in charge in the north, Charidemos involved, but remember that the archon could be mentioned in a backward reference. For 363/2 we know six generals: Timotheos, Chabrias, Aristophon, Hegesileos, Ergophilos and Kallisthenes. For 362/1 we have two: Autokles and Menon. In 361/0 Chares, among others, was general, but, we are told, though chosen to deal with Alexander of Pherai, he sailed to Corcyra (Diod. 15.95.3; Ain. Takt. 11.13ff.). Kirchner's restoration of Charidemos in IG II² 118, concerning Poteidaia, and his attribution to him of a generalship must be highly dubious and the inscription is not internally dated. Operations were taking place in the north in all these years, but the evidence does not encourage one to have Chares, Charidemos and Phokion in charge.

But if the archon reference is a backward one, even later years become possible. Chares may have been in the Hellespont in 358/7;⁶⁾ he also appears in succeeding years. Charidemos' expedition to Thrace in 351/0 was abandoned (Dem.3.5). He was general in 350/49. The three were all generals in 349/8, but Phokion is known only in Eu.boia. A backward reference to 349/8 now becomes possible. Could we consider 347/6, when Chares was general in the north and Proxenos, though involved in Phokis, later had to convey envoys to Philip (Dem.19.154-155)? How these envoys would get into the inscription I cannot say (though I do not doubt that ingenuity could produce a reason), but fragment d 23 has Πρόξενον τ[ὸν] στρατηγὸν μετὰ τῶν πρέσβων.

Historical considerations and evidence, therefore, do point us rather to the early 340s, if the archon mentioned is not Nikomachos and if the two parts are closely associated in time.

(5) Let us turn, then, to that last conditional. Whether or not one agrees with Osborne (I.52) that elements of the second part in any case presuppose an earlier decree, there is, as Osborne is aware, no guarantee that fragment a is it. Osborne (II. 74-75) argues that this fragment does precede the second document, but I think he is too optimistic. Recall that a 5-6 refers to good deeds "in the previous time." Could not that previous time be that of the second document, now reinscribed on the same stele? Earlier decrees could be so treated: see IG II² 107 (Tod 131). This could even allow the second part to belong to a time earlier in the 340s and the first to be dated to 341/0.

(6) The chances of the Orontes, who, it seems, must be the same man throughout, being the satrap of the 360s appear to be ever reduced. The arche of Orontes is mentioned in fragment a, but there is no internal evidence in the other part that he held such a position as of that time and economical assumptions have as such no evidentiary value. The chronicle of Pergamon (OGIS 264), cited by Osborne II. 65, does indeed, as he argues and despite

6) G.L.Cawkwell, "Notes on the failure of the Second Athenian Confederacy," JHS 101 (1981), 52 and n.49.

Moysey (97 n. 13), strongly suggest that Orontes died, possibly was executed, soon after the end of the satraps' revolt (cf. the prologue to Trogus Book 10 with Osborne II.66 n.216).

(7) Moysey (98) points out that Pandionis, the tribe in prytany in fragment a, is known to have held ninth prytany in 349/8 and part of that prytany will have extended into the month Thargelion, referred to in c 9 as the time, evidently, when the corn was to be acquired. Osborne (II.73) says "the decree should only antedate this month by a little." I suppose we could grant Moysey that arrangements made early in the prytany could be envisaged as being carried out in the next month, but a longer gap is possible and the association is not necessary. So, for example, Pandionis held seventh prytany in Nikomachos' archonship,⁷⁾ which is quite consonant with arrangements made for Thargelion. I see this, however, as entirely speculative.

(8) That Charidemos was an Athenian citizen in the late 360s is a weak part of Osborne's argument, as he has to make a way around the statement of Demosthenes (23.141) that Charidemos gained citizenship "for the sake of Kersebleptes," i.e. after 359 (357 is the date favoured by his opposition), and the reference to this as recent ($\nu\hat{\nu}$). Moysey (98 n. 18) thus has a point. I half-heartedly wonder, though, if Charidemos in the inscription has to be an Athenian general; the reference to Chares and him as strategoi in d 21-22 is constructed, however plausibly, only from an initial sigma.

(9) In c 11 is a reference to money $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\iota\omega\tau\iota\kappa\hat{\omega}\nu$. Moysey states that the existence of the stratiotic fund is not soundly attested until 347/6 (IG II² 212), treasurers being first mentioned in 344/3 (98-99 and n. 24). He is wrong at least in the first part. Dem. 49.12, 16 is evidence for the fund in 373, and 50.10 seems to show officials (though not a tamias) concerned with it in 362/1.⁸⁾

It is all very puzzling and, as I said at the outset, I have no confident solution to offer. Moysey is attacking a target which has moved, but his sights could be adjusted, even if some of his ammunition consists of blanks. It does seem that there are considerable forces ranged against Osborne. There is the plain fact that Pittakys read Nikomachos as archon and provided that it cannot be ruled out, and I am not convinced that it can, it has a sort of evidentiary priority. Then there is the dating criterion of the proposer's father. The coincidence of commanders is difficult to locate in the 360s, not at all in the 340s. And there seems too much to argue away if you wish to make Charidemos a citizen in the late 360s. The 340s, then, seem to be the context, though I would not take it that both parts of the inscription require the same date. The main obstacle is Orontes himself. If the old satrap

7) IG II² 228 (Tod 174; Osborne D 15) - in which Chares also appears!

8) P.Bruns, *Eisphora-syntaxis-stratiotika* (Paris 1983), 37, 170ff.

did not live into the 340s, and I find that unlikely, we are forced to invent a position at some stage for another Orontes, possibly the one later attested. The vacancy for his position of authority can be created and it need not in itself disturb us that neither it nor the relationships at work in the inscription are evidenced elsewhere. Yet one should never feel easy with such an expedient.

University of Tasmania

R.Develin