

MICHAEL B. WALBANK

IG II<sup>2</sup> 207 AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 73 (1988) 83–85

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 AGAIN

In ZPE 69,1987,93-100, R.A.Moysey has discussed the context of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207, whose date has been the subject of dispute ever since its discovery over a century ago.

What neither Moysey nor the two most recent commentators on this document, M.J.Osborne<sup>1)</sup> and A.S.Henry,<sup>2)</sup> have observed is that this inscription was engraved by the same mason as he who inscribed IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 and 143, the former of which is securely dated to 353/2 B.C.,<sup>3)</sup> while the latter has been assigned a date between 375 and 360 B.C.<sup>4)</sup>

Moysey makes a strong case on historical and prosopographical grounds for dating IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 to 349/8 B.C., whereas Osborne, followed by Henry, opts for ca 361 B.C., putting forward good historical arguments, as well as observations based upon the epigraphical formulae involved.<sup>5)</sup>

My identification of the mason as the same man who inscribed IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 in 353/2 B.C. is not, in itself, conclusive in setting IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 at or near to this date. The securely dated IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 provides an "anchor", but, depending on whether one regards it as the earliest or the latest in the series, the others will date to not much before 368 B.C., or not much later than 338 B.C.

Of these three documents, IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143 and 207 are closest both in appearance and in letter sizes: the decree on the upper part of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143, however, was inscribed in larger letters than those used for its epigram and list of names; the same letter size, in fact, that was employed for the decree portion of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138. Comparison of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 and 143 reveals, however, that the set of chisels used in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 was not quite identical in every respect to that used for IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143; moreover, the variation in the horizontal spacing is greater in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 than it is in IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143 and, for the matter, in IG ii<sup>2</sup>

1) BSA 66,1971,297-321, and Naturalization in Athens 1 (Bruxelles 1981) 52-54 and 2 (Bruxelles 1982) 61-80, No. D 12.

2) Honours and Privileges in Attic Decrees (Hildesheim 1983) 94, n.3.

3) For a new fragment of this decree, see M.B.Walbank, *Hesperia* 54,1985, 309-312, No.1.

4) For two new pieces of this document, see SEG XV, 89. It contains the ending of a decree concerning *συμβόλαια*, followed by a verse-epigram and a list of Athenians, probably *διαίτηται*. E.Schweigert assigned it a date between 375 and 360 B.C., "on the basis of its letter-forms and in view of what is known about some of the men in column III." In SEG XV, however, it is dated ca 370 B.C., on the basis of a restoration offered by A.M.Woodward (see below, footnote 6).

5) K.S.Pittakys, *L'ancienne Athènes* (Athens 1835) 500ff., who first published fragment a (which is now lost), included in his transcript an archon-formula which would date the decree to the year 341/0 B.C., but Osborne argues plausibly that Pittakys' transcript was defective on this point.

207. I conclude, therefore, that IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143 and 207 are likely to be very close in date, not far away from 360 B.C.,<sup>6)</sup> whereas IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 should probably be separated from them by an interval of perhaps 10-15 years. I show here tracings of three lines from each of these documents, made from squeezes.

IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143, fragment a<sup>2</sup> (EM 12929)

Π Α Ι Ν Ε Σ Α  
 Δ Ε Τ Ο Ν Ε Υ Ν Ο Μ Ι Α Σ  
 Π Α Υ Σ Α Ν Τ Ε Σ Ν Ε Ι Κ Η

IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207, fragment c (EM 7035<sup>b</sup>)

Ω Ν Ξ Υ Ν Τ Α Ξ Ε Ω Ν Τ Ω Ν Ε  
 Ο Υ Κ Α Ι Φ Ω Κ Ι Ω Ν Ο Σ Τ Α Τ Ε  
 Ο Ν Τ Α Σ Π Α Ρ Α Λ Λ Α Β Ε Ι Ν Τ Ο

IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138, fragment a (EM 6988)

Ε Π Ε Σ Τ Α Τ Ε Ι Ε Υ Θ Υ Μ Λ  
 Ν Ν Ι Α Σ Ε Σ Τ Ι Ν Α Ν Η Ρ  
 Κ Α Ι Ε Ν Τ Ω Ι Π Ρ Ο Σ Θ

To sum up: the historical arguments put forward for the date of IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 by Moysey, on the one hand, and by Osborne, on the other hand, are equally

6) A.M.Woodward, BSA 50, 1955, 271-274, argued that the *δαιτηταί* were those of the year of [Phrasi]kleides (371/0 B.C.); it is equally possible to restore the archon's name as [Chari]kleides (363/2 B.C.), whose date, I believe, is more in keeping with the evidence of the letter-forms.

plausible, although Moysey has overlooked his own earlier arguments<sup>7)</sup> regarding the date of the comparable decree IG ii<sup>2</sup> 141, a point that may incline the reader to favour Osborne's hypothesis. However, the date of the same mason's IG ii<sup>2</sup> 143, although not assured, is not likely to be later than ca 360 B.C., and it might, perhaps, be as early as 371/0 B.C. Thus, it is likely to have been engraved near the beginning of this mason's career, while IG ii<sup>2</sup> 138 would come near the end of his active life. On balance, therefore, IG ii<sup>2</sup> 207 is likely to belong where Osborne places it, ca 361 B.C., rather than in 349/8 B.C., where Moysey places it.

The University of Calgary

Michael B. Walbank

---

7) Am.Journ.Anc.Hist. 1,1976,182ff.