

HAROLD MATTINGLY

SOME FIFTH-CENTURY ATTIC EPIGRAPHIC HANDS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 110–122

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOME FIFTH-CENTURY ATTIC EPIGRAPHIC HANDS¹

In this paper I deal with four recognised groups of Attic hands. The first two masons use three chisels of different widths in a very characteristic pattern and show much affinity to each other. Indeed their work has sometimes been confused by scholars.² Wade-Gery originally isolated the first group, which then comprised four members – a decree for Eleusis (*IG i³ 58*), the Prytaneion Decree (131), the proxeny decree for Korinthios and another for three unknown men (158 and 159). Wade-Gery provided good photographs of all.³ To these *IG i³* adds a fragmentary decree beginning and a sacred calendar (187 and 255). The photographs again bear out the attribution.⁴ Meritt and Wade-Gery had added decrees on the water-supply and perhaps the Eleusinion in Athens (*IG i³ 49* and *50*) and again the photographs seem to confirm this; but in *IG i³* they are noted solely as being both by one hand. I propose to treat them as part of this mason's work or at least from his workshop. This may be the relationship of the Quota List of 416/5 (289), which Meritt and Wade-Gery saw as a late follower of their 3-chisel hand.⁵

The second 3-chisel group was isolated by Michael Walbank and myself. It comprises a Golden Nikai record (*IG i³ 467*), a decree on coinage (90), the Firstfruits measure (78b: Athens copy), the Perdikkas Treaty (89: 423/2?), a tribute schedule (77: 422), the proxeny decree of Asteas (80: 421/0) and the regulations for the Hephaisteia (82: 421/0). The photographs leave little doubt, although Walbank unaccountably failed to include the Nikai

¹ I am grateful to my respondent at the epigraphy seminar Professor Mortimer Chambers for his acute discussion of my paper. I have revised it for publication with his points very much in mind.

² Wilhelm, for instance, thought that *IG i³ 255* (mason 1) was cut by the same hand as 78 b (mason 2): see *Eph. Arch.* 1902 pp. 140-142.

³ *BSA* 33 (1932-1933) pp. 122-135 with figs. 11-16.

⁴ D.M. Lewis, *Hesperia* 44 (1975) p.185.1 and *Eph. Arch.* 1902 p.29f.

⁵ See *JHS* 83 (1963) p.105 n.35; *ATL* ii pl.XIV, D 19 (stone) and B.D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 14 (1945) pp.90-93 (squeezes): *ATL* i p.104 and ii p.37 (photographs of 289). The checker-pattern of 289 – 0.0172 x 0.0115 – is the same as that of the Prytaneion Decree (131).

record.⁶ The Ionic decree for Oiniades of Skiathos (110: 408/7) strikes me as a late product of this mason's workshop, though Meritt and Wade-Gery linked it rather with their group.⁷

Lewis identified a 2-chisel mason as long ago as 1960. His group comprised the recut prescript for Leontini (*IG* i³ 54, 1-15: 433/2), a decree for Apollo Delios? (130) and arrangements for a tribute squadron (60). He then thought that a treaty with an unknown state (67) was very close. In *IG* i³ he offers the proxeny decree for Leonidas (156) as a fourth member of the group. Once again the photographs bear out the connections.⁸

The fourth group centres round the famous Kallias Decrees (*IG* i³ 52 A-B) on Athenian finances. Bradeen was surely right in seeing both as the work of one mason and in recognising the Poteidaia epigrams as being also by him. They are usually dated 432, though 429 remains a viable alternative.⁹ Lewis has lately plausibly linked the Ionic sacred calendar from Thorikos with the Kallias hand, dating it accordingly c.440-430 against Daux's c.385-370. The hands are certainly very close and suggest proximity in time.¹⁰

I would begin by studying Lewis' 2-chisel hand. Menu rightly dissociated *IG* i³ 60 from the Melian expedition and saw its true meaning. We can now narrow down his c.430 dating. The decree established a force of thirty triremes to extract money from the allies,

⁶ See my article in *BCH* 92 (1968) pp.467 and 472-475 with *BSA* 65 (1970) pp. 142 and 147 (cutter's pattern); M.B. Walbank in *ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to B.D. Meritt* (edd. D.W. Bradeen & M.F. McGregor) (Locust Valley: 1974) p. 168f n.21 and *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto: 1978) p.51 n.21. For 467 see E. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) p.309 (photograph); for 77, 89 and 90 see H.B. Mattingly, *BSA* 65 (1970) p.141 a-c. For 80 see O. Kern, *Imagines Inscriptioinum Atticorum* (1948) no.17 and Walbank, *Proxenies* p.1.29 (his no. 49). For 78 b see the photograph in A. Wilhelm, *Jahresheft* 6 (1903) p.10 with Wilhelm's notes on the lettering on p.15 and in *Anzeiger Ak. Wien* 1922 p.45.

⁷ For photographs see Kern, *Imagines* no. 18 and Walbank, *Proxenies* p.1.60 (his no.87). On the mason see B.D. Meritt and H.T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* 83 (1963) p.105 n.35. The checker-pattern incidentally – 0.0162 x 0.011 – is the same as for 467 (Nikai). But it is not an uncommon one.

⁸ See D.M. Lewis, *BSA* 55 (1960) pp.190-194; for photograph of 130 b see pl.51a; for 54, 1-15 see D.W. Bradeen and M.F. McGregor, *Studies in Fifth Century Epigraphy* (Norman: 1973) p.111 pl.XX; for 60 see *Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson* (ed. G.E. Mylonas) ii (St Louis: 1953) p.1.69; for 156 see Walbank, *Proxenies* p.1.11 (his no.22). Leonidas' decree has the same checker-pattern – 0.0145 x 0.0190 – as the tribute squadron decree.

⁹ See D.W. Bradeen, *GRBS* 12 (1971) pp.469-483. Photographs in H.T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* 51 (1931) pls.I-III and *ATL* i p.210f. (Kallias): A.E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) p.21, (Poteidaia): *IG* i² 945 = *IG* i³ 1179. Poteidaia fell in winter 429 and the epigrams might commemorate the whole siege (Thuc. 270) rather than just the first battle.

¹⁰ See D.M. Lewis, *ZPE* 60 (1985) p.107; G. Daux, *L' Ant. Class.* 52 (1983) pp.151-160 with pls.I-II.

with a strong complement of marines, peltasts and archers – Athenian and allied combined.¹¹ Now in 430 and 428 (Thuc. 2.69 and 3.19) Athens had sent out such squadrons, but with low numbers of ships – 6 and 12 only – and both expeditions met with disaster. In 425/4 three generals were operating with larger forces of “money-raising” ships over a far wider area (Thuc. 4.50 and 75). Since one general took ten ships into the Black Sea, we may assume that the whole force amounted to thirty as in *IG* i³ 60.¹² Just before Kleon went to Pylos peltasts from Amos and archers from other allies were ready for service in Athens (Thuc. 4.28.4) and Kleon diverted them for his Sphacteria adventure. This is the first mention of such specialised allied cadres in the war.¹³ Finally in *Knights* 1070-1072 (winter 424) the Sausage-seller warns Demos that Apollo does not want him to give Kleon the swift “money-raising” ships for which he is always clamouring. Tougher measures for collecting tribute were imperative after the great Reassessment of 425 and everything points to dating the establishment of the special naval force precisely then.

The known work of the 2-chisel mason seems to lie between 433 and 425. The Leonidas proxeny decree (156) should not be put later than 427/8, since the secretary Charoiades is surely the general who died in Sicily in 427/6 (Thuc. 3.86 and 90.2).¹⁴ Lewis put 130 c.432, but this depends overmuch on his conjectures on its nature. The main text – long since lost – was found in the Peiraeus and earlier editors linked it with the cult of Zeus Soter, the main male deity of the port.¹⁵ Lewis added a smaller fragment from the Peiraeus Museum and I think that he was right in this. The likely line-length, the find-spot (not common for decrees), the checker-pattern and the subject matter of both pieces seem to fit.¹⁶ The deduction of Lewis from b 2 TEIEBA that the decree honoured Apollo and then from b

¹¹ B.D. Meriti, *Studies Robinson* ii pp.298-303.

¹² Lamachos had a minor disaster with *his* ten, which shows that the lesson had not been fully learned.

¹³ Gomme correctly noted that Thucydides' phrase about Amos did not mean that they sent peltasts regularly before this. D.W. Bradeen, in *ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to B.D. Meritt* (edd. D.W. Bradeen & M.F. McGregor) (Locust Valley: 1974) p.32f., was surprised “to find the allies included in these categories alone; perhaps it was a paucity of Athenian peltasts that led to their inclusion”.

¹⁴ The name is fairly rare and in the fifth century secretaries were distinguished men (“Arist.” *AP* 54.3).

¹⁵ See *IG* i² 128 with commentary; R. Schlaifer, *HSCP* 51 (1940) p.234 with n.4; W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*² (Munich: 1931) p.453 on Zeus Soter.

¹⁶ *BSA* 55 (1960) p.191. The smaller fragment has a checker-pattern 0.0194 x 0.0137: width and height of *IG* i² 128, when reckoned against surviving letters and lines, yield a very similar grid.

4 ΤΟΣΔΕΛΙ that it was Apollo Delios from Phaleron is much more questionable. The date could be the 17th or the 24th, as easily as Apollo's seventh, and in b 4 we could restore τὸς δὲ λί[θος] instead of τὸς Δελί[ος]. The clause might then authorise use of available stones near the site for repairs and improvements, just as in the decree for the Rheitos bridge in 422/1 (*IG* i³ 79, 5-11).¹⁷ *IG* i³ 130 may then deal with Zeus Soter after all and an excellent context can be found in 429/8. The enemy tried an audacious surprise attack on the Peiraeus, which was badly guarded, and, though diverted to Salamis by their fear of the wind, they caused near panic in city and port alike. After this the Athenians took rather better care of their harbours, whose defence they had clearly neglected (Thuc. 2.93-94). The credulous may have attributed the lucky escape to the watchful eye of Zeus Soter and certainly it would have been expedient to court him at this juncture. For the importance of his cult to the individual *naukleros* and *emporos* as well as to the Athenian state we need look no further than Aristophanes' *Ploutos* 1171-1190.¹⁸ The proposer of the decree was Lysikles and, though the name is not uncommon, it is tempting to identify him as the unlucky general of 428 (Thuc. 3.19.2).

I now turn to Wade-Gery's mason. The decree on the water-supply (*IG* i³ 49) shows that Perikles' family and his wards had offered to defray its costs, but the Assembly decided that it would be paid for out of current tribute. The decree can hardly be later than 430, since Xanthippos and Paralos died of the plague, and 432/1 – on the very edge of war – looks the likeliest placing.¹⁹ The Eleusis decree (*IG* i³ 58) was evidently passed after war had broken out, but not perhaps very long. The reference to setting guards on the sanctuary looks like reaction to Spartan invasion and certainly such measures began in summer 431.²⁰ The decree from the Athens Eleusinion? (*IG* i³ 50) could be the Athenian copy of the Eleusis

¹⁷ We should allow for both τῆι ἐβδ[όμει ἐπὶ δέκα ---] and τῆι ἐβδ[όμει φθίνοντος ---] in b 2 (*IG* i³ 130, 17). After [--- ἐς τὸν ἐπισκ/]εὐὲν τὸ ἱερῶ in b 3f. (130, 18f.) a new clause about building-stones is entirely in place. In the next line they seem to be ear-marked for this temple alone.

¹⁸ The *naukleroi* apparently contributed a drachm from their voyage(s) to the god's cult (*IG* i³ 130, 3-5). Schlaifer tried to include the *emporoi* also in line 3, but Lewis could not easily fit them in.

¹⁹ See my argument in *Historia* 10 (1961) pp.164ff., and see W.E. Thompson, *Athenaeum* 49 (1971) pp.329-332 (dating it c.430).

²⁰ See Wade-Gery, *BSA* 33 (1932-1933) p. 127: *IG* i³ 58, 20f. [--- π]ρὸ τὸ πολέμο οἰκὼν Ἐλευ/[σῖνι...] and 22f. καθάπερ πρὸ τὸ [πο/λέμο-?]: Thuc. 2.21 with 16f. [καθισ]τάντων δὲ φύλακας οἱ ἄρ/[χοντες --?]).

decree. Wade-Gery's text in *IG i³ 58* should probably be restored with a 58-letter line – with 50 the orator has only four letters in line 19 – and 50 can easily be restored to match with a prytany of six letters and a secretary of five. As with the Firstfruits Decree (*IG i³ 78 a-b*) probably one mason will have cut both copies with the same line-length and checker-pattern.²¹ The Prytaneion Decree (*IG i³ 131*) has normally been dated pre-war since Wade-Gery's study, but the arguments are too subjective. Jameson anyway in *IG i³* has cast doubt on Perikles as the orator and the Archidamian War lies open.²² The decree listed five classes of people entitled to *sitesis* in the Prytaneion: (1) high Eleusinian officials (?); (2) descendants of Harmodios and Aristogeiton; (3) *mantels* designated by Apollo; (4) victors in gymnastic and equestrian contests at the great games and (5) generals for outstanding military service.²³ Kleon won his grant of *sitesis* for his exploits at Pylos in summer 425 and Aristophanes extracts maximum profit in his *Knights* (Lenaia, 424). Hierokles the *mantis* was similarly mocked in *Peace* 1084-1087 and Lampon (Schol. *Birds* 521) must also have had the right by the 420s. Kleon's boast about his privilege (*Knights* 763-768) is soon neatly undercut by Demos in 786f., when he greets the Sausage-seller as a true descendant of Harmodios and, for his patriotic spirit, worthier than Kleon of sharing Harmodios' honour. All this would make excellent sense if the Prytaneion Decree and its very language

²¹ The checker-pattern of 50 and 58 is 0.0172 [0.0178] x 0.0133; that of 78 a and b is 0.0134 x 0.095-0.01 [0.093] and the line length is 50 letters. Wilhelm was convinced that both copies were cut by the same man (*Jahresheft* 6 [1903] p.15 and *Anz. Ak. Wien* [1922] p.45). There is no published photograph of the Eleusis copy (a), but my autopsy in the Epigraphic Museum seemed to confirm Wilhelm's view.

²² See Wade-Gery, *BSA* 33 (1932-1933) pp.123-126. On p.125 he writes "So I think the name is Perikles; and the august nature of the decree makes this likely". On p.126 we find "The third and fourth [classes of grant] are apparently bestowed by this decree. They suggest peace-time, and Delphi was very hostile to Athens at the outset of war... If Perikles was the proposer, I think this decree must belong to the early 'thirties". Jameson reads the name as [...]ἱκλες which allows too many alternatives.

²³ The hierophant and dadouchos were certainly *aeisitoi* in the Roman imperial period: see M. Ostwald, *AJP* 72 (1951) pp.28-32 and W.E. Thompson, *AJP* 92 (1971) p.228 with n.12. But their *sitesis* was then in the Tholos (S.G. Miller, *The Prytaneion* [Berkeley: 1978] p.38 n.1). Ostwald supplied the *manteis* as the third class (op.cit. pp.40-45) and Thompson (op.cit. pp.233-235) and Miller (op.cit. p.140) support this against the alternative suggestion of *exegetai Pythochrestoi*. Miller cuts his text off (op.cit. p. 139f. no.26) just before the suggestive remnant *περὶ τὸ στρατ* in line 19; but he recognises that successful generals did receive *sitesis* since Kleon – as Iphikrates (Dem. 23.130) – and that the decree covered them (op.cit. p.7f.). Jameson is prepared to link line 19 with this, but sees that the phrase could indicate just the stele's location. The choice might still be determined by the decree's relevance to the generals' office.

was still fairly fresh in the spectators' minds.²⁴

Wade-Gery's mason certainly cut *IG i*³ 158, 159 and 187 by the Archidamian War period, since there is no room for an archon in their preambles. This criterion looks sounder than before, now that *IG i*³ 91 and 92 prove to be dated 422/1 and not c.416/5. Their secretary Archikles Halaieus has appeared as secretary on a decree from Alkaios' archonship, which Matthaïou will publish.²⁵ Lykon's proxeny decree (*IG i*³ 174) – again without archon – should also go in 422/1 rather than 425-410; the secretary is surely Theaios and presumably is identical with the proposer of *IG i*³ 79 of the year of Alkaios.²⁶ Methodologically, decrees without archons should normally be put before the Peace of Nikias and this causes no problem with Wade-Gery's mason. His known work seems to stretch over a period of less than a dozen years.

*IG i*³ 159 is probably the latest. The formula for praise of the *proxenoi* is unusual and has only two close parallels. There is an intriguingly wide choice of other variations. Here we have the form "A. of B. since he does good to the Athenians, inscribe as *proxenos* and benefactor". The two parallels are dated 422/1 and 415/4 and suggest a possible dating-bracket for 159.²⁷ This is confirmed by evidence from the formula for publication. This is the compressed or telescoped form – "inscribe on a stone pillar on the Acropolis" – familiar from the records of proxeny, but rare with decrees of the fifth century, as my Table B shows:

²⁴ The generals' right and that of the *manteis* may have been newly established by the decree. *Knights* 281-284 (Perikles was never thought worthy of *sitesis*) and 575-578 (generals of old never begged Kleon's father for *sitesis*) and *Peace* 1084-1087 (a *wartime* grant) point this way.

²⁵ I owe my information to David Lewis. The archon-dating is not in the preamble, but is an "editorial" addition.

²⁶ I have argued a historical case for this dating in *BCH* 92 (1968) p.479, taking Lykon to be from Achaia Phthiotis and not the Peloponnese. Peisander, who proposed the decree, was a stubborn opponent of peace in 422/1 (*Peace* 395) and could have been effective in this as a Councillor.

²⁷ B.D. Meritt (*Hesperia* 10 [1941] pp.334ff.) established, with appeal to earlier editions, that IAΘE was a wholly legitimate reading in 159, 8. The rest all follows from that, although so little text survives.

TABLE A
FORMULAE FOR PRAISE OF <i>PROXENOI</i>
<i>IG i³ 174, 5-8 (Lykon: 422/1)</i>
Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀχαιοῶν, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποιεῖ Ἀθηναίω[ς], ἀναγραφάτω πρόψενον καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ---].
<i>IG i³ 95, 5-9 (proxeny: 415/4)</i>
Ἀνα[... ⁶ ...]/ν καὶ τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπειδὴ εὖ ποιεῖ τὴν πόλιν καὶ Ἀθηναίος, ἀναγράψαι πρόξενον [καὶ εὐεργέτην Ἀθηναίων ---].
<i>IG i³ 159, 4-10 (triple proxeny)</i>
[ἐπε]στάτε, Ἀ[... ⁶ ... εἶπε· ... ⁵ .../...]ον τὸν Ἀ[..... ¹⁵/...]αν τὸν Αἰ[..... ¹⁵/....τ]ὸν Φε[.... ⁷ ...], ἐπειδὴ εὖ/ [ποιδσ]ι Ἀθηναίος, ἐπαινέσαι μὲν καὶ ἀναγράψαι προχσένος/ καὶ εὐεργέτας ---].

TABLE B
FORMULAE FOR PUBLICATION
<i>IG i³ 11, 11-14 (Egesta: 458/7?)</i>
---[τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν [ἡόρκ]ο[ν] ἀνα[γρ]α[φ]ῆ[σα]ι ἐστέλει λιθίνει ἐμ πόλει τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς· [ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομισθοσάντων]· ἡοι δὲ κολακρέται δό[ν]το[ν τὸ ἀργύριον ---].
<i>IG i³ 119, 6-9 (Klazomenians: 408)</i>
[καὶ ἀνα]γράψαι τὸν γραμμα[τέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν στήλῃ]/λιθίνῃ ἐν [πόλει τὰς τε ξυνθήκας καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε ---].
<i>IG i³ 125, 29-32 (Epikerdes: 405/4)</i>
[--- τ/δ] δὲ ψήφισμα τ[όδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γρα[μ]ματέα τῆς βολ[ῆς] ἐμ πόλει ἐν στήλῃ/λιθίνῃ ὕ Ἀρχε[---].
<i>IG i³ 159, 12-17 (triple proxeny)</i>
ἡο δ/[ἐ] γραμματεὺς ἡο τῆς βολῆς ἀνα[γρα]φάτω ἐμ πόλει ἐστέλει λιθίνει· ἡοι δὲ πολεταὶ ἀπομ[ισθ]ο[σάντων]· ἡοι δὲ κολακρέται δό[ν]τον τὸ ἀργύριον ---].

It recurs intermittently between 403/2 and 38/16 and then virtually disappears.²⁸

Its natural use with multiple publication should probably be discounted for dating, as in the pre-war Eleusinian *epistati* decree (*IG* i³ 32, 32-34), where no less than three separate locations are involved.²⁹ It is worth noting that the fuller form - “inscribe on a stone pillar and set up on the Acropolis” - is used for the plain recording of *proxenoi* in 422/1 and 421/0, which confirms the change in usage in decrees about this date.³⁰ Only *IG* i³ 11 disturbs this pattern, on accepted dating (458/7!). But Mortimer Chambers has now virtually proved that the archon of the Egesta Treaty must be Antiphon (418/7).³¹ For those still unconvinced there is a powerful formal argument in its favour. The Egestan envoys are invited for hospitality ἐς τὸν νομιζόμενον χρόνον instead of the almost invariable ἐς αὐριον (lines 14f.). The one parallel is in *IG* i³ 165 (lines 14-16), a decree datable on its lettering and the anomalous feminine dative plural δραγμαῖσι c.420 and so listed in *IG* i³.³² I submit that the two uses of the exceptional periphrasis mark reaction to a recent deviation. In the last prytany of 418/7 we are back to the regular ἐς αὐριον (*IG* i³ 85, 3f.). Not long before that, however, we may put the troublesome decree for the Eretrians (*IG* i³ 149: 433-412), which provides in lines 14f. for hospitality in the Prytaneion for once not just on the morrow, but for a somewhat vague period - ἕως ἂν ἐπιδεμῶσι?. In the early part of 418/7 this would be twice implicitly censured by Assembly orators.³³

The publication formula of *IG* i³ 159 then also suggests that it should be dated no earlier

²⁸ See *IG* ii² 1, 66-68 (403/2); 17, 8-11 (394/3); M.B. Walbank, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) p.72f. no.2, 13-15 (c.394-2); 55, 6-8 and 56, 1-3 (before 387/6). Tod, *GHI* ii no.110 (Athens and Karpathos), has the telescoped form in lines 34-38 and is normally dated c.393. But Lewis would put it back to c.430 and will so publish it in *IG* i³, 2. Two locations are involved, as with Sthorys' decree (*IG* ii² 17). However in *IG* i³ 156, 19-26 (c.428?), 71, 22-25 (425) and 78, 48-51 (c.422?) the fuller form is used for the posting of decrees in two places. See next note for the problem of triple posting.

²⁹ The compressed form is used also in the treaty between Athens and Argos, Mantinea and Elis in 420/19 (Thuc. 5.47.11). The Elean copy was a bronze pillar setup jointly by all parties.

³⁰ See *IG* i³ 92, 9-13 and 174, 5-11 (422/1); 80, 12-18 and probably 81, 17-19 (421/0).

³¹ See the article by Chambers, Gallucci and Spanos in these *Acta* ('Athens' Alliance with Egesta in the Year of Antiphon').

³² See my arguments in *AJP* 105 (1984) pp.342-344 (review of *IG* i³). The only sure parallels to the anomaly are *IG* i³ 84, 10, 17 and 20 (χιλίασι, ταμίασι and μυρίασι: 418/7) and 78, 20 (χιλίασι).

³³ In *IG* i² 49 and Schweigert's text (*Hesperia* 6 [1937] p.322f.) fragments a and b are so placed as to allow reading [--- καλέ]σαι δὲ καὶ ἐπ[ὶ χσένια ..]/....]δεν ἐς τὸ πρ[υτανεῖ]ο[v] ἕως ἂν ἐπιδεμῶσι---] or ἐ[ῖ]τ[ι] 'Αθένεσι ---].

than 422/1. At this point in the argument Wade-Gery's admission in 1933 could become very relevant. He noted that the preamble of 159 *could* be restored exactly as in the Kallias Decrees. But he fairly also admitted that the prytany might be read as [ἡ]π[ρ]ο[θ]οντί[ς] and not [Κε]κ[ρ]ο[π]ί[ς]. If Kekropis really could be read, the Kallias Decrees might have to be dated 422/1 rather than 434/3.³⁴ But Walbank seems to have clinched this matter. Careful scrutiny of the stone convinced him that we must read ΠΟ and not ΡΟ in line 2 and this would impose Hippothontis. I fear that he is probably right, though even his good photograph is disappointing at the crucial point.³⁵

My study, however, weakens the accepted dating of the Kallias Decrees in other ways. The 430/29 dating suggested for the Golden Nikai record (*IG* i³ 467) takes the Kaffias dating as its base, since they are thought to be two of those authorised in the second decree.³⁶ In fact the method of weighing and listing the Nikai - as I argued in 1974 - is closer to 469 of c.410 than to 468, the record of the two completed in 426/5. Those are surely too late to be seen as statues, whose completion was decided in 434/3.³⁷ And the Nikai of 467 will have to be dated on principle close to the datable specimens of this mason's work, which center on the late 420s - with a possible outlier in 408/7.³⁸

Were they two of the Nikai authorised by Kaffias B? It is time to examine the evidence on the Kallias hand. The Poteideia epigrams (*IG* i³ 945 = i³ 1179) would fit either rival Kallias dating. But the Ionic text from Thorikos tilts the balance later. It has a close formal link with the religious calendar in Attic script from the Tetrapolis(?), which was cut by Wade-Gery's mason. Both use horizontal lines above new entries on the left to mark paragraphing and seem organised in monthly sections.³⁹ Interest in local religious life was surely revived as the bitter memories of invasion faded, especially after the Peace of Nikias. It is to this

³⁴ See *BSA* 33 (1932-1933) p.134. Wade-Gery wanted in any case to date 159 in the late 430s. Woodhead, dating it in *IG* i³ c.430, curiously printed [Κε]κ[ρ]ο[π]ί[ς] in the preamble without any note.

³⁵ See *Proxenia* p. 196f. and p1.18 (his no.37).

³⁶ See E. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) p.309f.

³⁷ See my article in *ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to B.D. Meritt* (edd. D.W. Bradeen & M.F. McGregor) (Locust Valley: 1974) pp.94-96.

³⁸ The Nikai record might be put c.420 or even later. Its checker-pattern is the same as that of the Oiniades decree - not perhaps coincidence.

³⁹ See G. Daux, *L'Ant. Class.* 52 (1983) pp. 151-160 with pls.I-II: *IG* i³ 255 (after lines 11?, 14, 17, 18) with Jameson's commentary on p.229.

period that Lewis preferred to attribute the Ionic record of Plotheia's finances and cults (*IG* i³ 257) and indeed documents entirely in Ionic script are rare in Attica before the 420s, except for those concerned with foreigners.⁴⁰ With its five old feminine dative plurals the Thorikos calendar can still be put as late as c.420, as my Table C of old and new forms shows. But Table C (which excludes square brackets, dotted letters and the rest in order to present a clear picture) will show more than this. The old forms are not known to Attic prose literature. As Dover lately observed "the rapidity and the completeness of the change from -ασι and -ησι to -αις in the neighbourhood of 420 point to a conscious decision and agreement, of a kind which plays no part in the evolution of literary or vernacular language":⁴¹

⁴⁰ Thus we have the Phaselis decree (*IG* i³ 10), the settlement with Eretria (39) and Aristonoos of Larissa's proxeny (55) all dated, with wide agreement, before the Archidamian War on these grounds. *IG* i³ 48 bis (part of a decree granting privileges to a priest) would be an exception to the rule, if the goddess (line 4) is Athena in one of her forms and the priest a citizen. But a shrine of Bendis was established before 430/29 (*IG* i³ 383, 143) – which fits the dating evidence for 48 bis (4.40-430) – and *her* priest would be Thracian.

⁴¹ *Trans. Phil. Soc.* (1981) p.4.

TABLE C		
OLD AND NEW FEMININE DATIVE PLURALS (434-417 BC)		
-ΑΣΙ, -ΕΣΙ		-ΑΙΣ
<i>FLOATING</i>		
434/3?	IG i ³ 52 B, 21: ταμίασι	52 A, 6, 18, 29: ἔλλενοταμίαις, ταμίαις, αἶς
c.440-430:	256, 2f., 6f.: τῆσι, Νύμφησι L' Ant. Class. (1980) 153f. [5]: ἠρωίνησι	256, 13: ταῖς Νύμφαις
430/29?:		281, col. III, 54, 60: ταῖσδε
429/8?:		282 col. I, 11: ἀρχαῖς
c.430:		255 A, 19: Νύμφαις
before 420:	165, 4f.: δραγμαῖσι	
<i>RECORDS</i>		
420/19:	353, 50: ταμίασι	418/7: 305, 2 & 329, 2: ταμίαις
432/1-427:	365 [5]: ἠελλενοταμίασι	422/1: 369, 26: ἠελλενοταμίαις (+ 7 others)
433/2:	450, 410: ἐπιστάτεσι	420/19: 473, 7f.: ἐπιστάταις
<i>DECREES</i>		
c.431:	55, 8f., 20f.: χιλίασιν δραχμησι	
c.430:	59, 4, 45: ταμίασιν, δραχμῆσι, χιλίασι	
by 428/7:	156, 5: τῆσι ἄλλεσι	
425/4:	71, 14, 30f.: μυρίασι [2], χιλίασι 37f., 42: δραχμῆσι [3], τῆσι [4]	?425/4: 60, 14: ταύταις ταῖς
424/3:	61, 14, 38f.: τῆσι [3], μυρίασι 48, 51f.: δραχμῆσιν, ἄλλεσι	424/3: 75, 29: ταῖς χουνθέκαις
c.423/2:	78a, 15, 20: αὐτέσι, χιλίασιν, δραχμῆσι 30: τῆσι ἄλλεσι τῆσι ἠελλενικῆσιν ἀπάσεσι	422/1: 76, 27: ἐν στέλαις λιθίναις 29: ἐν ταῖς στέλαις
421/0:	81, 22: -κτεσιν οσ-ετεςιν 82, 12: δεμότεσι	
418/7:	84, 10, 17, 20: χιλίασι, μυρίασι 20: δραχμῆσιν [2], ταμίασι	420/19: 83, 25: ἠαπάσαις ταῖς 418/7: 84, 16f.: ἀποδέκταις

IG i³ 84 of 418/7 is the only decree which uses both forms and the usage of the old in lines 10, 17 and 20 is anomalous.⁴² Kallias A has three new forms and B one old one, suggesting the same point of final transition, and, as Kallet-Marx has ably argued, B was probably passed substantially later than A – very possibly in a new prytany and with another secretary.⁴³ Now Dover has made it likely that either proposer or secretary or both were responsible for the actual language of decrees. He showed that Kallias A revealed “a certain liking for the perfective aspect and for its expression in periphrastic form”, which is missing from B as preserved. Kallet-Marx rightly saw this as support for her cause and I would argue that the new secretary stood out for the old dative.⁴⁴ Dover adduced other evidence than the datives to demonstrate “a systematic attempt to modernise documentary language in the decade 430-420”, though he had to admit that it was “only partially successful”.⁴⁵

The formal evidence recommends dating the Kallias Decrees to 422/1. The secretary Mnesiphilos is presumably the *hellenotamis* of 418/7 from Aigeis. Archikles of Halai (*IG* i³ 91-92) would then have to be from Kekropis.⁴⁶ The only obstacle is Meritt’s assumption that Prepis, secretary of Aigeis in 422/1 (*IG* i³ 79, 3) was from Xypete (VII); this was based on a very plausible revision of a dedication by the wife (?) of a Prepis from that deme.⁴⁷ Prepis is admittedly a rare name and so is Eupheros, the name of the secretary’s father; but Prepis from Xypete could still be from a different family. Attic prosopography continually

⁴² We find *χιλίασι* in lines 8 and 20 of *IG* i³ 55 from c.431 (see Thuc. 2.22.3), but both are restorations. To repeat, in my Table C I have included the readings and throughout omit square brackets, dotted letters and the rest, so as to present a clear, uncluttered picture. I am, however, very doubtful of the text of *IG* i³ 55. Such spelling is isolated c.430. *IG* i³ gives McGregor’s rival text (joining the two fragments), which yields *χιλίασι* in line 9 and probably 13; see *ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to B.D. Meritt pp.* 104-106 and pl.XV. His case seems to me cogent.

⁴³ See *CQ*² 39 (1989) pp.95-100.

⁴⁴ See Dover, *op.cit.* pp. 1-3, 6-9; Kallet-Marx, *op.cit.* p.96.

⁴⁵ Dover, *op.cit.* p.4f.

⁴⁶ There cannot be two secretaries from one tribe save for a replacement within a prytany; but Halai is associated with both Arraphen (II) and Aixone (VII).

⁴⁷ B.D. Meritt, *AJP* 62 (1941) p. 10f.

surprises us.⁴⁸ Even if the secretary should prove to be of Kekropis, it would just be arguable that Mnesitheos was not the *hellenotamias* and from a different tribe, the name being not uncommon. But I do not much like this way out.⁴⁹ The point that I would end on is that formal evidence would date Kaffias 422/1 and that the evidence on the hand of the decrees - Poteideia epigrams perhaps 429 and the Thorikos calendar c.420 – so far points the same way.⁵⁰ Perhaps someone will now engage in a serious study of this epigraphic hand and see where the main weight of the mason's productions lies.⁵¹

HAROLD MATTINGLY

Cambridge

⁴⁸ There is a Prepis of unknown tribe on a casualty-list from the 450s (*IG* i² 933, 23 = i³ 1150). Meritt (*AJP* 62 [1941] p.11) knew of a Eupheros of Aphidnai (IX) – one of only four in *PA* – and once saw that as Prepis the secretary's deme also. A Eupheros Aurides (VIII: hellenistic date) emerged from the Agora finds before 1941.

⁴⁹ There are a number of men of this name in *PA* from several tribes in the fifth and fourth centuries BC. But secretaries were men of account in the fifth century and might well move on to be generals or *hellenotamiai*. See for example Pasiphon Phrearnos - secretary in 413/2 (*IG* i³ 136, 1), general in 410/9 (*IG* i³ 375, 35) and naval commander in 409, dying on active service (*IG* i³ 1191, 10). P.J. Rhodes (*A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* [Oxford: 1981] p.602f. *ad* 54.3) plays down the secretaries' eminence slightly, I think. There are such gaps in our knowledge of the composition of the main boards of state.

⁵⁰ Walbank linked *IG* i³ 160 with the Kallias hand: see *Proxenes* p.214 and pl.21a (his no.40). He may well be right, but 160 is very fragmentary and both he and *IG* i³ date it only very loosely (c.435-415 or c.435-420). In line 6 Σικελί[α is a sound reading and it is tempting to think of a date no earlier than 427/6, when Athens first intervened in Sicily. But the context could be the Leontinoi treaty negotiations in 433/2 (see *IG* i³ 54 and 53: Rhegion).

⁵¹ Stephen Tracy's important article in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow* (ed. K.J. Rigsby) (Durham, NC: 1984) pp.277-282 raises basic issues about the identification of epigraphic hands. In my study I was more concerned to see what could be done historically with hands that have been considered "identical" by several scholars. However, Tracy's challenge must be met and more objective criteria of judgement must be formed.