

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

WHAT ARE THE RIGHT DATING CRITERIA FOR FIFTH-CENTURY ATTIC
TEXTS?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 126 (1999) 117–122

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

WHAT ARE THE RIGHT DATING CRITERIA FOR FIFTH-CENTURY ATTIC TEXTS?

Alan Henry has recently vigorously restated his case against the claim by Chambers, Gallucci and Spanos that ΙΦΟΝ is the correct reading for the end of the archon's name in *IG I³ 11* with its three-barred sigmas. There is no reason, he argues, for drastically down-dating the Eggesta Treaty to 418/7 BC, since none can be 100% certain about what can be read on the stone.¹ In the same short paper he seeks to demolish two main arguments for putting the Standards Decree (*IG I³ 1453*), despite the three-barred sigmas of the Kos copy, precisely in 425/4. He concludes that we should continue to respect the three-barred sigma criterion in dating Attic documents until uncontrovertible proof to the contrary is found. This strikes me as rather depressing after more than half a lifetime's work trying to free scholars from the tyranny of the 'before c. 445' rule.² What Henry ignores, however, is the existence of other strong evidence for the 418/7 and 425/4 datings.

I would first examine the close verbal correspondence between *IG I³ 11.14 f.* and *165.14-6*. I set them side by side:

- a) [ιον· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ] ἡ χσένια τὲν πρεσβείαν τῶν Ἐ[γεσταίων]
[ἔς πρυτανεῖον ἔς τὸν] νομιζόμενον χρόνον.
b) [ὄ· καὶ καλέσαι αὐ]τὸς καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν [. . .⁶. . .]
[.¹⁴.] ἐπὶ χσένια ἔς τὸ π[ρυτανεῖ]-
[ον ἔς τὸν νομιζόμε]νον χρόνον *vacat* [*vacat*]

Meritt challenged the Pritchett / *IG I³* text of 165 on the basis of a plausible reading of line 8 f.:

καὶ ἐν [τῷ βολευτ]

[ε]ρίοι ἐν [σανιδί]οι

This necessitates a stoichedon line of 32 – not 35 letters – and in line 15 f. he suggested

[.¹¹. καὶ] ἐπὶ χσένια ἔς τὸ π[ρυτα]
[νῆον ἔς τὸν εἰρεμέ]νον χρόνον *vacat*

He was followed by several other scholars. Now his change does not radically alter the significance of the phrase in the two decrees.³ But there is a fatal flaw. The spelling πρυτανῆον is not found before 405/4 and is used only sparingly in the early fourth century. Meritt's variant can be retained by allowing a 33 letter line, but that defeats his basic case.⁴ He further argued that the regular phrase ἐς] ἄρριον for Prytaneion invitations came into use only c. 424 (*IG I³ 67*) and that *IG I³ 11.14 f.* and *165.14-6* represented an earlier formulation. He apparently forgot *IG I³ 57.13* (c. 430) and 66.25 (427/6?) and it may simply be due to our incomplete record that we have no example from the 430s or earlier. Meritt's date for 165 was c. 435.⁵ How sound is this dating? Walbank considered the lettering of 165 very close

¹ For Chambers, Gallucci and Spanos see *ZPE* 83 (1990), 38–63. For Henry's campaign see *ZPE* 91 (1992), 138 f. and 142 f. with *CQ* N.S. 45 (1995), 238 and *ZPE* 120 (1998), 45 f. Henry's agnosticism has won adherents. See Lyntette Mitchell's review of my *Athenian Empire Restored* (Michigan: 1996) in *CR* N.S. 48 (1998), 373 f. Stewart Dawson's careful study of the crucial 'iota' (*ZPE* 112 (1996), 249–51) could make such doubters pause. But in this paper I would provisionally allow Henry's epigraphic case to stand.

² *ZPE* 120 (1998), 46–8.

³ For Pritchett's republication of *IG I³ 85* with a new fragment see *Calif. Stud.* 5 (1972), 159–64. Lewis in *IG I³* took over his line-length, but not all his supplements. For Meritt's view see *ZPE* 25 (1978), 288–95: M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto: 1978), no. 35, 186–90; Henry, *ZPE* 78 (1989), 249 f.; D. Whitehead, *ZPE* 118 (1997), 163–5.

⁴ For πρυτανῆον see *IG I³ 127.37* (405/4): II² 1.51, 53, 63, 75 (403/2): II² 13 b.8 (398/7): 24.16 with 51.17 and 53.10 (all before 387/6). The one outlier from 362/1 (109 b.31) may be due to a cutter's error, since the normal spelling is found in b.6.

⁵ Op. cit. (n. 3), 294 f. He dated *IG I³ 67* after Hiller. But Walbank (op. cit. (n. 3), no. 88, 453–5) has redated it c. 420–10 on letter-forms and is followed in *IG I³ 180*.

to his no. 43 (*IG I³ 167*), which he ascribed to the man who cut *IG I³ 86* (417/6) and he judged the 420s suitable for both texts.⁶ Other evidence for dating 165 escaped both Meritt and Walbank. Lines 7–12 are plausibly read as follows:

τὸ δὲ φσ]-

έφισμα τ[όδε ἀναγρ]αφσά]το ho γραμματεὺς ὁ τ]-
 ἐς βολῆς [ἐν στέλει] λιθίνε[ι καὶ καταθέτο ἐμ]
 πόλει ὅς [ἐν καλλί]στοι καὶ ΕΜ [. . .⁶. . . βουλευτ]-
 [ε]ρίοι ἐ[ν σανιδί]οι ἴνα περ τὰ ἄλλ[α . . .⁸. . .]
 10 [. . .]τα· οἱ δὲ κολ]ακρέται δόντον τὸ ἀ[ργύριον]
 [.¹².]εν καὶ τὸν ἀναγραφέν. [*vacat*]⁷
 [. . .⁸. . . εἶπ]ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Τ[. . .⁶. . .]

There is no room for the *poletai* in this publication clause. I can think of only two parallels before the very late fifth century.⁸

a) 424/3 *IG I³ 75.31–4*:

[χοι ἐπ]ὶ τὰ χσνγκε[ίμενα· τὰς δὲ χσνυθέ]κας ἀναγράψα-
 [ι ἐστέλε] λιθίνε[ι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολ]ῆς καὶ κατα-
 [θῆναι ἐμ πόλει· οἱ δὲ κολακρέται δόντ]ον [τὸ] ἀργύριον·
 [χαλιῆς δὲ θέντον τὸν στέλεν ἐς τὸ hi]ερὸν [ν τ]ῷ Ἀπόλλων-

b) 418/7 *IG I³ 84.26–8*:

τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε, ὅπος ἂν εἰ εἰδέναι τῶ[ι] βολομένοι, ἀναγράψα-
 ς ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βολῆς ἐν στέλει λιθίνει καταθέτο ἐν τῷ Νελεΐ-
 οὶ παρὰ τὰ ἴκρια· οἱ δὲ κολοκρέται δόντον τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ταῦτα

These parallels surely locate 165 in the neighbourhood of 420 BC. Furthermore in line 4 f. we find an old form of the feminine plural dative. Down to c. 420 the normal old forms -εσι(v) and -ασι(v) still occur at times. The form δρ]αχμαῖσι, however, is quite anomalous and only paralleled by μυρίασι and χιλίασι in the late 420s (61.38; 73.20) and χιλίασι, ταμίασι and μυρίεσι in 418/7 (84.10,17,20). It associates 165 so closely with 84 that both might reasonably be put in the same year – especially as they are apparently also linked by the very rare use of εἰς for normal ἐς.⁹ Where does this leave *IG I³ 11*?

The treaty between Athens and Eggesta's neighbour Halikyai was inscribed below the Eggesta Treaty on its stele and appears thus in *IG I³ 12*:

[ἔδοχσεν] τῷ βολεῖ [καὶ τῷ δέμοι·^{c.9}. . . . ἐπρυτάνευε,^{c.9}. . . .] ΣΤΟΙΧ. 54
 [. . . ἐγραμ]μάτευε, Ἄρ[. . . .^{c.7}. . . ἐπεστάτε,^{c.11}. . . . εἶπε· Ἄθηναίοις]
 [καὶ χαλι]κυσταίοις Ἐλ[ύμοις φιλίαν καὶ χσμμαχίαν εἶναι κατὰ τὰ χσ]-
 [γκείμενα] τὰ πρὸς Ἄθ[ηναίοις ἢ Ἐγεσταίοις ἐστίν· ταῦτα δὲ τὸν γραμμ]-
 5 [ατέα τῆς β]ολῆς ἀναγ[ράφσαι ἐμ πόλει ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ στέλει ἐν ἡεῖ ἀναγ]-
 [έγραπται κα]ὶ περὶ Ἐ[γεσταίον τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα τῷ δέμοι *vacat?*]
vacat?

⁶ Op. cit. (n. 3), 189 f. and 231.

⁷ Pritchett (op. cit. (n. 3), 16) tried καὶ τὸν στέλεν in line 11, which Henry rightly rejected (*ZPE* 78 (1989), 248 f.), following Lewis in *IG I³*. I would suggest [εἰς τε τὸν στέλε]ν. For εἰς in fifth-century Attic texts see *IG I³ 84.31* f. (ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς τῆς εἰσόδου): 475.292 f. (409/8); 476.9,10 and 41 (408/7).

⁸ In *IG I³ 127.37* and *II² 1.67* f. the *poletai* are missing from the publication clause in 405/4 and 403/2. But this surely merely anticipated normal fourth-century practice: the last mention of *poletai* in this context is in *II² 3.4* f. with 4.16 and 5.12 f. (all of c.403/2).

⁹ On the datives see L. Threatte, *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions II* (Berlin/New York: 1996), 96–101 (p. 99: ‘. . . the occurrence of μυρίεσι in a decree of 418/7 . . . seems to indicate that there was some confusion among these endings at that time’). The closest parallel to *IG I³ 165.4* f. is in a private dedication of c. 450–425 (*IG I³ 974*: τόνδε ταῖ Νύμφαισιν). For εἰς see the evidence cited in n. 7.

It has been restored on the model of the Rhegion and Leontinoi Treaties (*IG I³ 53.9 f. and 54.16–9*). But the opening of the Egesta Treaty would seem a better model:

[χσυμμαχία καὶ ἡρό]κρο[ς] Ἄ[θ]εῖν[α] καὶ Ἐγισταί[ον].
 [ἔδοχεν τῆ βολῆ καὶ τῶ] [δέμοι· . . .⁶ . . .] ἐπρυτάνευε, [. . .] ΣΤΟΙΧ. 48
 [. . .^{c.4} . . . ἐγραμμάτευε, . . .^{c.4} . . .]ο[. . .⁵ . . .]Ι[. . .⁸ . . .] . [.]ον ἔρχε, Ἀρ[χί]α[ς]
 [εἶπεν· περὶ μὲν Ἐγισταί]ο[ν τὸν] [ἡρό]κρον . . .⁵ . . . δ[ὸν]αὶ αὐτο[ίς] . .]

Bradeen and Mc Gregor improved this in line 4 f.:¹⁰

[. . . εἶπεν· περὶ Ἐγισταί]ο[ν τὸν ἡρό]κρον εὐθὺς δ[ὸν]αὶ αὐτο[ίς] κα]-
 [ὶ δέχσασθαι παρ' αὐτῶν ὁμ]όσα[ι μὲν]

They were clearly influenced by 54.15–21:

Καλλίας ε^{υυ}
 ἶπε· τὲμ μὲν χσυμμαχία-
 ν εἶναι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ
 Λεοντίνοις καὶ τὸν ὄρ-
 κων δῶναι καὶ δέχσασ-
 [θαι· ὁμ]όσαι δὲ Ἀθηναί-
 [ος τάδε·

I would suggest for *IG I³ 12.2 f.* the following:

[. . . ἐγραμ]μάτευε, Ἀρ[. . .^{c.7} . . . ἐπεστά]τε,^{c.15} εἶπε· τὸν ὄρ]-
 [κων ἡα]λι[κ]υαίοις Ἐλ[ύ]μοις δῶναι καὶ δέχσα[σθαι]

This would allow for some twenty two letters for the names of the *epistates* and orator, which looks excessive. There would be room for inserting an archon, though perhaps with only a four-letter orator. But a six, seven or eight-letter *epistates* is clearly possible. The *epistates* equally could have had a 10–12 letter name. That could be accommodated, with the archon, by reading [εἶπε· δῶναι ἡα]λι[κ]υαίοις Ἐλ[ύ]μοις τὸν ὄρκον . . .].¹¹ Now only in 421/0 was the archon regularly introduced in the preamble and 418/7 or 417/6 would suit *IG I³ 12* excellently.¹² This dating of *IG I³ 12* is at least completely consistent with putting the Egesta Treaty 418/7.

Now a certain Euphemos proposed a rider to that treaty (lines 15–18). Wilamowitz identified him with the Athenian spokesman at Kamarina in 415, in view of the shared Sicilian interests. But this was hardly possible with his 454/3 dating of the treaty and Kirchner treated the idea with reserve. Supporters of the early dating are either unaware of Wilamowitz' view or explicitly reject it.¹³ Yet Wilamowitz' instinct should be right. I find it frankly hard to believe that a close interest in that small corner of Sicily remained in one family over three generations. Thucydides' Euphemos after the disappointment at Kamarina surely went on that embassy to Egesta which won the consolation of valuable assistance from that ally. What would be more natural than that the Athenians should use the man in this context who

¹⁰ See *Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy* (University of Cincinnati: 1973), 71 and 80 with the n. in *IG I³* (p. 17).

¹¹ The *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II, Attica* (Oxford: 1994) lists only a few very rare 5-letter names in Ar-: of 6-letter names only Archias (74 entries) is at all common. But the *epistates*, being chosen by lot, quite often is a one-off in Attic nomenclature.

¹² My view – first formulated in *Meritt Studies* (1974), 90 f. and 101–3 (= *AER*, 325–7 and 342–5) – still seems valid.

¹³ See Thuc. 6.75.4 and 81–7: *Aristoteles und Athen 2* (Berlin: 1893), 78 n. 10. ('deshalb ist dieser zum sprecher in Sicilien ausersehn'). Kirchner listed orator and envoy doubtfully under *PA 6035. R.* Develin separated them (*Athenian Officials* (Cambridge: 1989), 75 and 151 with Index 1) as does *LGPN II* Euphemos I–2. On their view Thucydides' Euphemos would have had an homonymous grandfather, who bequeathed him a Sicilian interest. Others seem unaware of the problem. See A. W. Spratt, *Thucydides Book VI* (Cambridge: 1905), 313 on ch. 81 ('nothing is known of him'): Steup/Classen, *Thukydides VI* (Berlin: 1905), on ch. 81 ('Über die Persönlichkeit des E. ist nichts bekannt'): K. J. Dover, *HCT 4* (Oxford: 1970), 350 on ch. 75.4 ('nothing else is known of this man').

three years earlier had supported Egestan envoys seeking an alliance?¹⁴ Henry was surely wrong in cavalierly ruling out 418/7 for *IG I³ 11*.

He was equally wrong, I submit, about the Standards Decree. There is again strong formal evidence which he has neglected. In 12 we find the broken clause:

ο[ὶ δ'] ἐπιστάτ[αι ----- c. 31 ----- ἀναγ]ράψαντες κατα[θέντων
----- c. 12 ----- ἔμπροσθεν τῷ ἀργυροκο]πίο σκοπῆν τῷ βολομένῳ·

I know of only two epigraphic parallels:

a) After 434? *IG I³ 133.9-12*:

κα[ὶ τὸ πλεθ]ος τῷ ἀργυρίῳ [χσύμπαντος ...⁷. . . ἀναγράφσαν]-
τες ἐμ π[ιν]ακίοι μετὰ τὲν] ἑορτὴν κατα[θέντων²¹.]
[. . .]μίο [σκ]οπῆν τῷ β[ολομένο]ι κατὰ τὸ [.²⁸.]

b) c. 430 *IG I³ 60.29-31*:

[. . .⁸. . .]ν ἀναγ[ράφσαι δὲ²⁴.]
[. . .⁵. . . ἐκ]όστον κ[.³².]
[. . .⁷. . .]α τὰς σα[νίδας²⁷.]
[. . . σκο]πῆν τῷ βολομένοι·

The crucial shared phrase is otherwise found only in a literary version of a decree from 403/2, where it appears to be a deliberate echo of the great days of democracy.¹⁵ Now it is worth trying to narrow down the dating of *IG I³ 60* and 133. The first apparently provided for a task force of thirty triremes, equipped with a complement of hoplites, peltasts and archers – the latter two groups, it seems, drawn equally from Athenians and allies (lines 11–18).¹⁶ Now in 430 Melesandros was sent to Karia and Lykia with six triremes to collect money and combat enemy piracy. His venture ended in disaster.¹⁷ In 427 Athens sent out twelve more ‘money-collecting’ ships under Lysikles and colleagues. This expedition also came to grief.¹⁸ Did the Athenians now learn the lesson? A stronger, more specialised force was needed for such purposes. In 425/4 Thucydides records the actions of three generals ‘of the money-collecting ships, which were sent out to the allies’. Lamachos took ten ships into the Black Sea and, if he shared equally with his colleagues, the total force would exactly equal that specified in *IG I³ 60.9–12*. At an earlier date peltasts from Ainos and archers from elsewhere had been present in Athens and Kleon and Demosthenes were able to make good use of them at Sphakteria. Was their fortunate presence in Athens at that juncture an effect of *IG I³ 60*?¹⁹ How long before 425 can the creation of this squadron be set? In lines 2–7 there is mention of *epiphorai* and a clear concern to bring all the tribute in. This concern was met by Kleonymos’ tribute decree (*IG I³ 68*) in the first prytany of 426/5. Now *epiphora* is last recorded in Quota List ‘25’, where it is noted as ‘last year’s’ (*IG I³ 281.I.46*). The correct date of 281, as I have

¹⁴ Alkibiades admittedly took up the Spartan *proxenia*, which his grandfather had abandoned (Thuc. 5.43.2 with 6.89.1), and Kallias Hipponikou boasted of a Spartan *proxenia* through three generations (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.4: 371 BC). But such longstanding interests of a family in one area were surely rare. For the Egesta embassy in 415 see Thuc. 6.88.6 and 98.1.

¹⁵ See Andokides 1.83–4 (twice). In true democratic fashion the orator invites ‘everyone’ to participate in revising and publishing the laws.

¹⁶ Meritt (*Studies D. M. Robinson* 2 (1953), 298–303) was the first to find the right interpretation and context for this decree, formerly associated with the Melian expedition of 417/6.

¹⁷ Thuc. 2.69 with Gomme, *HCT* 2,202 f. and S. Hornblower, *Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford: 1991), 354 f.

¹⁸ Thuc. 3.19 with Gomme, op. cit. (n. 17), 279 f. and Hornblower, op. cit., 404 f.

¹⁹ See Thuc. 4.50.1, 52 and 75 with Hornblower, *Thucydides* 2 (1996), 206 and 245–8 for the ships. For the peltasts etc. in Athens see Thuc. 4.28.4 and 32.1. Aristophanes significantly censured Kleon’s demands for ‘swift, money-collecting ships’ in winter 424 (*Knights* 1072–4).

The two epigraphic parallels to the Standards Decree suggest that after all it belongs to the 420s. A third line of enquiry leads to greater precision. In 1453 § 7 we find provision for sending heralds one by one to the Islands, Ionia, Hellespont and Thrace. Now there are twenty four possible permutations of the four names, though in fact only four were used between 438/7 and 425/4, as my table shows.

TABLE

<i>IG I</i> ³ 274–80	438/7–432/1	IONIA	ISLANDS	HELLESPONT	THRACE
283	428/7 ²⁷	THRACE	ISLANDS	HELLESPONT	IONIA
282	427/6 ²⁸	THRACE	ISLANDS	HELLESPONT	IONIA
281	426/5 ²⁸	IONIA	THRACE	ISLANDS	HELLESPONT
71.5 f.	425/4 ²⁹	IONIA	THRACE	ISLANDS	HELLESPONT
71 (list)	425/4	ISLANDS	IONIA	HELLESPONT	THRACE
77, 285, 287, 289, 290	422/1–415/4	ISLANDS	IONIA	HELLESPONT	THRACE

When Thoudippos sent out his eight heralds two by two he used the current order of districts as established the previous year. That order was changed when it came to the assessment schedule. I submit that the proposer of the Standards Decree did exactly what he had seen Thoudippos do. In 425/4 he naturally followed the order of districts established in the schedule and destined to remain invariable as long as tribute was collected.

Cambridge

Harold B. Mattingly

²⁷ 283 survives only in its last two columns (Hellespont, Ionia). But frg.1 is surely misplaced. The quota representing 18 T on the right in line 13 is too high a figure for any Ionian ally. Köhler saw this and made the figure Hellespontine. Frg.1 must then be moved to the *left* of the Hellespontine names in col. II. The three letters in line 10 will then be the abbreviated form of the only known Thracian ally with this type of name – Pergamoteichitai, found on the Assessment Schedule of 425/4 (*IG I*³ 71.IV.63 and *ATL* 1,533 f., *Gazetteer*).

²⁸ For the date of these two lists see n. 20.

²⁹ *IG I*³, following *ATL* II A 9, gives 'Ionia and Karia'. Thuc. 2.9.4 can hardly be used to support the unnecessary inclusion of Karia. Other 9-letter supplements can easily be found.