

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 ΙΦΩΝ 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 Egesta 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] χσένια τὲν πρεσβείαν τὸν Ἐ[γεσταίον]
[ές πρυτανεῖον ἐς τὸν] νομιζόμενον χρόνον.
- b) [ο· καὶ καλέσαι αὐ]τὸς καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόυ [.]
[.¹⁴.] ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ π[ρυτανεῖ]-
[ον ἐς τὸν νομιζόμενον χρόνον vacat [vacat]

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

καὶ ἐγ [τοι βολευτ]

[ε]ρίοι ἐγ [σανιδί]οι

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

[.¹¹.] καὶ ἐπὶ χσένια ἐς τὸ π[ρυτα]
[νεον ἐς 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 πρυτανῶν 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] αὔριον 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. Merritt'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 Proxenies 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 πρυτανῶν 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]-
 ἐφισμα τ[όδε ἀναγρ]αφσά]το ho γραμματεὺς ὁ τ]-
 ἐς βολῆς [ἐν στέλε]ι λιθίνε[ι καὶ καταθέτο ἐμ]
 πόλει ὁς [ἐν καλλί]στοι καὶ ΕΜ [...]βολευτ]-
 [ε]ρίοι ἐ[ν σανιδί]οι ὄναπερ τὰ ἄλλ[α . . .⁸ . . .]
 10 [...]τα· o[ι δὲ κολ]ακρέται δόντον τὸ ἀ[ργύριον]
 [...] . . .¹² . . .]εν καὶ τὲν ἀναγραφέν. [*vacat*]⁷
 [...] . . .⁸ . . . εῖπ]ε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Τ[...] . . .]

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:

[hoi ἐπ]ὶ τὰ χσυγκε[ίμενα· τὰς δὲ χσυνθέ]κας ἀναγράφσα-
 [ι ἐστέλε]ι λιθίγε[ι τὸν γραμματέα τῆ[ς βο[λ]ῆς καὶ κατα-
 θὲναι ἐμ πόλει· οἱ δὲ κολακρέται δόντ]ον [τὸ] ἀργύριον·
 [haλιēς δὲ θέντον τὲν στέλεν ἐς τὸ hι]ερὸ[ν τ]ῷ Ἀπόλλον-

b) 418/7 *IG I³* 84.26–8:

τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τόδε, ὅπος ὃν ἐι εἰδέναι τὸ[ι] βολομένοι, ἀναγράφσα-
 ξ ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τές βολῆς ἐν στέλει λιθίνει καταθέτο ἐν τῷ Νελεί-
 οι παρὰ τὰ ἵκρια· 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 δροχμαῖσι, however, is quite anomalous and only paralleled by μυρίαισι and χιλίαισι in the late 420s (61.38; 73.20) and χιλίαισι, ταμίαισι 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 Egesta's neighbour Halikyai was inscribed below the Egesta Treaty on its stele and appears thus in *IG I³* 12:

[ἔδοχσε]ν τεῖ βολῆι [καὶ τῷ δέμοι . . .^{c.9} . . . ἐπρυτάνευε, . . .^{c.9} . . .]
 [.. ἐγραμ]μάτευε, Ἀρ[. . .^{c.7} . . . ἐπεστάτε, . . .^{c.11} . . . εἶπε· Ἀθεναίοις]
 [καὶ haλι]κυαίοις Ἐλ[ύμοις φιλίαν καὶ χσυμμαχίαν εῖναι κατὰ τὰ χσυ-
 [γκείμεν]α τὰ πρὸς Ἀθ[εναίοις hὰ Ἔγεσταίοις ἐστίν· ταῦτα δὲ τὸγ γραμμ]-
 5 [ατέα τές β]ολῆς ἀναγ[ράφσαι ἐμ πόλει ἐν τεῖ αὐτεῖ στέλει ἐν hῆι ἀναγ]-
 [έγραπται καὶ]ι περὶ Ἔγεσταίον τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα τῷ δέμοι *vacat?*]
vacat?

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 54

⁶ Op. cit. (n. 3), 189 f. and 231.

⁷ Pritchett (op. cit. (n. 3), 16) tried καὶ τὲν στέλεν in line 11, which Henry rightly rejected (*ZPE* 78 (1989), 248 f.), following Lewis in *IG I³*. I would suggest [εῖς τε τὲν στέλε]ν. For εἰς in fifth-century Attic texts see *IG I³* 84.31 f. (ἐπὶ τές βολῆς τές εἰσιόσες): 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]κο[ζ] ’Α[θ]εγα[ίον κα]ὶ ’Εγεσταί[ον].
 [ἔδοξεν τει βολέι καὶ τ]ῶι [δέμουίζ] ἐπρυτάνευε, [.] . . .
 [. . .^{c.4.} . ἐγραμμάτευε, . .^{c.4.} .]ο[. .^{c.4.} .]Ι[. . .^{c.4.} .] . [.]ον ἔρχε, ’Αρ[χί]α[ζ]
 [εἰπεν· περὶ μὲν ’Εγεστα]ίο[ν τὸν] [hό]ρ[κον . .^{c.4.} . δ]ῶν[α]ὶ αὐτο[ίς] . .]

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 48

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

[. . εἰπεν· περὶ ’Εγεστα]ίο[ν τὸν ἡρό]ρ[κον εὐθὺνς δ]ῶναι αὐτο[ίς κα]-
 [ὶ δέχσασθαι παρ’ αὐτῶν ὄμ]όσα[ι μὲν

They were clearly influenced by 54.15–21:

Καλλίας ενν
 ἵπε· τὲ μὲν χσυμμαχία-
 ν εῖναι ’Αθεναίοις καὶ
 Λεοντίνοις καὶ τὸν ὄρ-
 κον δῶναι καὶ δέχσασ-
 [θαι· ὄμόσ]αι δὲ ’Αθεναί-
 [ος τάδε·

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

[. . ἐγραμμάτευε, ’Αρ[. . .^{c.7.} . . ἐπεστάτε,^{c.15.}εἰπε· τὸν ὄρ]-
 [κον] [καλλί]κυαίοις ’Ελ[ύμοις 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 [εἰπε· δῶναι καλλί]κυαίοις ’Ελ[ύμοις 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 aussersehn'). 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, *Thukydidis 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[ι δ'] ἐπιστάτ[αι] ————— c. 31 ————— — ἀναγράψαντες κατα[θέντων]
———— c. 12 ————— ἔμπροσθεν τῷ ἀργυροκόπιο σκοπὲν τῷ βο[λομένωι].

I know of only two epigraphic parallels:

a) After 434? *IG I³* 133.9–12:

κα[ὶ τὸ πλέθ]ος τῷ ἀργυρίῳ [χσύμπαντος . . .⁷ . . . ἀναγράφσαν]-
τες ἐμ π[ιν]ακίοι μ[ετὰ τὲν] ἔορτὲν κατα[θέντον . . .²¹] . . .
[. . .]μίο [σκ]οπὲν τῷ β[ολομένο]ι κατὰ τὸ [. . .²⁸]

b) c. 430 *IG I³* 60.29–31:

[. . .⁸ . . .]ν· ἀναγ[ράφσαι δὲ . . .²⁴]
[. . .⁵ . . . ἐκ]άστον κ[. . .³²]
[. . .⁷ . . .]α τὰς σα[νίδας . . .²⁷]
[. . . σκο]πὲν τῷ[ι 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).

shown elsewhere, is 426/5 – and not 430/29 – and 427/6 would thus seem to be both the date of the last known imposition of *epiphora* and the likeliest context for *IG I³ 60*.²⁰

IG I³ 133 deals with the cult of the Anakes or Dioskouroi. According to Lucian their sanctuary was burned down in Perikles' lifetime, when Anaxagoras was in Athens. The fire was recent at the dramatic date of his dialogue *Timon*. Kleon and Hyperbolos were already troublesome politicians and 'last year's' magnificent victory over the Peloponnesians at Acharnai may, as Faber thought, have been a comic travesty of the minor cavalry skirmish in that deme in 431.²¹ Presumably restoration of the Anakeion followed in the early 420s and *IG I³ 133* should be somehow connected with it. Lippold indeed explained the survival of paintings by Polygnotos and Mikon in the Anakeion by the assumption that they were old paintings moved into the restored sanctuary.²² In *IG I³ 133.13 f.* moneys of the Anakes were to be handed over to the Treasurers of the Other Gods, who certainly handled some of their funds in 429/8 (*IG I³ 383 1–4* with 165 f. and 346). Now, according to the *ATL* editors, a sum of perhaps c. 400 talents was borrowed from the Other Gods in 430/29 and another c. 366 talents in 429/8, years in which borrowing from Athena was being drastically reduced.²³ This evidence might suggest the years 430–428 as a very suitable context for *IG I³ 133*, but we should surely not exclude a date a year or two later.

The phrase σκοπὲν τῶι βο[υ]λομένῳ was current in the early 420s. Was it also used in the Standards Decree – and there alone, to our knowledge – some twenty years previously? Another epigraphic parallel should help. In *IG I³ 1453 § 7* Lewis, following Klaffenbach and Tod, supplied the phrase

κήρυκας δὲ ἔλεσθαι τὸ[ν δῆμον καὶ πέμψαι ἀπαγγελοῦντας τὰ ἐψηφισμ]ένα.

This is very close to *IG I³ 78.21–3*:

[κέρ]υ-

[κα]ς δὲ ήελομένε he βολὲ πεμφσάτο ἐς τὰς πόλες ἀ[γ]γέλλον[τ]ας [τὰ]

[νῦν] ήεφσεφισμένα τῷ δέμοι

The parallel becomes even closer, if, with Tod, we supply in 1453 the present participle and not the future.²⁴ The date of *IG I³ 78* has oscillated violently in the past, but it seems now to have settled c. 422. The secretary Timoteles under the Kekropis prytany, however, points another way. The third Methone decree of 425/4 also has the Kekropis prytany and a secretary . . . εξ.²⁵ Why can not *IG I³ 78* be dated 425/4 as well? Margherita Guarducci suggested this long ago and the period of euphoria after Pylos, which lingered on till spring 424, provides a good context. Possession of the Spartan prisoners from Sphakteria meant that invasion of Attica was no longer possible. The emergency occupation of the Pelargikon could now be ended and the abuses rectified. And, so long as Sparta continued to press hard for peace, the Assembly could even envisage that somewhat optimistic appeal to all Greeks to join Athens in offering firstfruits to Eleusis (lines 30–36).²⁶

²⁰ On the dates of Quota List '25' and '26' (427/6) see my case in *AER* Appendix 4,525 and *GRBS* (1999: forthcoming). The late short feminine plural datives in *IG I³ 60.14* are neatly matched in 281.III.54 and 282.I.11.

²¹ See *Timon* 10 (Anakeion), 30 (demagogues) and 50 (victory). The MSS tradition in 50 is corrupt and editors variously emend to give Akarnania or Acharnai as the site of the battle.

²² See *RE* XV, col. 1588 f. Polygnotos' paintings in the Propylaia gallery were certainly old paintings moved there after 432 (*RE* XXI, col. 1632).

²³ For the loans see *ATL* III,342 f., ns. 79, 82 and 90.

²⁴ For Tod's view see *JHS* 69 (1949), 105. He consciously modelled his supplement on *IG I³ 78*.

²⁵ The Methone dossier was finally recorded on stone in the eighth prytany of 424/3 (*IG I³ 61.2* with Thuc. 4.118.11 and *IG I³ 369.32* f.). In the first prytany of 426/5 Athens promised to deal with Methone's complaints against Perdikkas after their embassies returned (61.47–51). They would surely not have waited two whole years. So 425/4 looks assured for the third decree.

²⁶ For Guarducci's view see *Riv. Fil.* 89 (1961), 288–95. See also Thuc. 2.17.2–3 with *IG I³ 78.54–9* (Pelargikon); Thuc. 4.41.1 (prisoners). For Spartan peace overtures and euphoria see Thuc. 4.41.3–4 and 65.3–4; Aristophanes *Knights* 784–6 and 1303 ff. with *Peace* 676 ff.: Gomme, *HCT* 3,624–6 and Hornblower, op. cit. (n. 19), 227 f.

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 I³</i>	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,	422/1–415/4	ISLANDS	IONIA	HELLESPONT	THRACE
	289, 290					

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 I³* 71.IV.63 and *ATL* 1,533 f., Gazetteer).

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

²⁹ *IG I³*, 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.