

STEPHEN D. LAMBERT

IG II² 450, ATHENS AND ASANDROS: A NOTE

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126 (1999) 129–130

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

IG II² 450, ATHENS AND ASANDROS: A NOTE

The only substantial Athenian state decree at present securely datable to the government of Demetrios of Phaleron (317–307) honours the satrap of Caria, Asandros of Macedon.¹ At lines 17–22 of fragment a of the inscription, M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* (Brussels, 1981), D42, prints:

κ-
αὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς τὴν
πόλιν τὰς τε ναῦς τὰς ἰδία-
20 ς καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας παρ-
[έχετα]ι Ἀθ[η]ν[α]ίοις εἰς τὰς χ-
[ρείας] - -

Most earlier editors (see e.g. Dittenberger, *SIG³ 320*; Köhler, *IG ii 234*) restored παρ[έσχετο] in 20–21, but in the uncorrected paper of Wilhelm published at *ABSA 7* (1900/01), 156–62, παρ[έχεται] appears. Repeated by Kirchner in *IG ii² 450*, it was confirmed for Osborne by his detection of “the top of an upright in the right of the stoichos” before the first preserved alpha in 21. Attention has recently been drawn, however, to some awkward historical implications of restoring a present tense.² The decree is dated to 11 Gamelion (i.e. late January–early February) 313; but at that time, according to the conventional interpretation of Diodoros’ chronology,³ Asandros was hard-pressed in Caria by Antigonos the One-eyed and scarcely in a position to render Athens much assistance, let alone come to Athens in person. Moreover, the (unsuccessful) Athenian expedition to Lemnos, normally identified as the likely context of Asandros’ help, should have taken place in the 314 campaigning season, and may have been over by Gamelion 313. O’Sullivan’s solution is to disengage the decree from the Lemnos expedition and to suppose that the aid related to preparations for an Athenian expedition to Samos in 313. No such expedition is mentioned by Diodoros, however; and the only evidence for it is tenuous: two undated and heavily restored Samian decrees.⁴ Moreover, if Asandros was not in a position to come to Athens to help with an expedition to Lemnos in the late winter of 314/3, he seems unlikely to have been in a position to come to Athens to help prepare one to Samos either.

There is also a slight epigraphical awkwardness, shared by παρ[έσχετο] and παρ[έχετα]ι. They both entail restoration of 5 letters in 4 stoichoi in a stoichedon inscription.⁵ No such awkwardness would attend a restoration παρ[έσχε]ν or παρ[εἶχε]ν; and it would account as well as παρ[έχετα]ι for Osborne’s top of an upright to the right side of what should be the fifth stoichos. The active of παρέχω occurs in precisely such a context at Polyb. 3.97.4: (Publius) παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἰβηρίαν . . . μεγάλην παρεῖχε χρεῖαν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν. Historically, one could envisage the Athenians (or rather, that proportion of them who still sat in the Assembly) looking back with (perhaps somewhat artificial) gratitude in Gamelion 313 to services rendered by Asandros the previous year, quite possibly against Lemnos.

¹ Cf. S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* (Berkeley, 1995), 36 with n. 2.

² L. O’Sullivan, *ZPE* 119 (1997), 107–16.

³ Diod. 19.68.2 ff. The alternative scheme of R. M. Errington, *Hermes* 105 (1977), 478–504, especially 498 n. 63, has not attracted general agreement. See Osborne’s commentary on D42, vol. II, 114; O’Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 109–10 n. 17.

⁴ C. Habicht, *AM* 72 (1957), 152–274, nos. 18–19. Cf. O’Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 110–14.

⁵ There is admittedly an additional letter in two other lines, 5 and 16, though in one of these (5) the text ran over into the right margin, which is not a possibility here.

Line 22 is followed by a lacuna of unknown extent. When the text resumes with fragment b, Asandros is receiving further praise (the text again is Osborne's):

[...⁵..]αζ εἰς τ[.....¹⁰.....]
 [..³.]εἰλαγ τέλεσ[ι τ]οῖς [αὐτ]-
 25 [οῦ].

What had been done at Asandros' expense? There has been general agreement that the verb in 23–24 was ἀπ/έστ]εἰλαγ and that Asandros had perhaps facilitated the return to Athens of men captured or stranded by the defeat on Lemnos. Wilhelm (followed by Kirchner), accordingly ventured εἰς τ[ῆν ἰδίαν ἀπ/έστ]εἰλαγ, but, as Osborne noted, “this, while possibly giving the right sense, necessitates the assumption of a vacant space at the end of line 23, and, despite the incidence of irregularities at the ends of the first few lines, it is to be noted that the line ends are otherwise regular from line 6–34.” An elegant solution is recorded on a card in the museum of the British School at Athens, written in 1985/6 by the great Oxford historian of his generation, W. G. Forrest: εἰς τ[ῆν ἑαυτῶν ἀπ/έστε]εἰλαγ. “They returned to their own land.”⁶

The British School at Athens

Stephen D. Lambert

⁶ I thank Sean Byrne for reading a draft of this note. I hope to publish shortly a new edition of this inscription, of which fragment b is in the British School at Athens, in a catalogue with the other inscriptions in the School.