

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE ATHENIAN PROXENY DECREE, *IG* 1² 30 + 23 (*SEG* 10.20)

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

MICHAEL WALBANK deserves our thanks for republishing this obscure document so thoroughly.¹ He begins by noting that the same hand may well have inscribed the Sigeion Decree, a mysterious measure for the Kolophonians, and the Treaty with Hermione. All three texts are normally dated ca 450 B.C. on the basis of their letter-forms.² Next he argues boldly that the fourth text in this hand does not in fact honour men of Parion, as we have long thought. On the contrary it concerns a certain Parianos of Issa in Lesbos and his two sons. The "ethnic" could indeed be read as a proper name, and to this extent Walbank could be right.³ But I cannot follow him much further. He tries to show—optimistically, with so mangled a text—that leading men of Issa were honoured for having despatched a small naval squadron on a military mission abroad. But ἐς Λέσβον ("to Lesbos") in line 20 works awkwardly against him.⁴ The role of Issa—if this reading is right—remains beyond conjecture. An alternative explanation should still be considered. The men honoured (possibly, as Walbank insists, *not* from Parion) had performed useful service for a small Athenian naval force that had put in—or was expected to put in—at Lesbos. Perhaps the point of call lay near Issa.⁵

¹*Hesperia* 42 (1973) 334–339. I am most grateful to the journal's anonymous readers for a number of acute criticisms. I have tried to take proper account of these, and the presentation has been thereby improved.

²See his p. 334 with n. 4 on *SEG* 10.13 (*IG* 1² 32+), *IG* 1² 34, and *SEG* 10.15. He would also add *IG* 1² 33, a fragment of quite uncertain content. The Sigeion Decree contains what is most probably a broken archon name, Anti-: the archons of 451, 435, and 418 B.C. would all fit. The letter-form criterion has imposed the first. See Meritt, *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 360 ("lettering characteristic of the middle of the fifth century") and Walbank, *loc. cit.* Walbank over firmly asserts (339, n. 18) "the only name that can be restored in line 5 is that of the archon Antidotos, so that the date 451/0 B.C. is assured." This seems a dangerously circular argument. See further note 13, below.

³*Op. cit.* 336. Only Παριαν is preserved in the heading with the names. In n. 6 he cites twenty examples of ethnic/personal names from the Index of *IG* 1² alone. See also n. 12.

⁴*Op. cit.* 338 f. Clearly ships sent from Issa would later return "to Lesbos," but this seems rather unsatisfying.

⁵Walbank takes over κατὰ Ἴσσαν (line 16) and [ἐκ τῶ δι]κασ]τερίο Ἰ[σσαιον] (20f.) from the previous editors of his text (Loughran and Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 16 [1947] 79–81, no. 2). I can find no alternative for the first passage. Issa is certified as a town in Lesbos by Stephanos of Byzantion (*s.v.* Ἴσσαι), and Antissa—known already from Thuc. 3.18.1–2 and 28.3—seems to imply it. But to restore [τὰς ἄρ]χας or [τὸς ἀπάρ]χας

Yet Walbank's radical rethinking remains most welcome. It leads him to challenge another part of the general consensus. Instead of reading Archedemos(?) in line 7 f. as the name of the orator, he sees there "the end of an archon formula and the beginning of an orator formula: [----- ἐ[ρ]χ^ε Δεμο[...⁵... ἐ[τ]πειν]." Archon formulas are indeed found in two other texts with comparable "early" lettering, the Egesta and Sigeion Decrees.⁶ This is at first an attractive line of reasoning. But it is badly flawed. Archons are hardly found in preambles before 421/0 B.C., and we should be particularly wary of multiplying a hypothesis such as this round the middle of the century. Formally it would be safer for Walbank, with his orthodox dating, to let *χεδεμο* stand as part of the orator's name.⁷

Finally I must deal with Walbank's historical objection to the normal view of SEG 10.20. He cannot see how the affairs of Parion could have been relevant to those of Lesbos. Suitably rephrased this point loses most of its force. At some moment of history Lesbos could have been *very* relevant to men of Parion or another Hellespontine ally. It was from Tenedos after all that advance warning came to Athens of the Mytilenean revolt in the summer of 428 B.C.⁸ Four years later Lesbian exiles, mostly operating from the Asia Minor mainland, seized Rhoiteion near Sigeion and let it go—after having removed eight talents worth of tribute waiting shipment to Athens.⁹ They next grabbed Antandros in the same

in line 15 f. ("the authorities at Issa") with Walbank and his predecessors is extremely hazardous. The restoration is far from compelling. Similarly [δι]κασ[τ]εριοι or even [βο]λευ[τ]εριοι are likelier supplements in line 20 f. My view on the ships and the role of Issa is essentially that of Loughran and Raubitschek (*op. cit.* 80), who suggest that *allied* vessels are probably mentioned in line 17 f.

⁶*Op. cit.* 337 (adducing IG 1² 19 and SEG 10.13). Admittedly [ἐ]ρ[υ]τ[τ]||ἀνευεν in line 7 prepares one for ἐρ[χ]εν rather than ἐρ[χ]ε; but practice in regard to nu-movable is erratic in fifth-century preambles and can vary within them.

⁷For the full evidence on the archon formula see my paper in ΦΟΡΟΣ: *Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt* (1974) 90 f. and 101–103. The archon of 433/2 B.C. appears in the unusual headings of the Rhegion and Leontinoi Treaties (IG 1² 51 and 52). Meiggs and Lewis (*Greek Historical Inscriptions—henceforth ML*—91 and 93) challenge the restoration of an archon-name in the Erythrai Decree of the 450s, with good reason. For the dating of the Sigeion and Egesta Decrees (perhaps not mid-century) see my n. 13 and my article in *Historia* 24 (1975), forthcoming. The Miletos Decree (ATL 2 D10)—*pace* Walbank, 317 n. 12—probably did not have an archon date in its preamble: see my argument in *Annali del Istituto Italiano di Numismatica* 12–14 (1969) 216 f., with n. 52. Alan Boegehold (*Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 58 [1969] 175–180) would insert the archon formula in the "preamble" of IG 1² 24, the first Athena Nike Decree. This would at least be another exception to the general rule. But McGregor (*Phoenix* 24 [1970] 179 f.) rightly questions this and proposes new readings in the first two lines of the Nike stele which would eliminate it.

⁸See Walbank, *op. cit.* 336, and Thuc. 3.2.3 (Tenedos).

⁹Thuc. 4.52; ATL 2.82 and 3.88 (a brilliant, convincing explanation of the 2000 Phokaian staters); Gomme, *Thucydides* 3.507 (unnecessarily cautious?).

way and made it their base, intending to build a fleet, coerce the Aktaian cities, and regularly raid Lesbos itself. They were dislodged by two Athenian generals, who moved down from the Hellespontine area with a small fleet reinforced by hasty levies from those allies. Since the third general had gone on with his ships through the Bosporos into the Euxine, they may have been stationed as far east even as Parion when the news about Antandros recalled them.¹⁰ A similar situation could be conjectured ca 450 B.C. Indeed there *was* trouble in the Hellespontine region ca 447 B.C., and Lesbian ships could easily have been involved, as later against Samos. Perikles apparently settled the Chersonnese with Athenian cleruchs at this time and two payments "to Tenedos" in the Quota List of 446 B.C. may reflect necessary military mopping up in the area. Meiggs thinks that these operations even reached Byzantion.¹¹ Walbank is right in insisting that the honorands of *SEG* 10.20 were not necessarily from Parion. They could, however, have come from some nearer Hellespontine or Thracian ally rather than from Lesbos itself.¹² The normal interpretation may stand in principle and the orthodox date satisfies the historical evidence. I incline myself to question it on other grounds.¹³

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

¹⁰See Thuc. 4.52.2–3 and 75 with Gomme's useful notes *ad loc.* The allied *στρατιά* perhaps included ships below the rank of trireme: see Thuc. 6.43.1 (two Rhodian pentekonters at Syracuse) and the triakonter and pentekonter of *SEG* 10.20 itself (lines 17 ff.), if rightly interpreted by Loughran and Raubitschek ([above, note 5] 80).

¹¹See his good discussion in *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 158–161 (adducing Plut. *Per.* 19.1; *ATL* 2, List 8, ii.108 f.; *IG* 1² 943 = *ML* 48). Not everyone would date *ML* 48 (casualty list, Byzantion) ca 447 B.C.: see the fair discussion in *ML* 127 f. (alternatives are 440–438 and ca 410 B.C.).

¹²One of the editor's readers shrewdly suggested to me the possibility that the honorands came from Athenai Diades in Euboea. I am a little dubious. The normal ethnic 'Αθηνῆνται—see *ATL* 1.218 f. (Register)—will not square with 'Αθῆνα in *SEG* 10.20.2, and the nominative city name 'Αθῆναι Διάδες would be out of place in a proxeny heading. Admittedly the ethnic 'Αθηναῖοι does occur *once* in the Quota Lists (*ATL* 2, List 7, iv.20; 448/7 B.C.?). Frankly the opening Προχσέγον καὶ εὐεργετῶν 'Αθηναίων still seems to me almost inevitable and the editors at least agree on this. Loughran and Raubitschek continue with [τῶν πρέσβων τῶν] Παριάνων *vacat*] 'Αθηνῶδ[όρο τῷ *nomen patris*]]. Walbank's version—modified solely so as not to prejudge the question about Issa—runs essentially 'Αθῆνα[ῖον *vacat*] Παριάν[ο + patronymic + ethnic] 'Αθηνῶδ[όρο? τῷ Παριάνο]].

¹³There is good reason on formal grounds for assigning the Sigeion Decree (*SEG* 10.13) to the archon Antiphon (418/7) instead of Antidotos (451/0). See my article in *AJP* 96 (1975) 283–284. I would agree with Walbank—see my n. 2—that the "Parian" Decree seems to be by the same hand.