



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Harold B. Mattingly The Alliance of Athens with Egesta

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **16 • 1986**

Seite / Page **167–170**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1216/5583> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1986-16-p167-170-v5583.1

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

The Alliance of Athens with Egesta

Not so very long ago I found myself admiring JOHN TRAVLOS's elegant demonstration of where the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus and Basile should be located at Athens – a precise site near the Ilissos and within the Themistoclean city-wall. The well-known decree of Antiphon's archonship (418/7 B. C.) was discovered there in 1884 and in 1962 a boundary-stone turned up *in situ*, on the line of an ancient road delimiting the sanctuary to the south.¹ Since Adousios' decree ordered the demarcation of the sanctuary, it struck me as most natural to regard this stone as one of those duly set up in 418/7 B. C.² Life for epigraphists is rarely so simple. The stone reads HOROΣ TO HIERO and scholars have therefore dated it c. 450 B. C. instead.³ The Egesta Treaty has suffered similar treatment. Because it has rounded, tailed *rho* and three-bar *sigma*, it is normally put in the 450s B. C.; the archon's name in the preamble ends in -on and Habron (458/7 B. C.) has been preferred.⁴ The rider, however, was almost certainly proposed by a man called Euphemos.⁵ An Athenian of this name was the main negotiator for a Kamarina alliance in winter 415/4 B. C. and may well have gone on to Egesta later. If Kamarina *had* joined Athens, there would have surely been valuable cavalry assistance. Instead Egesta was persuaded to spare three hundred horse.⁶ What could be more natural than to identify envoy and orator?⁷ There is a good parallel in this late period. The Eu-

¹ See Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Greece (1971), pp. 332–34 with fig. 435 f.: IG I³ 84: P. STAVROPOULLOS, AD 20 (1965), pp. 68–70 with SEG 24. 58 and TRAVLOS, fig. 436 (*horos*).

² IG I³ 84.6–9 with 14 f. and 30–32 (rider). The *probouleuma* had made the *basileus* responsible. τὸς ὀριστὰς ἐπιπέμψαι ὀρίσαι τὰ ἱερὰ ταῦτα.

³ See TRAVLOS (n. 1), p. 332 and SEG 24. 58.

⁴ So MEIGGS and LEWIS, Greek Historical Inscriptions no. 37, pp. 80–82: D. W. BRADEEN and M. F. MCGREGOR, Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy (1973), pp. 71–81: IG I³, 11 (WOODHEAD).

⁵ Editors vary between reading Εὐφε[μ]ος εἶπε, Εὐφεμ[ο]ς εἶπε and Εὐφεμ[ο]ς εἶπε (IG I³ 11. 15). The only alternative is Eupheros, which is extremely rare (PA 6043-5 and 6043 a).

⁶ See Thuc. 6, 75.4 and 81–88 (Kamarina): 88.6 and 98.1 (embassy to Egesta): 20.4 – 21.1 (Athens' need for cavalry): 67.2, 75.3 and 88.1 (Kamarina's support for Syracuse – about twenty horse – was nominal).

⁷ WILAMOWITZ could not resist it (Aristoteles und Athen 2 [1883], p. 135 with n. 10), though he dated the alliance 458/7 B. C.!

krates who proposed a rider to the Bottiaian Treaty of 422/1 B. C. (?) was probably general in the Thraceward region in 412/1 B. C.⁸ Just how sound is the argument for dating the Egesta alliance in the 450s?

The archon's name is the crux, since only the last four spaces show letters or possible traces. Reused as a threshold block the stone has been worn nearly smooth at that point by the passage of countless feet.⁹ TERRY WICK has insisted, on the basis of a new squeeze and photographs, that the *phi* of Antiphon can be read.¹⁰ The opposition has claimed the *beta* of Habron, but with less assurance.¹¹ Many will feel tempted to agree with PETER RHODES that «enough letters to guarantee the archon's name can be seen only by those who know what they want to see».¹² This is neatly put, but it is unintentionally misleading. WICK's 1981 paper concluded with a report by Professor J. M. BALCER. BALCER had remained very sceptical about the reading on the stone, though agreeing that WICK's squeeze seemed to show a *phi*. Scrupulous study of the stone produced interesting results. In the fourth place from the end of the name he saw a vertical stroke only and no trace of the supposed *beta*. On the crucial third space he reported fully: «I saw less of the *phi* [under limited lighting] than on the squeeze; in fact I must admit that I could hardly make it out. But playing my penlight across the surface, the *phi* became clearer and clearer – still very difficult, but clear . . . I then moved the stone on its dolly back to a big light. When I used both lights, the oval of the *phi* became very clear . . . Given the condition of the stone the Φ ON could not be clearer, and the clarity is such that many would not dot any of these four letters».¹³ Others have independently seen the same.

In February 1965 PETER GREEN wrote to me from Athens. I had suspected *phi* as early as 1962 from WOODHEAD's 1948 photograph and a squeeze and what I wrote led GREEN first to study the photograph closely and then to check the stone. Scrutiny «made it clear beyond any conceivable doubt. The letter before -ON in the archon's name can't be anything but *phi*, possibly. I read *phi* with visual confi-

⁸ See IG I³ 76. 34: Aristophanes, Lysist. 103: PA 5757 (Nikias' brother?). For the date of the alliance see MERITT, AJA 29 (1925), pp. 29–31.

⁹ See the good description and plate in BRADEEN and MCGREGOR, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 71–73: IG I³ 11 n.

¹⁰ JHS 95 (1975), pp. 186–88: CPh 76 (1981), pp. 118–121. Photographic reproduction unluckily does not do justice to his squeeze; but WICK describes the epigraphic facts admirably.

¹¹ BRADEEN and MCGREGOR argued for [hú]β[p]ov (op. cit. n. 4, pp. 77–79). Dotted *beta* was also championed by RAUBITSCHER (TAPA 75 [1944], p. 10 n. 3), MERITT (BCH 88 [1964], pp. 413–15), and WOODHEAD (Hesp. 17 [1948], p. 59 f.). But MEIGGS and LEWIS preferred to print [húβp]ov: WOODHEAD in IG I³ 11 leaves the archon's name unsupplemented in the text.

¹² G & R (New Surveys in the Classics, no. 17), «The Athenian Empire» (1985), p. 23.

¹³ See CPh 76 (1981), p. 120 f.

dence». ¹⁴ When I came to Athens in April we looked hard at the stone together, studying it under varied lighting and in sunlight. I was amazed to find that I too could read *phi* clearly, though faintly. Three young American epigraphists confirmed our discovery with a shock of surprise. One of them was FORDYCE MITCHELL, who has lately written me a fascinating letter. He was evidently so excited that he returned to the stone more than once in 1965 and, measuring very carefully, he found that the *phi* in line 3 exactly matched the *phis* in lines 11 and 15. In 1972/3 he was back in Athens on other work, with some extremely bright ophthalmological penlights. He naturally used two of them on the Egesta stone, and he now reports as follows: «When I shone the light on the *phi* the «shadow» of the upright seemed to be there . . . Concerning the Φ I am absolutely sure». ¹⁵ BALCER and MITCHELL both saw the *phi* when they were not really wanting it. PETER GREEN had admitted no more than a *prima facie* case. I had certainly had my suspicions, but would still stress my sense of shock when suddenly the *phi* became visible on the stone – and, once seen, refused to go away.

The first editor ULRICH KÖHLER also «saw» it and KIRCHHOFF took over from him the curious transcription $\odot\odot\text{N NEPXEAR}$. . . Since this fitted no Athenian archon before 442/1 B. C. – the then *terminus* for three-bar sigma – or even after, KÖHLER was driven to such desperate shifts as arguing for MSS corruption in some archon's name. Evidently he had excluded the possibility of *phi*. ¹⁶ LOLLING did reckon with this, in reediting the text, but he concluded that the traces matched closely *none* of the rounded letters in the text and that therefore they were fortuitous. ¹⁷ Clearly this is true only of *theta* or *omicron*. Even MERRITT has now recognized the possibility of *phi* in the third last space, though in the course of trying to refute WICK. ¹⁸ That KÖHLER missed the vestigial traces of the upright is hardly surprising in an epoch before modern lighting devices and other scientific aids. Otherwise he saw precisely what others have seen since. He viewed the stone several times under different light and always had the impression of a rounded letter in the

¹⁴ For my observations see *Historia* 12 (1963), p. 268 f. GREEN reported the result of his autopsy in Armada from Athens (1970), p. x.

¹⁵ He has kindly allowed me to quote him. He also saw a vertical «scratch», a «vestigial *iota*» before the *phi*: probably the «ghost» of a completely abraded letter.

¹⁶ IG I, 20 (with a puzzled note): KÖHLER, *Hermes* 2 (1867), p. 17: «Vom Name des Archonten ist . . . deutlich der letzte Buchstabe N, weniger deutlich der vorhergehende O erhalten, dagegen habe ich, so oft ich auch den Stein darauf angesehen habe, stets auch an der drittletzten Stelle die Spuren eines kreisrunden Buchstaben zu erkennen geglaubt». Uneasy about invoking MSS corruption he argued that uniquely *epistates* and *archon* may have followed their verbs!

¹⁷ See AD 1891, p. 103 no. 9 and IG I, Suppl., p. 139. PRITCHETT approved LOLLING's agnostic approach (*AJA* 59 [1955], p. 58 f.).

¹⁸ *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 121 (1977), p. 438. WICK's effective counter is in *CPh* 76 (1981), p. 119 f.

third space from the end of the name. He honestly tried to come to terms with this fact.¹⁹

In short I would argue that KÖHLER's instinct was correct and that it is no coincidence that four modern scholars have independently read *phi* from the stone in line 3. The Egesta alliance must be dated 418/7 B.C., where it always belonged historically.²⁰ KÖHLER rightly shrunk from arbitrarily altering an MSS archon to fit ΘON or OON. It is a pity that KIRCHHOFF did not feel the same restraint. When KOUMANOUDES first published the Miletos Decree, with its three-bar sigmas, he naturally dated it 426/5 B.C. by the archon Euthynos whom it cited.²¹ KIRCHHOFF, on account of the sigmas, pronounced that it must be at least twenty years earlier and proposed accordingly to alter Diodoros' Euthydemos of 450/49 B.C. to Euthynos.²² Since in addition Euthynos is an extremely rare Attic name, there now seems no reason for not returning to KOUMANOUDES' instinctive reaction.²³ First editors can sometimes be right.

The University of Leeds

School of History

Leeds

LS2 9JT

Great Britain

¹⁹ Note the words *so offi* and *stets* in the passage quoted in my n. 16 and his insistence on printing *two* vestigial round letters in his text.

²⁰ For a thorough study of it in this context see J. D. SMART, *JHS* 92 (1972), pp. 128–146.

²¹ *Athenaion* 5, pp. 82 f. and 167 and 6, p. 127.

²² *IG I Suppl.* p. 7 (n. on 22 a): *IG I³*, 21. 61 and 86.

²³ On the heavy chances against *two* archons of this name within only 25 years see my argument in *Historia* 30 (1981), pp. 113–117 and *AJPh* 105 (1984), pp. 347 f.