

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE DATE OF THE ATHENIAN-EGESTAN ALLIANCE¹

IG, 1². 19 and 20. 1–2 record the alliance of Athens and Sicilian Egesta, the alliance which the Egestans in 416/15 B.C. invoked and which the Athenians late in the same year or early in the next honored by despatching an armada to the West.² Scholars long dated this alliance to 454/53, believing Ariston to be the archon named in the primary fragment's third line; but most now assign it to 458/57, thinking the archon named to be Habron.³ Among the staunchest defenders of the date presently in favor is B. D. Meritt, and the reading which he advocates in his most recent study of the inscription is [h]ἄβρον.⁴ Demonstrable, however, is that this reading rests upon epigraphical improbabilities which inspire anything but confidence in it. Demonstrable, too, is that the proper reading is [Ἀντ]ιφῶν, and thus the correct date of the alliance 418/17.

One may begin with the epigraphical improbabilities of [h]ἄβρον, the first of which underlies the dotted rho which Meritt reads on the basis of the rounding (as well as partial vertical stroke) which he acknowledges in the antepenultimate letter-space of the archon's name. Because this rounding is significantly lower in its stoichos than is the rounding of any of the eleven rhos preserved elsewhere on the stone, to read it as part of a rho is to read a rho which is quite unique.⁵ This is precisely what Meritt does, concluding that "it is possible that the rho in line 3 in the archon's name was cut lower than normal" and that "if the letter was in fact rho and not phi something like this must be the explanation."⁶ What one has here is an epigraphical possibility which the evidence of the stone itself renders improbable, but which Meritt nevertheless treats as likely and makes a part of the epigraphical evidence which he ultimately terms "decisive" in favor of his date in the 450s.⁷ And what is true of the rho is equally true of the beta (as against iota) which he adduces.⁸ Though the only two betas preserved elsewhere on the stone have *rounded* lobes,⁹ Meritt concludes that in the name of the archon is a

1. For reading the manuscript and offering helpful suggestions, I am indebted to Professors J. M. Balcer, H. B. Mattingly, K. S. Sacks, and Mr. J. D. Smart. For the photographs which appear in plates 2–4, I owe special thanks to my wife, Landora.

2. Thuc. 6. 6–7. 1, 7. 4–26, 30–32. 2, 42–44. 1.

3. For a summary history of the reading of the archon's name, see T. E. Wick, "A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance," *JHS* 95 (1975): 186–88.

4. "The Alliance between Athens and Egesta," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 121 (1977): 437–47. D. W. Madsen and M. F. McGregor, "Thucydides and Egesta," *Phoenix* 33 (1979): 238, conclude that Meritt "argues powerfully" his case for [h]ἄβρον, and they quote with approval the judgment with which his article ends: "The epigraphical evidence is . . . decisive."

5. For the locations of the eleven rhos, the positions of their roundings in their stoichoi, and what the positions of their roundings suggest, see Wick, "A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance," p. 189 with nn. 28–29.

6. "The Alliance between Athens and Egesta," p. 441.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 446.

8. The vertical stroke in the pre-antepenultimate letter-space of the archon's name is appropriate for either of these two letters, and tau, in addition; see Wick, "A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance," pp. 188–89.

9. They are in line 12, stoichos 38, and line 14, stoichos 32.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

beta with *angular* lobes,¹⁰ a beta which—however unlikely it might seem—he says “one need not be surprised to find.”¹¹ Finally, there is the improbability of the alpha. As the photograph which Meritt publishes as evidence of the letter clearly shows,¹² his dotted alpha is flanked on the right by at least one alpha form and is overlapped on the left by another such form which is itself overlapped on the left by yet another. The existence of these (and still other, nearby) alpha-like scratches certainly does not, in itself, make the alpha which Meritt reads impossible, but it does make his alpha as suspect and improbable as are his singular beta and his unique rho.

Meritt could, of course, have contented himself, as have other epigraphers, to read no more than $[h\acute{\alpha}\beta\rho]ov$ ¹³ or $[h\acute{\alpha}|\beta|\rho]ov$ ¹⁴ and to defend his 458/57 date largely on the basis of what has been called “the ‘law’ of the three-barred sigma”¹⁵ and what may by analogy be called “the ‘law’ of the tailed rho,” the first holding that three-barred sigmas (sigmas of the sort found in *IG*, 1². 19 and 20. 1–2) were not used for official purposes in Athens after 446/45, and the latter that tailed rhos (rhos of the sort which the inscription contains) were not employed after 438/37. But Meritt is a scholar too thorough, too conscientious, and too familiar with this inscription to have chosen that course. Much to his credit, he has both perceived and acknowledged that there is more to be read. To his credit, too, he has frankly conceded that his case for $[h]\acute{\alpha}\beta\rho ov$ —as the case for $[^{\ast}Av\tau]ιφδν$ —must in the final analysis stand or fall on what remains of the letter third from the end of the archon’s name, and with reference to which he writes: “I acknowledge Wick’s reading of the rounding in the antepenultimate letter which he interprets as part of the letter phi. This is discernible in the photograph which he has published in *J.H.S.* 95 (1975): plate XXIIIb. It is allegedly the right rounding of the letter. There is also a small central section of the vertical which shows in the photograph. . . . All that Wick says about these strokes seems to me to be true, but they do not, as strokes, guarantee the letter phi rather than the letter rho. The same rounding and the same partial vertical can have belonged to the letter rho. The identity of the letter would be settled beyond doubt if the left rounding (as of phi) were also preserved.”¹⁶ Meritt then goes on to argue that the traces of rounding in the left half of the letter-space are “thin, haphazard, and not continuously part of any stroke properly belonging to the left half of the letter,” that is, they are all scratches. “The outermost of them,” he continues, “has been taken by Wick as a genuine stroke and he uses it to measure the width of his phi. But this is easily distinguishable in character from the genuine curving stroke on the right-hand side. Even as a scratch its curvature is too sharp and it has no continuity beyond

10. “The Alliance between Athens and Egesta,” pp. 443–44.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 444.

12. Fig. 6 (*ibid.*, p. 445). And as photographs soon to be considered show, as well.

13. The reading favored by, among others, R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 80–81.

14. The reading of, for example, D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor, *Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1973), pp. 71, 75–79. Meritt himself advocated this reading in “The Alliance between Athens and Egesta,” *BCH* 88 (1964): 413–15, though by 1971 he had come to favor $[h\acute{\alpha}]\beta\rho ov$; see Wick, “A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance,” p. 187 with n. 8.

15. The phrase is that used by Bradeen and McGregor, *Studies*, p. 77.

16. “The Alliance between Athens and Egesta,” p. 438.

the small segment visible.”¹⁷ On the basis of what Meritt has said, it would seem that to “guarantee the letter phi rather than the letter rho” one must demonstrate that in the left half of the antepenultimate stoichos of the archon’s name is a curving stroke *not* distinguishable in character from the curving stroke in the right half, that the curvature of it is *not* too sharp, and that it *has* continuity—in short, that in the left half of the antepenultimate letter-space of the name there is rounding which cannot be dismissed as “thin, haphazard, and not continuously part of any stroke properly belonging to the left half of the letter.” With what is necessary to guarantee a phi firmly fixed in mind, one may turn to the plates showing the squeeze of *IG*, 1². 19 which C. Molisani of the Epigraphical Museum helped to prepare in the summer of 1972 and which J. M. Balcer of The Ohio State University examined in the spring of 1978 and judged to be of remarkable and superior quality.

In plate 1 is reproduced the photograph published in *JHS* 95 (1975) as plate XXIV (a); it shows the upper right-hand portion of the squeeze as it appears with light splayed from bottom to top across its front. Marked on the photograph as reproduced is the relatively small section of the squeeze shown in plates 2–4 as it appears with light shone from the *top* of the squeeze onto its *back*. Such lighting either washes out or obscures in shadow the detail of certain stoichoi, but at the same time it heightens the detail of certain others, among them the stoichos antepenultimate in the archon’s name. Examination of the plates will show that the rounding in the *right* half of this stoichos, clear in plate 1, is clear also in 2–4; that the rounding in the *left* half, suggested in plate 1, is confirmed in 2–4; and that the rounding in the left half joins with the rounding in the right half to form a distinct and virtually complete, symmetrical oval which scratches sometimes intersect and partly overlies, but which they by no means obliterate. Examination of the plates will show, as well, that in the middle of the oval is the partial vertical stroke which Meritt acknowledges, and that the distance from the center of this stroke to the center of the part of the oval outermost to the left is the same as the distance from the center of the stroke to the center of the part of the oval outermost to the right.¹⁸

That this partially bisected, symmetrical oval may be seen on the stone itself has been confirmed by Balcer, whose remarks on pages xii–xiii and 145 of his recently published *Athenian Regulations for Chalkis: Studies in Athenian Imperial Law* (Wiesbaden, 1978) testify to his epigraphical objectivity. Significantly, his remarks there were written prior to his scrutiny of the squeeze in the spring of 1978 and his careful reexamination of the stone itself in the following summer, reexamination which he agreed to make because he was genuinely disturbed by the fact that his scrutiny of the squeeze had convinced him that the squeeze does indeed reveal a phi in the archon’s name. In his report on this reexamination (a report dated 10 August and sent to the writer in a personal letter of 5 September), Balcer begins by noting that “I have, as you know, long resisted Antiphon, and that *the squeeze* shows phi is all that I could agree to.” Adding that “I did not look at the stone during the first week at the Epigraphical Museum, as I did not want to plunge in until I had looked at other stones, copied, struggled, and im-

17. Ibid.

18. The distance is in each case .0049 m; Wick, “A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egean Alliance,” p. 189.

proved my eye," he proceeds to discuss the letter-spaces which originally contained the initial letters of the archon's name, and he finishes by stating that "before the fourth stoichos from the end, I could see nothing of any letter." Discussing next the pre-antepenultimate stoichos, he concludes his comments on it by observing that "the vertical of Professor Meritt's beta is there," that "the other marks are clearly scratches," and that "Meritt's beta will not hold." Passing then to the antepenultimate letter-space, he says that when examining it under limited lighting, "I saw less of the phi than on the squeeze; in fact, I must admit that I could barely make it out. But playing my penlight across the surface, the phi became clearer and clearer—still very difficult, but clear. . . . I then," he continues, "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 $\Phi\Theta\Lambda$ could not be clearer, and the clarity is such that many would not dot any of these four letters."

Thus does an impartial scholar's examination of the stone confirm what the reader may see for himself in plates 2–4: the partially bisected, symmetrical oval antepenultimate in the name of the archon of IG, 1². 19. Because this oval can belong to no letter but phi, the phi in [$\Lambda\upsilon\tau$] $\Phi\Theta\Lambda$ is guaranteed, and so in consequence is the 418/17 date of the alliance which IG, 1². 19 and 20. 1–2 record.¹⁹

T. E. WICK

*University of Wisconsin,
Stevens Point*

19. Since the alliance recorded in IG, 1². 19 and 20. 1–2 dates to 418/17, the alliance recorded in the later lines of IG, 1². 20—that between Athens and Sicilian Halikyai—can date no earlier than 418/17, just as it can date no later than 413 (Wick, "A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance," p. 190, n. 32). If the AP which appear in the fifth line of IG, 1². 20 belong to the name of the archon, as thought likely by U. Köhler, then the name of the archon is Arimnestos and the date of the alliance 416/15 (ibid.). But if, as Meritt ("The Alliance between Athens and Egesta," p. 446) is very possibly correct in believing, the AP belong to the name of the *epistates* and the name of the archon was not specified, then the recording of the two alliances on the same stele and the naming of the archon in the first but not in the second combine to suggest for the second, as for the first, the year of the archonship of Antiphon.

THE INTERPRETATION OF SALLUST *CATILINE* 10. 1–11. 3

It has long been noticed that in chapters 10–11 of the *Bellum Catilinae* Sallust appears to contradict himself. Chapter 10. 3 states that "primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit," and from the next two sentences, which develop these two concepts respectively, it is clear that Sallust identifies "pecuniae cupido" with *avaritia* and "imperi cupido" with *ambitio*. But only two sentences later, in 11. 1, we are told that "primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat." In his recent commentary on the *Catiline*, P. McGushin expresses his dissatisfaction with existing attempts to explain this apparent contradiction.¹ K. Büchner's

1. C. Sallustius Crispus, "*Bellum Catilinae*": *A Commentary* (Leyden, 1977), pp. 90–91. See also the recent discussion by K. Vretska in his extensive commentary: C. Sallustius Crispus, "*De Catilinae coniuratione*," vol. 1 (Heidelberg, 1976), p. 213. Vretska, unlike McGushin, finds an earlier explanation of the passage acceptable, namely, that of D. C. Earl (see n. 3).