

THE ATHENA NIKE DOSSIER:

IG 1³ 35/36 AND 64 A-B*

Stephen Tracy's neat demonstration that IG 1³ 35—authorizing the building of a temple and appointment of a priestess for Athena Nike—was cut by the man responsible for the Promachos accounts (IG 1³ 435) at first seemed decisive for the traditional c. 448 B.C. against my radical down-dating.¹ Ira Mark then argued that this decree provided for the *naiskos* and altar of his Stage III in the 440s: the marble temple belonged to Stage IV over twenty years later.² Despite these two powerful interventions the matter is not closed. David Gill has, I fancy, convincingly refuted Mark on archaeological and architectural grounds.³ And there is still more to be said from the epigraphic angle.

IG 1³ 36, cut on the back of the stele, looks like a delayed rider to 35. But just how delayed was it? It arranged for the regular payment of the priestess's salary by the *kolakretai* in office in the month Thargelion. On the traditional view the gap would be close to a quarter of a century, since 36 is firmly dated 424/3 B.C. This is quite extraordinary, though reasons have been found for it. More serious perhaps is some neglected epigraphic evidence. We have eighteen other examples in fifth-century Attic epigraphy where decrees are followed on the same stone by other texts; but virtually all the gaps are short, never more than a few years. The relevant texts are IG 1³ 4, 11/12, 41, 42/43, 52 A-B, 59, 61, 66, 68, 71, 72, 73, 89, 93, 101, 127/II²1, 156, 1454. It is true that 42/43 are dated c. 445–442 and c. 435–427 B.C. in IG 1³, but this is quite arbitrary. The one distinguishing feature is the three-barred sigma in 42 and Hiller in IG 1² 34/35 was content to put the texts before and after 446/5 B.C. Only 11/12 parallel what is claimed for 35/36 on traditional dating. 11, of course, is the famous Egea Treaty, now the subject of lively dispute. Many scholars have been convinced by the brilliant demonstration by Chambers, Gallucci, and Spanos that *IΦON* can be read of the archon's name. Habron (458/7) will be ruled out. With Antiphon (418/17) the gap before 12 will be very short, since Halikyai is known as an Athenian ally in 413 B.C. and probably joined when Athenian envoys visited Egea two years earlier.⁴ If this dating of 11 is right, the postulated gap between 35 and 36 is quite without parallel in Attic epigraphy.⁵ This should surely give defenders of the IG 1³ dating cause for thought.

* This paper was given in an earlier form to a meeting of the British Epigraphy Society in Cardiff on 24 April 1999. It followed David Gill's treatment of the history of work on the Nike bastion. I am grateful to all those who took part in the stimulating discussion after our two papers and to the *CQ* reader for helpful criticism.

¹ See S. Tracy, in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow*, ed. K. J. Rigsby (Durham, NC, 1985), 277–82. David Lewis—in Ian Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires*, *BAR International Series* 343 (Oxford, 1987), 57—felt that this was decisive and I wavered temporarily (*ibid.*, 68). But see my *The Athenian Empire Restored: Epigraphic and Historical Studies* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 522 for my come-back.

² Ira Mark, *Hesp. Suppl.* 26 (1993), 42–68, 104–10, 120–1, and 130–5. R. A. Tomlinson in his review (*JHS* 115 [1995], 238) was convinced by Mark.

³ David Gill, *Historia* (forthcoming).

⁴ See *ZPE* 83 (1990), 38–63. Alan Henry remains the most determined opponent of the Antiphon reading: see most recently *ZPE* 120 (1998), 45–8. I have answered him in *ZPE* 126 (1999), 117–20. For Egea and Halikyai, see Thuc. 6.62 and 7.32.1.

⁵ Admittedly Lisa Kallet-Marx has suggested putting IG 1³ 52 A (Kallias decree) in 431/30 and B in 418/17: see *CQ* 39 (1989), 94–113 and *ead.*, *Money, Expense and Naval Power in Thucydides' History* (Berkeley, 1993), 105ff. But most scholars prefer to date them to the same year: see *GRBS* 38 (1997), 113–26 for my counter to her view.

Dinsmoor long ago made an interesting observation on the stelai which carried *IG* 1³ 35/36 and 64 A–B. Both most unusually tapered downwards, increasing in thickness at the same rate, and they were probably originally of the same height—though of slightly different width. He found no parallel for this and was led to the tempting suggestion that the stelai were set up side by side in the Athena Nike precinct.⁶ This is awkward for Mark's thesis, on which the stele with 35 would have been first set up in the Stage III precinct, at a level a metre below that of the Stage IV precinct to which the 64 stele relates.⁷ Did the Athenians rescue the 35 stele, when raising the ground level for the marble temple, and then prepare a matching stele for the later records? This is possible, of course, but it would seem more natural, if Dinsmoor was right, to assume that the two stelai belong to the *same* building phase of the 420s.

A further piece of epigraphic evidence now proves very relevant. *IG* II² 403 records repairs to a statue of Athena Nike dedicated by the Athenians in 425 B.C. from campaigns in northern Greece. Could this be the cult-statue for the temple authorized in *IG* 1³ 35?⁸ Mark naturally had to rule this out, but his case is far from cogent. He rightly recognized τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα of 64.20–1. as the archaic statue of Athena Nike: but the adjective seems to imply a contrast with a *new* one under construction.⁹

From *IG* II² 403.6–12 we learn that the statue was dedicated 'from the Ambrakiots and the army at Olpai, the insurgents against the Corcyrean *demos* and from Anaktoron'. The last two items enable the statue to be fitted in very closely in a context of late summer and autumn 425 B.C.¹⁰

I can best demonstrate this in a table.

Chronological table: 425/4 B.C.

Surrender of Sphakteria	Thuc. 4.39–40	c. Aug. 5 (Gomme); c. Sept. 5 (Meritt)
Athenian attack on Corinth	Thuc. 4.42–5	
Reassessment of tribute	<i>IG</i> 1 ³ 71 ¹¹	prytany 3
Athenian fleet in Corcyra	Thuc. 4.46–8	
Payment for Pylos garrison	<i>IG</i> 1 ³ 369.16	prytany 4.3 (late October)
Athens takes Anaktoron	Thuc. 4.49	end of summer
Dedication of Nike statue	<i>IG</i> II ² 403	

The prytany of *IG* 1³ 71 (first decree) was either Aiantis or Leontis. Now Meritt plausibly dated *IG* 1³ 70, from the Aiantis prytany, to the winter of 425/4 B.C.: there are mentions of Chios or Chian(s) and of guarantees, *pisteis* (lines 8, 11, and 13) and Meritt acutely adduced Thuc. 4.51, where we find Chios demolishing its new wall on Athenian insistence and negotiating guarantees in return.¹² Lewis (in *IG* 1³) and Walbank rejected Meritt's scenario and proposed other years. But I think that Meritt's

⁶ W. B. Dinsmoor, *AJA* 17 (1913), 376 and 27 (1923), 318–21.

⁷ See Mark (n. 2), 69–76.

⁸ For this view see A. Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig, 1893), 211; T. Dohrn, *Antike Plastik* (Krefeld, 1957), 21; J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London, 1971), 149; L. A. Jeffery, *Miscellanea . . . E. Manni* (Rome, 1980), 1237–8.

⁹ Mark (n. 2), 108–10 and 123–5.

¹⁰ See Thuc. 3.108 and 111 with 4.46 and 49.

¹¹ The return of the expedition (lines 34–5) probably refers to Nikias' Corinthian campaign, as E. Cavaignac (*REG* 48 [1935], 245–9) and M. F. McGregor (*TAPA* 66 [1935], 156–61) saw long ago.

¹² B. D. Meritt, *Hesp* 14 (1945), 115–19.

view should stand.¹³ It would rule out Aiantis for *IG* 1³ 71 and leave Leontis. Now the prytany of *IG* 1³ 35 was almost certainly Leontis (lines 8–9). It could fit well with 71 soon after Nikias' return from Corinth. Once the temple of Athena Nike was voted, the Assembly could decide on a new cult-statue for the goddess, to celebrate the string of victories in the north. In 424/3 B.C. the priestess's salary was regularized. Then, perhaps in the last prytany of that year (*IG* 1³ 84 A.17) further decisions about the temple building were reached. Finally the accounts were inscribed on the back of that second stele—set up beside its 'twin'. The history of the temple on this view seems consistent and I submit that it suits *all* the evidence better than the traditional view enshrined in *IG* 1³ or Mark's ingenious variant.

Cambridge

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

¹³ See M. B. Wallbank, *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Toronto, 1978), no. 19, 123–9; J. P. Barron (in J. Boardman and C. E. Vafopoulou-Richardson, *Chios* [Oxford, 1986], 101–2) and Simon Hornblower (*Commentary on Thucydides* 2 [Oxford, 1996], 209–10) both support Meritt's view with good arguments.

ΘΗΛΥΠΑΙΣ IN LYCOPHRON 850–1

Lycophron, *Alexandra* 850–1:

καὶ πάντα τλήσεθ' οὐνεκ' Αἰγύας κυνός
τῆς θηλύπαιδος καὶ τριάνορος κόρης.

Menelaus shall endure all things for the sake of the Aegyan bitch, the *thēlypais* and three-manned wench.

Besides the direct tradition, these verses are cited by Stephanus of Byzantium, s.n. Αἶγυς, who explains: ὁ λόγος περὶ Ἑλένης Λακωνικῆς οὔσης καὶ ἄρρεν μὴ τεκούσης καὶ τῷ Μενελάῳ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ Δηϊφώβῳ γαμηθείσης. Commentators have followed him both as to the identity of the three husbands and the sense of *θηλύπαις*: 'female-childed'.

Homer tells us that, once she had borne Hermione, the gods granted Helen no more children, Megapenthes being Menelaus' son by a handmaiden (*Od.* 4.10–14):

υἱεὶ δὲ Σπάρτηθεν Ἀλέκτορος ἤγαγε κούρην,
ὅς οἱ τηλύγετος γένετο κρατερὸς Μεγαπένθης
ἐκ δούλης· Ἑλένη δὲ θεοὶ γόνον οὐκέτ' ἔφαινον,
ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἐγέναιτο παῖδ' ἑρατεινὴν,
Ἑρμιόνην, ἣ εἶδος ἔχε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης.

Lycophron takes no notice of the sons whom certain writers accorded to the couple, nor indeed of those such as Korythos whom she was said to have given Paris,¹ for at v. 58 Korythos' mother is Oenone. But at v. 103 Iphigenia is Helen's daughter by Theseus.²

Theseus, passed over by Stephanus, was the first of the five bedmates with whom the *πεντάλεκτρος* Helen of v. 143 partook of the *νυμφεῖα πεντάγαμβρα* (v. 146) set out in

¹ See Roscher, 1.1932–5; Jacoby on *FGrH* 382 F 12 (cf. 76 F 88, 91, 316 F 6); and see *Σ* II. 3.175 (1.147–8 Dindorf), *Σ* *Od.* 4.11, *Σ* *Eur. And.* 898, Tzetzes on Lyc. 513. 'A iuvene et cupido credatur reddita uirgo?', asks Oenone scornfully (*Ov. Her.* 5.129).

² *δυοὶν πελειαιν ὠρφανισμένην γονῆς*, the two doves being Iphigenia and Hermione.