occurrence of the definite article in the traditional reading's ἀ βροδοδάκτυλος μῆνα (or, as amended by Schubart, σελήνη [Aeolic, σελάννα]). According to Lobel, as stated by Page, the rule in Sappho is that a definite article never accompanies an adjective + noun,[11] unless the noun is a divine personal name. It is also clear that on metrical grounds 'α' cannot be retained alongside ἀργυροδάκτυλος.[12] If, however, my argument so far is correct, one may assume that 'α' was added to the text in order to mend the metre, after βροδοδάκτυλος had ousted ἀργυροδάκτυλος. Once ἀργυροδάκτυλος is restored, the metrical need for 'α' disappears, and it can be excluded from the text. The first syllable of ἀργυροδάκτυλος preserves the metre in its place, while the grammatical problem is eliminated.

Finally, the emendation σελάννα (proposed on metrical grounds by Schubart) has been supported with further arguments by Heitsch.[13] If this and the general argument of this note be accepted, I would venture to conclude that Sappho wrote of a woman's beauty in these terms:

$$\ldots \ \overset{}{\omega}\varsigma \ \pi\sigma\tau' \ \mathring{a}\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$$
$$\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma \ \mathring{a}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\sigma\delta\acute{a}\kappa\tau\upsilon\lambda\sigma\varsigma \ \sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{a}\nu\nu\alpha$$
$$\pi\acute{a}\nu\tau\alpha \ \pi\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\sigma\iota\sigma' \ \overset{}{a}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\ldots$$

. . . like the silver-fingered moon, once the sun has set,
surpassing all the stars . . .

London   CLIFFORD HINDLEY

[11] Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 90.
[12] Various analyses of the metrical scheme of this poem agree that the third syllable of the line should be long. Cf. P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, trans. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford, 1962), 40 (para. 54.10); D. S. Raven, *Greek Metre: An Introduction* (London, 1962), 73; D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 319 (para. V ii).
[13] Heitsch (n. 3), 391.

THE ATHENIAN DECREE FOR CHALCIS (*IG* 1³.40)

This important complete Attic text is usually dated 446/445 B.C. and linked with the crushing of the Euboean revolt. It looks a perfect fit.[1] Some thirty years ago, however, I suggested 424/423 B.C. instead, since Philochorus reported Athenian military intervention in Euboea that year and he is no mean authority on Athenian affairs.[2] In order to help clarify the problem I would first stress two formal points.

IG 1³.40 is closely linked to *IG* 1³.35, the first decree for Athena Nike. In 40.40 we find, after a gap and starting a new line, just Ἀντικλῆς εἶπε·: the usual amendment formula τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῆι βολεῖ is omitted. In 35.14 we find, again after a gap and starting a new line, just ἑστιαῖος εἶπε: the normal formula is missing once more.[3]

[1] See *IG* 1³ and Meiggs and Lewis *GHI* (henceforth *ML*), no. 52, 143–4.
[2] *JHS* 81 (1961), 124–32 = *Athenian Empire Restored* (Michigan, 1996: henceforth *AER*), 53–7: schol. on *Wasps* 718: *FGH* IIIB (suppl.), I, 504 and II, 407 (on 328 F 130).
[3] In *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1972), 71–2, n. 2, Peter Rhodes was content to note just how odd the two decrees were in this respect. Meiggs and Lewis were strangely inconsistent. On no. 44, p. 198 they wrote 'An amendment (though the normal amendment formula . . . is omitted) was carried by Hestiaios.' But on no. 52, p. 141 they note 'There follows a decree, moved by Antikles . . .'. The two phenomena should not be treated differently.

In 40.64–7 a three-man board chosen from Council is to assist Hierocles with the sacrifices vowed for Euboea. A similar board chosen from Council is to help the architect Callicrates in 35.15–19 with the Nike project. I know of no other comparable board in the fifth century designed explicitly to expedite the matter in hand.[4] The two decrees may then be close in date. But, since 35 is normally dated c. 448 B.C., this might seem to clinch the 446/445 B.C. dating for 40.[5]

I have, however, recently argued the case for dating *IG* 1³.35 to 425/424 B.C. shortly before the building of the Nike temple began. It is considerably stronger than my previous case and some doubters have been won over.[6] If it is valid, it would support 424/423 B.C. for *IG* 1³.40 and, as I have argued on earlier occasions, a most idiosyncratic usage in the decree seems to point this way. In lines 45–7 we find hoίτινες δὲ ἐχσορκόσοσι ἀφικόμενοι ἐ|ς Χαλκίδα, ἐλέσθαι τὸν δεμον πέντε ἄνδρ|ας αὐτίκα μάλα. The only parallels in Attic epigraphy are *IG* 1³.76.30–2 (422/421 B.C.) and 82.17–18 and 29–30 (421/420 B.C.).[7] The normal use with οἵτινες *after* the verb of choice is found both before and after the late 420s in *IG* 1³.156.27–9 (c. 427 B.C.), 149.13 (c. 425–415 B.C.), 93.3 (415 B.C.), Ἀθ. πολ. 29.2 (411 B.C.) and *IG* 1³.102.22–5 (410/409 B.C.). The other looks a short-lived innovation.[8] This is confirmed by two striking echoes in *IG* 1³.40 of decrees precisely dated 424/423 B.C. First, we must examine *IG* 1³.73.29–30: ταῦτα μὲν τὲμ βο[λὲν φσεφίσ]ασθαι· ἐὰν δέ το δέ|εται Ποταμόδορος. The orator apparently divided the *probouleuma* proper from his own addition in Council.[9] The only real parallel is in *IG* 1³.40.63–5: ταῦτα μὲν φσεφίσασθαι Χαλκ|ιδεῦσιν. ᵛᵛᵛᵛ τὰ δὲ hιερὰ τὰ ἐκ τὸν χρεσμ|ὸν hυπὲρ Εὐβοίας. This time the amendment is divided, when the speaker moves from Chalcis to the oracles.[10] Second, we seem to have a clear echo of the opening clause of the One Year's Truce (Thuc. 4.118–11): τύχη ἀγαθῇ τῇ Ἀθηναίων, ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν καθ ἃ ξυγχωροῦσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι αὐτῶν καὶ ὡμολόγησαν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ·. In 40.40–3 we find ἀγαθεῖ τύχει τεῖ Ἀθεναῖον ποέσθαι τὸν hόρκον Ἀθεναῖος καὶ Χαλ|κιδέας, καθάπερ Ἐρετριεῦσα ἐφσεφίσατ|ο ho δεμος ho Ἀθεναίον. The first surely dated appearance of τύχη ἀγαθή at Athens is in the heading of the Pronaos Inventory of 426/425 B.C. (*IG* 1³.300.1). We next find ἐπ' ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ in Aristophanes, *Wasps* 569 (423/422 B.C.), ἀγαθή τις τύχη in *Peace* 360 (422/421 B.C.) and τύχ ἀγαθῇ in *Birds* 436 and 675 (415/414 B.C.). τύχει ἀγαθεῖ is also found epigraphically in 415 B.C. (*IG* 1³.93–3) and c. 410–404 B.C. (*IG* 1³.236.42–3). The full formula does not seem to

---

[4] I have already discussed these two points in *AJA* 86 (1982), 385 = *AER*, 465. The purpose of the boards was—as J. Bundgaard (in *Mélanges . . . G. Daux* [Paris, 1974], 48) saw for the Nike project—surely to speed up proceedings. The five-man board from Council restored in *IG* 1³.102.22–5 in 410/409 B.C. does not seem to have been so designed and is hardly a parallel.

[5] See *IG* 1³ and *ML* no. 44, pp. 107–11.

[6] *CQ* 50 (2000), 604–6.

[7] See my earlier case in *Historia* 25 (1976), 38–40 = *AER*, 391–3.

[8] 156 has a secretary Charoeades, probably the general killed in Sicily in 426 B.C. (Thuc. 3.90.23: 149 should be c. 425 B.C. or after with its later dative form in lines 9–10, χιλία[ις δρα]χμαῖς: see my Table in *ZPhE* 83 (1990), 120 = *AER*, 515. The bottom line for 149 is provided by the *kolakretai* in line 3. Their last sure dated appearance is in 418/417 B.C. (*IG* 1³.84.28): the general consensus puts their abolition in the period 415–411 B.C.

[9] See on this B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 10 (1941), 324. For guarded acceptance of Meritt's view, see Rhodes (n. 3), 74, n. 8 and 246. Not until 362/361 B.C. do we find a *probouleuma* so divided as in *IG* 1³.73.29–30. See *IG* II².112.12–14: τα[ῦ]τα μὲν ηὐχθ[αι, ἐπει[δὴ δ]ὲ οἱ σύμμαχοι δόγμα εἰσήειγκαν εἰς τ[ὴν βουλ|ὴν δ]έχεσθαι τὴν σψμμαχιαν.

[10] ταῦτα μὲν ἀναγράφσαι, followed by a fresh clause, in *IG* 1³.66.23–6 (427/426 B.C.) and 78.52–4 (late 420s) is not really parallel and anyway would not alter the dating.

reappear until early in the fourth century, though it may lurk in the . . . ἐ]πε· τύχε[ι ἀγαθἐι of *IG* 1³.93.26.[11] The only two fifth-century texts with the full formula ought to belong in 424/423 B.C.: they should not lightly be separated by over twenty years.

I must now turn to prosopography. Dracontides, *epistates* of Antiochis, is surely Dracontides Thoraieus. His generalship in 433/432 B.C. might seem to suit either dating. But other evidence supports the lower context. In a later generalship he apparently proposed the prosecution of Pericles for misuse of public funds and in 423/422 B.C. he was in danger of being tried himself.[12] For the orator Diognetus there is no independent evidence *c.* 450 B.C. Indeed the fifth-century men of this name cluster in the last quarter. With the 424/423 B.C. dating the obvious candidate is the brother of the famous Nikias.[13] Archestratus, proposer of the second rider (lines 70–9), could well be the man active in the assembly on Boeotian affairs in 424/423 B.C. Boeotia and Euboea were closely connected in Athenian minds. It would be natural for Archestratus to turn to Euboea.[14] Hierocles (lines 64–7) is a well-known figure, typical of the soothsayers who flourished in wartime (Thuc. 2.21.3, 8.1.1), enjoying great influence in times of crisis. His Euboean origin and interests and pedantic concern with ritual were ridiculed by the comic poets in the late 420s—but not apparently before.[15]

Taking all this evidence into account I submit that we should recognize that Philochorus was right about Athenian military intervention in Euboea in 424/423 B.C. and that *IG* 1³.40 represents the subsequent settlement. We would then have a precious record of an otherwise forgotten chapter in the history of Athenian–Euboean relations. It may, however, be reflected in Thucydides' narrative. There was an Athenian garrison at Oropos and an Athenian fort in Eretreian territory by 412/411 B.C., on the eve of the Euboean revolt from Athens. Archestratos (*IG* 1³.40.76–9) had ordered the generals to take all possible steps for the safety of Euboea. These two outposts may represent the generals' response.[16]

Cambridge   HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

[11] The earliest fourth-century example may be of the 380s (*IG* II².82.2–4), the latest is from 368/367 B.C. (*IG* II².105.6–7). In *IG* II².43.7–9—the charter of the Second Confederacy in 378/377 B.C.—the full formula is extended to include Athens' allies.

[12] See *IG* 1³.364.20–1, Plut. *Per.* 32.3–4, Aristophanes, *Wasps* 157; *APF* 4511. Generals could introduce decrees either as a body or individually. See *IG* 1³.89.55 and 92.5 (body) and Aristophanes, *Ach.* 550–4 and Plut. *Per.* 13.7 (Pericles) with *IG* 1³.46.12–13 and 36–9 (Democleides: see also ?48–42).

[13] See *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* 2, nos. 5–7, 28, and 40. For Nicias' brother, see *PA* 3863/*APF* 10808. Nos. 5 and 40 were respectively *zetetes*/Councillor? in 416/415 and secretary in 409/408 B.C. (Andoc. 1, 14 and *IG* 1³.104.1, 3) and so should probably be ruled out for Council in 424/423 B.C.

[14] See *IG* 1³.73.9–20 and 39–47 (two riders). For the Boeotia/Euboea link, see Thuc. 1.113–114.1 and 8.60.1–2. The Euboean revolt in winter 411/410 B.C. was triggered by the Boeotian capture of Oropos. In winter 424/423 B.C. Athens' Boeotian campaign ended disastrously in the territory of Oropos (Thuc. 4.96.6–7 and 99): though the enemy failed to capitalize on its success, this must have caused Athens alarm over Euboia.

[15] See Aristophanes, *Peace* 1043–126 (for 'the chresmologos from Oreos', see lines 1047, 1125–6): Eupolis, *Cities* fr. 231 (*PCG* V, p. 432: *c.* 425 B.C.).

[16] See Thuc. 8.60.1 and 95.6 and my earlier view in *Historia* 41 (1992), 135–6.