

II.—Athens and Halikyai

ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHKE

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS
PRINCETON, N. J.

Our knowledge of the relationship between Athens and Sicily before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War is based for the most part on four Attic decrees.¹ Two of these (*IG* 1².51 and 52) were passed on the same day of the year 433/2 and contain the renewal of alliances with Rhegion and Leontinoi.² Although we have no literary evidence for the date of these earlier alliances, or for their renewal on the eve of the Peloponnesian War, the known relationship between Leontinoi and Rhegion on the one side, and Athens on the other, is only confirmed by these two decrees.

The third inscription contains the alliance between Athens and Egesta (*IG* 1².19) concluded presumably in 458/7.³ The early date of this alliance is surprising, but it explains the close relation between Athens and Egesta during the Peloponnesian War.⁴

¹ See H. Droysen, *Athen und der Westen vor der Sicilischen Expedition* (Berlin, 1882).

² See the brief but comprehensive commentary of M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1933) p. 126; cf. H. Droysen, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 13–14; W. Bauer, *Klio* 15 (1918) 188–191; and S. Accame, *RFIC* 63 (1935) 73–75 and 480. See also the recent discussion of these inscriptions by A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1945) I, 198.

³ The date depends on the restoration of the archon's name in the second line; cf. P. Haggard, *The Secretaries of the Athenian Boule* (New York, 1930) 8–9, note 4, and 26, note 3. The name is commonly restored as [*Ἀριστο*] (454/3), but U. Köhler, in the first publication (*H* 2 [1867] 17), noticed the traces of another round letter before the omikron. An examination of the squeeze of this inscription reveals also traces of an upright stroke in front of this round letter, and the restoration [*há*]βρον may be tentatively suggested. Habron was archon in 458/7 (*IG* 2².2318, line 52; see *Hesperia* 6 [1937] 155–156; 12 [1943] plate I), and it is known that Athens at that time sent a fleet as far as Naupaktos (W. A. Oldfather, *RE s.v.* "Naupaktos" 1986–1987). To the same period may belong the treaty between the Messenians and Athens (*IG* 1².37), the early date of which has recently been emphasized by B. D. Meritt (*Hesperia* 13 [1944] 224–229).

⁴ See K. Ziegler, *RE s.v.* "Segesta" 1061–1063. Cf. G. Busolt, *Griech. Geschichte* (Gotha, 1897) 3.521; F. M. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London, 1907) 39; G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Greci* (Firenze, 1939) 2.124 (repeated from *RFIC* 63 [1935]), assumes that the expedition of Diotimos (Scholion to Lyc. *Alexandra* 732–733; cf. H. Philipp, *RE s.v.* "Neapolis" 2114–2115) belongs to this early period. The generally accepted date (433/2; see W. Judeich, *RE s.v.* "Diotimos 1") seems confirmed by the record of the expenses for the two expeditions to Corcyra (*IG* 1².295; see B. D. Meritt,

The fourth document is a small fragment of an Attic decree (*IG* 1².20) which has received a great deal of attention, although it has never been studied carefully. The inscription was first published by U. Köhler (*MDAI* [A] 4 [1879] 30–33), and his interpretation has remained the basis of all subsequent discussions.⁵ Köhler noticed the difference in script between the two top lines and the following decree, but he (as well as all those who have subsequently commented on this fact) thought that this irregularity was merely an indication of the early date of the inscription. Moreover, he suggested restoring the name of the archon Ariston (454/3) in the text of the decree, and this restoration seemed to be confirmed by the restoration of the name of the same archon in *IG* 1².19, which records the alliance of Athens with Egesta (see above, note 3). Finally, Köhler correctly restored the name of the Halikyaioi in the third line of the decree, and connected with it a passage in Diodoros (11.86) concerning a war between Egesta and Lilybaion (incorrectly written by Diodoros for Halikyai). The contents of the various discussions listed in note 5 show clearly that Köhler's main points have been uncritically accepted by all scholars who have dealt with this inscription.

An examination of the squeezes of *IG* 1².19 and 20 reveals that the first two lines of *IG* 1².20 are in fact the last two lines of the decree, the beginning of which is preserved on *IG* 1².19.⁶ The thickness of *IG* 1².19 is recorded as 0.19 m. by U. Köhler (*H* 2 [1867] 17) and as 0.18 m. by F. Hiller (*IG* 1².19), who gives that of *IG* 1².20 as 0.185 m. which is reasonably close to the measurement

Athenian Financial Documents [Ann Arbor, 1932] 69–71) and by the renewal of the alliances with Rhegion and Leontinoi (see above, note 2) which all belong to the same year; see A. W. Gomme, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 198.

⁵ H. Droysen, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 21 and 57–59; *IG* 1 (suppl.) 58–59, no. 22 k; H. G. Lolling, *Δελτ.* 'Αρχ. (1891) 106; J. Beloch, *H* 28 (1893) 631 (repeated in *Griech. Geschichte* [Berlin, Nachdruck 1931] 2[1].202, note 4); G. Busolt, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 3.521, note 2; R. von Scala, *Staatsverträge* (Leipzig, 1898) 42, no. 57 (VIII)b (with earlier bibliography); A. Wilhelm, *JOEAI* 2 (1899) 226–227, note 17 (promising a new restoration of the text); K. Ziegler, *RE s.v.* "Halikyai"; W. Bauer, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 191; K. Ziegler, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 1060, line 6—1061, line 50; J. I. S. Whitaker, *Molya* (London, 1921) 102–104; *IG* 1².20; R. Hackforth, *CAH* 5.159; S. Luria, *H* 62 (1927) 260; W. Bannier, *RhM* 77 (1928) 271; G. Glotz, *Hist. Grecque* (Paris, 1929) 2.154 (note 49), 173 (note 22), 682; M. N. Tod, *op. cit.* (see note 2) p. 57; H. T. Wade-Gery, *ABSA* 33 (1935) 112, note 2; G. De Sanctis, *RFIC* 63 (1935) 71–72; S. Accame, *RFIC* 63 (1935) 74; A. E. Raubitschek, *AJPh* 61 (1940) 478, note 12; A. W. Gomme, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 365–366.

⁶ See *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 18, note 29.

of the larger fragment. The original width of the smaller fragment cannot be determined, but it should be noticed that the letters of the decree (lines 3–8) are more narrowly spaced than those of *IG* 1².19. On the other hand, the spacing of the first two lines of *IG* 1².20 agrees completely with that of *IG* 1².19. The same applies to the size and the shape of the letters. Even without reference to *IG* 1².19, it should be clear that the first two lines of *IG* 1².20 do not belong to the same document as lines 3–8 which are part of the beginning of an Attic decree. Since the first two lines obviously contain the names of several citizens of Egesta, and since a list of the members of the embassy from Egesta may be expected at the end of *IG* 1².19, the connection of the two fragments may be considered as very probable.

ca. 458 B.C.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 48

[πρέσβες] Ἐγείσται[ον ἡοὶ τὸν ἡόρκον ὅμοσαν·]¹⁴
 [. Σ]ικίνο Ἀπ[.]³⁴

427/6 B.C.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 48

[Ἔδοχσε]ν τῷ βολεῖ [καὶ τοῖ δέμοι — — — ἐπρυτάνευε — —]^{ca. 7} ^{ca. 5}
 [. . ἐγραμ]μάτευε Ἀρ[— — — ἐπεστάτε — — — εἶπε· Ἐγείσταιοις]^{ca. 4} ^{ca. 7}
 [καὶ ἡαλι]κναίοις Ἐλ[ύμοις συμμαχίαν ἔναι κατὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα σν]
 [γκείμεν]α τὰ πρὸς Ἀθ[εναίος. Τὸ δὲ φσέφισμα τότε ἡο γραμματεῖ]
 5 [ὅς ἡο τῆς β]ολῆς ἀναγ[ραφσάτο ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ στέλει ἐν ἡῖ ἀναγ]
 [ἐγραπται κα:] περὶ Ἐ[γείσταιον τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα τοῖ δέμοι — —].

Not enough is preserved of the surface below line 6 of the decree to show whether or not a seventh line followed. It should be noticed, however, that the decree is technically complete as it stands, and that Köhler remarked that there may be an uninscribed space below the sixth line.

In the restoration of the two lines above the decree, the example of *IG* 1².51 and 52 has not been followed since the formula [πρέσβες] Ἐγείσται[ον ἡοὶ τὸν χσυμμαχίαν ἐπόεσαντο καὶ τὸν ἡ[όρκον] would extend with five letters into the second line and thus leave no space for the name of the first envoy. Moreover, it seems hardly possible to restore the names of four men (with those of their fathers) in the second line; yet the embassies from Rhegion and Leontinoi consisted each of four members. The restoration suggested above provides



IG 1².20

space for four names (with patronymics) the first of which stood in the first line.

It goes without saying that the restoration of the decree is only tentative, but the following remarks may indicate that the contents of this decree are in full agreement with the other evidence concerning the relationship between Athens and the little Sicilian town of Halikyai.

The name of the Egestaioi has been restored at the beginning because this decree was engraved on the same stele as the earlier alliance with Egesta, and because it seems likely that Halikyai was simply included in the renewal of the alliance with Egesta. The restoration 'Ελ[ύμοις] implies that Halikyai was one of the cities of the Elymnoi, a suggestion which has already been made by G. F. Unger.⁷ The question is closely related to the problem whether or not the city of Halikyai mentioned by Thucydides (7.32.1) is identical with the city in Western Sicily which is mentioned in all other accounts, including the inscription discussed here. Thucydides reports that when the Syracusans had succeeded in raising troops from all over the island, Νίκιας πέμπει ἐς τῶν Συκελῶν τοὺς τὴν διόδον ἔχοντας καὶ σφίσι ξυμμάχους, Κεντόριπας τε καὶ Ἀλικυαίους καὶ ἄλλους in order that they should not allow the enemy to pass. Many students of this passage have felt that the mention of Halikyai is here out of place since this city lies in the extreme West of the island. The correct interpretation is given in the school edition prepared by G. Boehme and revised by S. Widman,⁸ who suggest that Thucydides merely mentions the two communication centers, (1) Halikyai on the way from Egesta to Selinous, Mazara, Lilybaion (Motye), and the interior, and (2) Kentoripa at the other end of the island, to-day a station on the railroad from Katana towards the interior. To this argument it may be added that Thucydides clearly says that both Kentoripa and Halikyai were allies of Athens. The historian himself tells (6.94.3) the occasion of the alliance (ὁμολογία) with Kentoripa,⁹ and the inscription discussed here gives evidence of a treaty between Athens and Halikyai. It would be an extraordinary coincidence, indeed, if Athens should have been

⁷ *Ph* 35 (1876) 212–213; cf., however, K. Ziegler, *RE* s.v. "Halikyai" 2265, lines 25–39.

⁸ *Thucydides*, Siebentes Bändchen: Buch VII, sechste gänzlich neubearbeitete Auflage (Leipzig, 1908) p. 35.

⁹ See R. von Scala, *op. cit.* (see note 5) 83, no. 90.

allied at one and the same time with two small Sicilian towns called Halikyai, one of which would be otherwise unknown. It may therefore be assumed that the alliance between Athens and Halikyai, the existence of which is attested by Thucydides, was recorded in the inscription under discussion.

The date of this inscription as suggested above is based on the letter forms and on some historical considerations. As long as the first two lines of the fragment were considered part of the same document as the following decree, no correct evaluation of the letter forms could be made.¹⁰ It is clear now that the decree of *IG* 1².20 must be dated without respect to the first two lines, which in fact belong to the same document as *IG* 1².19. On the basis of the letter forms, a date within the ten years from 435 to 425 B.C. should be suggested, and special attention should be called to the narrow upsilon and to the broad sigma and epsilon.

Twice within this decade (435–425 B.C.), Athens is known to have made or renewed alliances with Sicilian cities. In 433/2, the treaties with Rhegion and Leontinoi were renewed (see above, notes 2 and 4), but no contact with the western part of the island is reported. In 427/6, on the other hand, Laches entered Sicily and in fact renewed the alliance between Athens and Egesta.¹¹ Since the inscription under discussion (*IG* 1².20) contains (according to the restoration suggested above) a renewal of the treaty with Egesta, it may safely be concluded that it belongs to the year 427/6.¹²

¹⁰ It is interesting to notice that A. Wilhelm, an expert judge of letter forms, compared (*JOEAI* 2 [1899] 226–227) the lettering of *IG* 1².20 (which he, too, dated in 454/3) with that of *IG* 1².946 (which he dated in 457 B.C.). More recently, *IG* 1².946 has been dated in 431 B.C. (*Hesperia* 12 [1943] 25–26), and *IG* 1².20 may belong to the same period.

¹¹ The pertinent passages from Thucydides were collected by R. von Scala, *op. cit.* (see note 5) 56, no. 76; cf. K. Ziegler, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 1061–1062; H. Swoboda, *RE s.v.* "Laches" 337, lines 25–29.

¹² Or possibly 426/5; see H. B. Mayor, *JHS* 59 (1939) 47–48; cf. W. K. Pritchett, *AJPh* 61 (1940) 471.