

IN HIS WORK ON ANCIENT ARTILLERY E. W. Marsden concluded that by 371/0 Athens possessed catapult machinery.¹ He adduced as evidence IG 2² 1422, a fragmentary inventory, in which are listed "two boxes of catapult bolts." This inscription, however, hardly sustains his conclusion. Its date is tentative, resting upon the largely restored name of the eponymous archon for 371/0: [ΕΠΙ ΦΡΑΣΙΚΑ]ΕΙΔΟ ΔΔ vacat. In Marsden's view, the bolts had been donated to Athens by Dionysius of Syracuse. He argued this from two premises: that Dionysius had been manufacturing artillery pieces since 399 (Diod. 14.42.1); and that in the late seventies Athenian-Syracusan relations were amicable enough to provide a suitable context for such gifts.²

There is no valid reason for doubting that the catapult was introduced into Greek warfare by Dionysius. I shall, however, argue that, if IG 2² 1422 is to be dated to 371/0, Dionysius cannot be the voluntary donor; or, if he is the voluntary donor, that the gift and inscription must be dated to the sixties—the inscription to a year with a restorable eponymous archon's name.

What can be said about the Syracuse relationship? In the period prior to 369/8 there is not a shred of evidence to support Marsden's contention of friendship between Athens and Syracuse. In fact Diodorus and, to a lesser extent, Xenophon attest a tradition of military cooperation between Dionysius and Sparta.³ By the late seventies, the very time for which Marsden hypothesized the gift of bolts, relations between Athens and Dionysius had reached a nadir. In 372 Sicilian ships were dispatched to assist the Spartan fleet at Corcyra.⁴ Diodorus' first account of this

¹*Greek and Roman Artillery: Historical Development* (Oxford 1969) 65–66.

²These views have not received adequate critical examination from scholars whose main interests have been Hellenistic poliorcetics and fortifications. See, for example, the reviews of Marsden by B. S. Hall, *Technology and Culture* 2 (1970) 620–621 and by D. Baatz, *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 257–260. See also F. E. Winter, *Greek Fortifications* (Toronto 1971) 219 and *passim*; Y. Garlan, *Recherches de Poliorcétique Grecque* (*Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 223 [Paris 1974]) 172 and n. 2; A. W. Lawrence, *Greek Aims in Fortifications* (Oxford 1979) 46–47.

³For Spartan aid to Dionysius: Diod. 13.81.2; 86.4; 14.10.2–4; 44.2; 56.1; 58.1; 62.1–2; 63.4; 70.1. For Syracusan aid to Sparta: Diod. 13.34.4; 61.1; 14.78.5; 15.47.7; 70.1; Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.31; 5.1.28; 6.2.33; 7.1.20. See also A. H. M. Jones, *Sparta* (Cambridge, Mass. 1967) 114–115; C. D. Hamilton, *Sparta's Bitter Victories* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1979) 96.

⁴For 372 as the date of Iphicrates' departure from Athens, see A. G. Woodhead, "Chabrias, Timotheus and the Aegean Allies 375–373 B.C.," *Phoenix* 16 (1962) 363; R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek States ca. 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley 1976) 424.

event (15.47.7) is briefer than Xenophon's (*Hell.* 6.2.33–36), but later (16.57.2–3) he refers again to the incident and adds more detail. He suggests that the Sicilian fleet had another purpose in the mission, that of conveying costly statues to Olympia and Delphi.⁵ After capturing this bonanza, Iphicrates, not knowing what he should do with it, requested instructions from Athens and received the cynically pragmatic reply that he should not be bothered about the gods but about his own men. He then sold the statues. Dionysius was incensed when he heard of this and wrote strongly to the Athenians to accuse them of sacrilege. The story is unlikely to be complete fiction, although some of the detail may be garbled. It makes it extremely unlikely that in the following year Dionysius was presenting the Athenians with anything, let alone military hardware.

The Spartan defeat at Leuctra brought about a realignment of the leading powers. The conclusion of a formal alliance between Athens and Sparta (*Xen. Hell.* 7.1–14) led immediately to changes in the relationship between Athens and the old allies of Sparta. It is at this point, and not before, that Dionysius abandons his long-standing animosity towards Athens and adopts an attitude of apparent good-will. 368 saw not only an expedition from Syracuse to aid the allied effort against Thebes (*Hell.* 7.1.28), but also diplomatic exchanges between Dionysius and Athens.

An Athenian decree of the summer (Tod 2.133) reveals that Dionysius had written to the Athenians concerning the rebuilding of Apollo's temple at Delphi and that envoys from the tyrant were already in the city (1.14).⁶ Athens for her part was interested in developing the contact in the belief that circumstances were then right for the making of that formal alliance which she had sought since the nineties.⁷ An honorary decree was the first step; the second was the award of the first prize to Dionysius for his "Ransom of Hector" at the Lenaea in January/February 367.⁸ The culmination was the conclusion of a formal treaty of military cooperation (Tod 2.136). In the light of the renewal of the war against Carthage (*Diod.* 15.73.1–4) and the Syracusan reverse at Eryx, we can readily suppose that Dionysius desired the alliance as much as the Athenians, particularly for the potential of Athenian warships and mercenary contacts.

⁵G. Glotz, *Histoire Grecque* (Paris 1936) 3.405; H. W. Parke, *A History of the Delphic Oracle* (Oxford 1939) 223.

⁶Kirchner, in a note on *IG* 2² 103, suggests that the envoys came to Athens at the same time as the expeditionary force. This was the second force to be sent; the first came in 369/8 to aid the Spartans against the Thebans (*Xen. Hell.* 7.1.20; *Diod.* 15.70.1).

⁷Lysias 19.19–20; Tod 2.108; R. Seager, "Thrasybulus, Conon, and Athenian Imperialism 396–386 B.C.," *JHS* 87 (1967) 103.

⁸*Diod.* 15.74.1; A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*² (Leipzig 1889) 794.

This is clearly the time when one might expect to find Dionysius making gifts to Athens and, in view of the fact that he was something of a showman, what better than weaponry which to the Athenians was novel and distinctive?

We may now turn to *IG* 2² 1422 and consider alternatives to the 371/0 date. Two features of the inscription allow a different restoration of the archon's name: the lettering is not stoichedon, and only the last four letters (ΕΙΔΟ) of the name are legible on the stone. These letters, however, restrict the field of choice between 371/0 and 323/2 to one alternative, *Χαρικλείδης*, the eponymous archon of 363/2.⁹

W. Bannier suggested a connection between *IG* 2² 1422 and *IG* 2² 1425, an extensive inventory datable without reasonable doubt to 368/7. He assumed the correctness of the 371/0 archon restoration and relied on the occurrence of *σώρακοι* in both inscriptions: "Wir dürfen auch einen Zusammenhang der *σώρακοι τοξευμάτων δύο* und *σώρακοι καταπαλτῶν δύο* mit den Stücken *σώρακοι καινοί* und *σώρακιον τοξευμάτων σαπρῶν ἀχρήστων* vermuten . . ."¹⁰ Bannier's reasoning is loose, since the mere mention of *σώρακοι* is not particularly significant. For the fourth century, the inventories reveal that the *σώρακος* was a common type of container used to hold arrows,¹¹ catapult bolts,¹² and possibly arrow points.¹³ The occurrences of the term cover the broad period from just after 385/4 (*IG* 2² 1412.28; 1414.19) to ca 318/7 (*IG* 2² 1475.32). Furthermore, if W. B. Dinsmoor and W. S. Ferguson are correct in identifying the "8½ cases of rotten and useless arrows" of *IG* 2² 1425 as all that remained of the twenty cases of arrows transferred from the Parthenon in 406, it is clear that these arrows have no connection with the two containers of arrows of *IG* 2² 1422.¹⁴

It may be more useful to regard the "two baskets of arrows" and "two baskets of bolts" of *IG* 2² 1422 as a single identifiable unit. This same combination appears in later inventories of the Chalkotheke: *IG* 2² 120.36–37, dated 358/7 or 353/2,¹⁵ and *IG* 2² 1440.48, dated ca 350/49. Comparison of these two inscriptions suggests that the contents of the

⁹I would like to thank Professor J. S. Traill, Department of Classics, University of Toronto, for his valuable help with the epigraphical argument.

¹⁰"Zu den attischen Uebergabeurkunden des 4. Jahrhunderts in Kolumnenschrift," *RhM* 70 (1915) 587; cf. H. Lehner, *Über die athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Bonn 1890) 101.

¹¹*IG* 2² 1412.28; 1414.19; 1469.75–76; 120.36; 1440.48; 1422.8.

¹²*IG* 2² 1475.32; 120.37; 1440.48; 1422.9.

¹³*IG* 2² 1469.106–107; 1471.55–56.

¹⁴W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932) 129 n. 1; W. B. Dinsmoor, "The Burning of the Opisthodomos," *AJA* 36 (1932) 169 n. 2. For B. D. Meritt's ingenious restoration of *IG* 2² 1425.281, see N. Kyparisses, 'Αρχ Δελτ. 2 (1927/8) 128.62.

¹⁵E. Schweigert, "An Inventory of the Treasurers of Athena," *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 218 n. 16; J. Tréheux, "L'Inventaire des Clérouques d'Imbros," *BCH* 80 (1956) 468.

Chalkotheke underwent very little change. Confirmation is provided by the same preceding and following entries in both inscriptions: "twenty brazen shields next to the wall" (preceding); "two large cauldrons" and "forty couches in good condition" (following). Thus it seems reasonably certain that the "two baskets of arrows" and the "two baskets of bolts" of *IG* 2² 120 and 1440 are the same. If this is so, I would suggest that it is these same arrows and bolts which are listed in *IG* 2² 1422. If this is correct, a date for *IG* 2² 1422 in the late sixties would bring its inventory chronologically closer to the two inventories of the fifties.

The "two baskets of bolts" sat, apparently unused, for at least twelve years and at most twenty years. Such prolonged periods of storage strongly suggest that these bolts were not treated by the Athenians as military hardware intended for actual use.¹⁶

If, in spite of the above arguments, the date of *IG* 2² 1422 is 371/0 and if the bolts did come from Sicily, then the incident involving Iphicrates, as related by Diodorus, provides an alternative channel through which the bolts might have reached Athens in sufficient time to appear in an inventory of that year. On this hypothesis the captured Syracusan ships were carrying, in addition to statuary, these very bolts, products of exceptional craftsmanship, perhaps intended as dedications or votives at Olympia and Delphi (hence "two baskets of bolts"). Iphicrates confiscated these objects and sent them back to Athens with Callistratus early in 371, when they were dedicated *ex-voto* to Athena.¹⁷

In summary, a re-examination of the evidence suggests conclusions very different from those advanced by Marsden and his followers. If the bolts were in Athens by 371/0 they are most unlikely to have been a voluntary gift of Dionysius; such a gesture is improbable before 368/7. If they are a voluntary gift, then *IG* 2² 1422 must be dated to 363/2. Arguments from epigraphic evidence favour the later date, although they do not exclude the earlier one.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

¹⁶The silence of the literary sources and the inventories does not constitute a valid basis for the argument that the Athenians did not in fact possess catapult machines. If the evidence of Plutarch (*Pelopidas* 2.3, *Mor.* 187c) can be trusted, Timotheus barely escaped being struck by a bolt at the siege of Samos in 366/5. From this we might infer that Athenian generals were familiar with the defensive use of catapults.

If the Athenians were using catapults offensively, it is possible that the machines were built on the site and left behind at the end of the operation. Well-made bolts, on the other hand, that were unused and in good condition would probably be retained and stored at Athens against future need.

¹⁷W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings* (Cambridge 1902) 110 and n. 5, includes catapult missiles in a list of enemy arms dedicated *ex-voto* to Athena.

Professors J. W. Cole, B. S. Hall, M. B. Wallace, all of the University of Toronto, and an anonymous reader have helped me in various ways in the preparation of this note and I would like to express my gratitude to them.