

XVI. Demades of Paeania and IG II².1493, 1494, 1495

FORDYCE W. MITCHEL

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE

I

The present paper is a report on the results of a re-examination, both in Princeton and in Athens,¹ of IG II².1493, 1494 and 1495. The study was undertaken with a two-fold purpose: first, to determine more precisely, if possible, the relationship of the three stones to one another, as non-contiguous fragments of the same monument;² and secondly, to attempt, on the basis of information gained from the first step, to establish beyond question the validity of Wilamowitz' restoration of the name of Demades of Paeania as that of the Military Treasurer mentioned in lines 12 and 16 of II².1493.³ The acceptance of this restoration, which has been accepted by some, rejected by others and generally ignored by most,⁴ is of obvious importance—both for its information concerning the career of Demades and for the light it sheds on the

¹ I wish to thank Prof. B. D. Meritt for his generous permission to use the facilities of the Institute for Advanced Study, especially the squeezes of these inscriptions, and for his many helpful suggestions during the course of the study. Special thanks go to Dr. M. Mitsos for his many kindnesses and interest during my visits to the Epigraphical Museum. This paper was written with the help of a grant from the University Center in Virginia.

² It has long been noted that the fragments belong together. Cf. Koehler, note to IG II.740 (=II².1494): "Satis certum est hoc fragmentum ad eandem tabulam pertinuisse cum eo, quod praecessit, aut ad easdem certe rationes"; also Kirchner, note to IG II².1495: "Cum Koehlero non dubitandum est quin hoc quoque fragmentum ex eodem monumento supersit cum n. 1493 et 1494."

³ Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 1.208, note 36: "Demades war doch wol 334–330 ταμίης στρατιωτικῶν, CIA II 739, 12, obwohl die strenge, aber sonst nicht durchführbare, gleichheit der zeihlen vier buchstaben vor ἄδους Παανιῶς verlangt."

⁴ So far as the author can determine, the problem has developed as follows: Koehler (II.739), in restoring the text on the basis of *stoich.* 20, indicated 4 spaces before -ἄδους in line 12 but did not note that an allowance for a similar space in line 15 forced him to crowd 9 letters [-ἄδους Παα-] into only 8 spaces in line 16. For whatever reason, Wilamowitz' suggested restoration of line 12 was not mentioned by Thalheim, *RE* 4 (1901) 2703–4, s.v., "Demades"; by Kirchner, *PA* (1901) 3263; or by W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 5–7, in his discussion of Demades' role in the political coalition of the 330's. K. J. Beloch, however (*Gr. Gesch.*²

in-fighting among the several leaders of the uneasy coalition government which was headed by Lycurgus.⁵

II

There is little to add to the published descriptions of the stones. What follows, therefore, is a consideration of those particular characteristics which are common to all three and tend to show that they are indeed fragments of the same stele and which may give a better idea of the original positions of the three fragments relative to one another and to the stele as a whole.

Although it may not be immediately apparent that the subject matter of all three fragments is the same, further consideration reveals that this is so. IG II².1493 says that it is the account of the Treasurers of Athena and of the Board in Charge of the *Nikai*, Processional Vessels and Canephoric Ornament, and it records the amounts of gold they received in successive prytanies from the Military Treasurer. IG II².1494, the smallest and most damaged of the fragments, again refers to the Treasurers (of Athena) and to Those in Charge of the Processional Vessels as either paying or receiving some amount of money. IG II².1495 tells us that certain goldsmiths received *n* drachmas of gold (i.e., in the form of old and damaged dedications) to be melted down; that in the process *n* drachmas were lost, *n* drachmas of pure gold were refined, *n*

4.1 [Berlin and Leipzig 1925] 52, note 4), noted the crowding in line 16 and declared: "es ist ohne alle Frage [Δημι]άρχους zu ergänzen." On the basis of this restoration Beloch unequivocally stated that Demades in the summer of 334 had taken over the administration of the Military Fund. But again Kirchner, with the republication of the inscription in 1927 as IG II².1493 in the first fascicle of that volume, failed to mention the proposed restoration; not until the Addenda appeared, in the second fascicle (1931), did K. print it and then only to express his doubt: "quod spatiis non respondet." This demurrer came too late, however, to prevent Ernst Meyer (*RE*, 2^{te} Reihe, 4 [1931] 267, s.v. *Στρατιωτικά*) from listing Demades as one of those who were known to have been Military Treasurers.

In 1938 Glotz-Cohen (G. Glotz-P. Roussel-R. Cohen, *Histoire grecque* 4 [Paris 1938] 198, note 65) affirmed that Demades was Military Treasurer in 334/3, referring only to Beloch (see above) and to IG II².739 (sic). Finally A. N. Oikonomides, *Platon* 6 (1956) 105-29, has gathered the epigraphical testimonia for the life of Demades (along with the decrees which Demades himself had proposed) but has mentioned neither IG II².1493 nor the restoration. One may note that those who are generally known as historians have tended to accept the restoration while those who are primarily epigraphists have either rejected or ignored it.

⁵ For general discussions of this coalition see Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* 7-14; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*² 4.1.51-56; W. W. Tarn, *CAH* 6 (Cambridge 1927) 440-50; Glotz-Cohen, *Hist. grecque* 4.196-213. For a more detailed account see A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*² (Leipzig 1885-87).

drachmas were recovered from the ashes and, finally, that a certain total of pure gold was received back from the goldsmiths.

As independent as each of these activities appears to be at first glance, each is still only a part of a comprehensive whole, for each records one or another phrase in the execution of the detailed regulations which were promulgated by a resolution of the *Nomothetai* (IG II².333) on the motion of Lycurgus. This was the resolution by which Lycurgus gained the authority to reorganize the financial resources of the state's religious cults (and evidently to appropriate the monthly surpluses of the Military Fund)⁶ in order to provide precious metal for the restoration of the golden *Nikai* and for the making of new vessels and paraphernalia for the several sanctuaries and religious processions.⁷ These pious deeds (which were not without fiscal overtones)⁸ were among those benefactions to the state for which Lycurgus was later honored by the decree of Stratocles (IG II².457).⁹

Since all these transactions were carried out under the authorization of the same resolution of the *Nomothetai* and under the supervision of the Treasurers and the Board, it seems probable enough that what pitiful remains we have of their financial records belong to a single account inscribed on a single stele. Or perhaps it is more accurate to say that, if the physical characteristics of the fragments are such as to suggest that they belong to the same stele, the *apparent* lack of unity in subject matter should not be used as an argument against regarding them as one document.¹⁰

⁶ For an account of how revenue flowed into and out of the Military Fund, see Ernst Meyer, *RE*, 2^{te} Reihe, 4 (1931) 264-65.

⁷ These activities of Lycurgus are briefly discussed by W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1932) 122-26.

⁸ Cf. Ferguson, *Treasurers* 26: When Lycurgus is praised for having collected so much wealth onto the Acropolis ([Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 852b), the "text is ordinarily interpreted (IG II².1496 b, note) to mean that Lycurgus collected the treasure of the local shrines and had it recast into more appropriate articles which were left on the Acropolis. In other words it was a revival of Pericles' policy of 434 B.C.; and it is not incredible that the fourth century financier had the same conception in the back of his mind, viz., to accumulate in the hands of the *Tamiae* a mass of plate which could be drawn on for the making of money in time of great national need." Nor is it incredible to think that he had in mind to publish the accounts in conscious imitation of the great financial documents of the previous century.

⁹ Cf. [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 852b: "He collected much wealth onto the Acropolis, and furnished ornament for the Goddess, all-gold *Nikai*, processional vessels of gold and silver, and golden ornaments for an hundred *kanêphoroi*."

¹⁰ This *caveat* is necessary because there is another inscription (IG II².1496), to be

While the Corpus does not commit itself beyond saying that all three fragments are of Pentelic marble, a side-by-side comparison shows that the marble is all of the same mediocre quality and shows a striking similarity in grain and texture. This is especially true of $\Pi^2.1493$ and 1494, and one concludes that these two pieces must have lain for a long time in the same context and have been subjected to the same kind of weathering and/or chemical action which has produced in them the same streaks of grey discoloration and has reduced the inscribed surfaces to the same wretched condition—badly flaked and still flaking in chips the size of small fish scales. Several of the letters copied by Koehler have now quite disappeared. The surface of $\Pi^2.1495$, on the other hand, has not been affected in like manner and remains in relatively good condition. Indeed some of the letters may with confidence be promoted out of brackets into the preserved text.¹¹

The letters of all three fragments are 0.005 in height and 10 of them occupy a horizontal space of 0.075. They are in general characteristic of the Lycurgan period, but more than that, the marked peculiarities of several letters (kappa, mu, sigma, rho and upsilon) suggest that all three fragments were inscribed by the same hand.

The preserved edges of $\Pi^2.1493$ indicate that it was the top left-hand corner of the original stele. It has a thickness of 0.09. Kirchner's proposed restoration of lines 2–5 of the prescript with a line of about 70 letters, plus margins of 0.025 at either end, suggests an original width of about 0.57. Below the prescript is a *vacat* of 0.017 before the beginning of the first entry of Col. 1. The right-hand margin of Col. 1 is nowhere preserved, but the restoration of the text of the basis of *stoich.* 20 leaves ample room at the right for two more columns of similar length, separated by *vacat*'s of 0.025.

discussed below, which has precisely the same date, and likewise deals with the melting-down of golden *ex-voto*'s and with other matters that were set up and regulated by the same resolution of the *Nomothetai* (*IG* $\Pi^2.333$).

¹¹ The accounts of the *Tamiai* were surely set up on the Acropolis, where indeed $\Pi^2.1495$ (and the fragments of $\Pi^2.1496$) was found. After the stele had been smashed, we know that 1493 tumbled or was heaved over the north wall, for it was found below on the north slope; it may be assumed that 1494 (provenience unknown) suffered the same fate. At any rate this theory would account for the similarly battered and eaten condition of the latter two fragments and for the relatively well preserved inscribed surface of the former. No comparison of the original treatment of inscribed surfaces is possible.

The thickness of *IG* $\Pi^2.1494$ is 0.105, i.e., about 0.015 thicker than 1493. Therefore it must belong to the lower part of the stele. The *vacat*, which is 0.025 wide and crosses the stone at right angles to the lines, indicates that it is the division between two columns. Only the left column can be even tentatively restored, but enough is preserved of the ends of the lines to show that the mason observed syllabic division.¹² The fact that the Treasurers and the Board in Charge of the Processional Vessels are mentioned here again, and in the nominative case, suggests that this part of the text belongs to a new entry. The fragment, therefore, probably belongs to the lower parts of Columns Π and III rather than to Columns I and Π .

$\Pi^2.1495$ is 0.10 thick, and its position on the stele relative to the other two fragments would, therefore, be below 1493 but not as far down as 1494. This text also, following a *vacat* of 0.012, begins a new category, the accounts of certain goldsmiths mentioned above. This fragment probably belongs to the third column. Neither margin is preserved, but the text can be restored on a basis of *stoich.* 20, although many of the lines have fewer letters, and two lines that end in numerals are longer by one letter-space. But as far as words are concerned the mason seems to have observed syllabic division.¹³

This consideration of the three fragments as parts of the same inscription does give a better idea of the overall appearance of the stele, but little help as far as the text of $\Pi^2.1493$ is concerned. The one bit of helpful information that can be gleaned from the preserved ends of lines in 1494 and from the restored lines of 1495

¹² A text of three columns is Kirchner's suggestion: "Qui sequuntur versus per columnas tres subiecti fuisse videtur." The preserved left-hand margin of $\Pi^2.1493$ is 0.025 wide to the centers of the first letters, and this corresponds with the space between the columns of 1494.

¹³ A. M. Woodward (*Num. Chron.* 1951, pages 109–11), in commenting on the numerals in *IG* $\Pi^2.1495$, has shown that it is impossible to find a number which occupied 9 spaces ending in \vdash and which, when added to 2713, could give a total that could be written in 6 spaces ending in \vdash . Therefore he has emended the offending lines, 18–19,

[καθαροῦ] παρ' Ἡρα[κλειοδώ]
[ρου . . .⁵ . . .] \vdash *vacat*

by moving the [ρου] to line 18 and restoring [X X [Ϟ Η Η Η Γ Ϟ] \vdash in line 19. But this would make line 18 three spaces longer than the maximum. It seems preferable, therefore, to suggest that the goldsmith's name was Heraclides. This would make line 11 short by 3 spaces, but this is common (cf. lines 9, 13), and in line 18 Ἡρα[κλειδου] would just fit. In any case both restorations conform to the principle of syllabic division.

is that syllabic division was observed and that the lines were not all of the same length. The application of this same principle of word-division to the text of 1493 removes the difficulty of restoring Demades' name and makes possible an almost complete restoration of lines 7–21, except for the amounts received.

The proposed new text of *IG* II².1493, lines 7–21, is as follows:

Stoich. 20

- 7 τάδε ἔχομεν χρήματα [χρυ]-
σών[ητ]α εἰς τὰς νίκ[ας καὶ]
τὰ π[ομ]πεῖα ν ἐπὶ τῇ $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Αἶα} \\ \text{Λεω} \end{array} \right] \nu$]-
- 10 τίδ[ος] πέμπτης πρυ[τανεί]-
ας [πά]ρ[α] ταμίον στ[ρατιω]-
[τ]ι[κῶν Δη]μάδους Π[αιανι]-
[ῶς: ? . .] Τ Τ Τ Τ vacat
[ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπ]ποθωντ[ίδος ἔκ]-
- 15 [της πρυτανείας παρὰ τὰ]-
[μίον στρα]τιωτ[ικῶν Δημά]-
[δους Παια]νιῶς: [- - -]
[ἐπὶ τῆς Κε]κροπιδ[ος ἑβδό]-
[μης πρυτ]ανείας π[αρὰ τὰ]-
- 20 [μίον στρατ]ιωτι[κῶν Δημά]-
[δους Παιανι]ῶς: [- - -]

COMMENTARY

7. Kirchner restored a *vacat* before [χρυ]-, but the fact that the mason observed syllabic division makes this no longer necessary. The adjective [χρυ]σών[ητ]α follows χρήματα directly. This line has 20 letters, but only because the initial tau is inscribed in the left-hand margin.

8. The raking hasta of the dotted alpha, observed by Koehler but ignored by Kirchner, is quite clear on the stone and on the squeeze in Princeton. The letter cannot possibly be a nu. For the verb, χρυσωνεῖν, “to buy or change for gold,” suggested by Bannier, *BPhW* 48 (1928) 783, see *LSJ*. I take lines 7–9 to mean: “We [received and] have on hand the following amounts exchanged for gold for the *Nikai* and the Processional Vessels.” Cf. note on line 13 below.

9. The prytanizing tribe of the fifth prytany was either Aeantis

or Leontis [Koe.]. The underlined letter in this line and those in line 11 were read by Koehler but are no longer legible.

11. This line, because of syllabic word-division, has only 19 letters; cf. also lines 12, 16 and 19. The length of line 19 was already noted by Kirchner.

12. The dotted mu is a very wide letter. The mu is the only letter which is consistently wider than all the others. The only other letter which is sometimes as wide is the eta.

13. The numerals do not preserve the *stoichêdon* order. By measuring distances between centers of the preserved T's it is possible to estimate that there is a space for 3 numerals in the lacuna after [ô̄s]. The minimum amount that can be restored in seven spaces ending in T T T T is 29 talents. A *vacat* and six letter-spaces would still yield 19 talents, a sizable sum. Nineteen talents of gold (which would be meant if we kept [χρῡ]σῶν) is an impossibly large amount. That would have been enough gold to gild eight and a half *Nikai*, according to the estimates of D. B. Thompson, *Hesperia* 13 (1944) 173–209.

14. The ἔκτης here and the ἐβδόμης in line 18 follow the suggestion of Koehler: "Probabile sane est secundam pensionem prytania sexta, tertiam prytania septima solutas esse." Further arguments in support of these ordinals are presented below in the eniautological appendix.

III

On the basis of this restoration we may conclude, with Beloch,¹⁴ that Demades did indeed take over the administration of the Military Fund in the summer of 334, in the archonship of Ctesicles.¹⁵ Presumably he was still holding the office in the spring

¹⁴ Cf. *Gr. Gesch.*² 4.1.52, note 2; and above, note 4.

¹⁵ *IG* II².1493 has been dated [ἐπὶ Κτησικλέους ἀρχοντος] on the basis of its relationship with II².333 and II².1496 (see above, note 10). II².333 can now be dated securely in the tenth prytany of Antiochis, the sixth of Scirophorion in the archonship of Euaenetus, 335/4 (on the basis of the prescript of an unpublished inscription, E.M. 13067; cf. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* [Berkeley 1961] 80). One of its measures (cf. 333 c, line 10) was the creation of a special board, οἱ εἰρημένοι ἐπὶ τὰς Νίκας καὶ τὰ πομπεῖα καὶ τὸν κόσμον κανηφορικόν (cf. [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 852B; 841A). Since II².1493 is a record of the money this board received, and the account begins in the fifth prytany, it is probable that the account began to be recorded only a few months after the creation of the Board, i.e., in the following year.

of 332/1, when the Spartans under King Agis rose against Antipater;¹⁶ at this time Demades, who was in control of the public moneys,¹⁷ was able to preserve Athenian neutrality by persuading the multitude to keep their funds for their own use and not to spend it on triremes for the Spartans. Since these two events are separated by some three years, and we know, furthermore, that the Military Treasurer could not be re-elected,¹⁸ we must assume that Demades' term was in excess of three years, therefore surely four—and that this was Aristotle's principal meaning when he said, "they (i.e., the Military Treasurer, Directors of the Theoric Fund and Superintendent of Wells)

This probability receives corroboration from $\pi^2.1496$, lines 68–151, which records the receipts from the sales of the hides of the sacrifices. This too, was a matter regulated by the resolution of the *Nomothetai* (333 c, line 23: ἀργύριον τὸ ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ γ[υγνόμενον]; cf. Harpocration, s.v. Δερματικόν), and therefore $\pi^2.1496$ stands in the same chronological relationship to $\pi^2.333$ as does $\pi^2.1493$. And since the account [ἐκ τοῦ δε]ρματικοῦ begins with the year 334/3, [ἐπὶ Κτησ]ικλέους ἄρ[χον]τος, it is fairly certain that the first entry of $\pi^2.1493$ must also belong to the same year. Finally it should be noted that the first recorded receipt ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ was from the celebration of the Dionysia in Piraeus, [ἐν Διο]νυσίων τῶν [ἐμ Πει]ρα[ιέ], a festival regularly celebrated in Posideon, which was the sixth month and for the most part coincident with the fifth prytany (cf. Meritt, *Athenian Year* 73, for the equation: Posideon vi 27 = Prytany v 31 = 175th day). As Koehler has pointed out, it can scarcely be accidental that both accounts began to be recorded from approximately the same date within the year, one in the fifth prytany and the other in the month of Posideon. The fact that they do begin at the same time definitely indicates that they were both subject to the same piece of regulatory legislation and that this legislation preceded the recording by only a short interval of time. Perhaps $\pi^2.333$ contained a proviso that the publishing of records should start with the fifth prytany of the next year, which was about to begin, but should thereafter be kept from the first prytany of each year for the next quadrennium—at least that is what was actually done; cf. $\pi^2.333$ c, line 17. It seems probable that accounts were to be run on an annual basis with a grand accounting at the end of the fourth year. This is in accord with what is known of the four-year term of the Administrator of the Revenue and with the terms of the other officers who rendered accounts ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια (see below, note 19).

¹⁶ For the date of Agis' uprising, cf. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*² 3.1. 646. The anecdote from Plut. *Præcepta* 818E (see next note) concerns the Pitcher Festival at Athens, which was regularly celebrated early in the spring.

¹⁷ Plut. *Præcepta* 818E: ὅτε τὰς προσόδους εἶχεν ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ τῆς πόλεως. This phrase, which is reminiscent of some of those that describe the activities of Lycurgus ([Plut.] *Vit. X. Or.* 825B: γενόμενος τῆς κοινῆς προσόδου ταμίης τῇ πόλει and Diod. 16.88.1: δώδεκα . . . ἔτη τὰς προσόδους τῆς πόλεως διοικήσας), probably does not mean that Demades actually controlled the whole revenue of the state, for the episode falls within the second quadrennium of Lycurgus' authority (not to say office) as Administrator of the Revenue. The question of what extraordinary, superior authority Lycurgus held must remain open; see B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 2–4, No. 3.

¹⁸ Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 62.3.

hold office from Panathenaea to Panathenaea.”¹⁹ Demades’ quadrennium, therefore, ran from Hecatombaeum 28, 334 to Hecatombaeum 28, 331.²⁰

Among the several duties which Aristotle says were standard procedure for a Military Treasurer,²¹ one can be related directly to Demades and π².1493. This is the joint concern which that officer had with the *boulê* “in the making of the *Nikai* and the Panathenaic prizes,”²² and which the *boulê*, in turn, had with the Treasurers of Athena (who took over their custody of the *Nikai* and other sacred objects under the supervision of the *boulê*).²³ These statements of Aristotle, taken in conjunction with the text of π².1493, suggest that Demades had far more to do with the restoration of the *Nikai* than simply turning over to the Treasurers of Athena certain amounts of gold which he had purchased at the end of each prytany from the surpluses of the Military Fund.²⁴

¹⁹ *Ath. Pol.* 43.1: τὰς δ’ ἄρχας τὰς περὶ τὴν ἐγκύκλιον διοίκησιν ἀπάσας ποιοῦσι κληρωτάς, πλὴν ταμίον στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν θεωρικῶν καὶ τοῦ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητοῦ· ταύτας δὲ χειροτονοῦσιν, καὶ οἱ χειροτονηθέντες ἄρχουσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια. “All the officers who have to do with the annual administration are selected by lot, except the Military Treasurer, the Directors of the Theoric Fund and the Superintendent of Wells. These they elect by show of hands, and those who are elected hold office from Great Panathenaea to Great Panathenaea.” This translation takes into account Aristotle’s apparent differentiation between those officers who were selected by lot and those who were elected by show of hands, between those who had to do with the annual administration and those who served for another, longer period of time, a quadrennium.

Ferguson (*Hellenistic Athens* 474–75) and others (cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatsk.* 1055, note 3), oppose this interpretation. J. A. Davison (*JHS* 78 [1958] 29–33, esp. 31) has recently re-examined the meaning of the phrase ἐκ Π. εἰς Π. and believes that (page 23): “Even in official documents Παναθήναια can be used alone; but this usage is not so ambiguous as it appears, since... I have not found a single case in which Παναθήναια alone necessarily, or even probably, refers to anything but the great Panathenaea.” Although Davison is, I believe, quite correct so far as he goes, the problem deserves a fuller treatment than he has attempted.

²⁰ Ferguson (*loc. cit.*, note 19) is right in so far as “from Panathenaea to Panathenaea” also means that the Treasurers (and incidentally other officers as well) held office on the basis of a fiscal rather than a civil year. Cf. U. Kahrstedt, *Magistratur in Athen* (Stuttgart 1936) 80–81, and B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1928) 16–19, 95.

²¹ *Ath. Pol.* 47.2: The *polêtai* sell the mining and tax rights μετὰ τοῦ ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικὸν ἡρημένων ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς.

²² *Ath. Pol.* 49.3: καὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν Νικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄθλων εἰς τὰ Παναθήναια συνεπιμελεῖται <sc. ἡ βουλὴ> μετὰ τοῦ ταμίου τῶν στρατιωτικῶν.

²³ *Ath. Pol.* 47.1: οἱ ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς . . . παραλαμβάνουσι τό τε ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τὰς Νίκας καὶ τὸν ἄλλον κόσμον καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς.

²⁴ Another case in which Demades’ responsibilities went beyond the simple disbursement of funds appears in *IG* vii.4252, lines 22–25: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον τὸ εἰς τὸν

He shared with the *boulê* and with the specially created Board the responsibility for seeing that the statues were made (or that the old ones were restored, which seems to have been the case).²⁵ It seems somewhat ironic that only Lycurgus should finally have received any credit (thanks to the honorary decree which Stratocles moved in 307/6, many years after these events)²⁶ for a job which actually had been executed by so many men, not least of whom was Demades.²⁷

στέφανον δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν, καὶ παραδοῦναι τὸν στέφανον ποησάμενον τοῖς ἐπιμεληταῖς ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. This is from a decree of 332/1, the archonship of Nicetes, which ordered a golden crown of 1000 drachmae for Amphiarus. This falls within the tenure of Demades, and therefore he must have been the disbursing officer. That this non-military expenditure was ordered paid from the Military Fund has long been noted, but the important thing to note at this point is that the Treasurer himself had more to do than sign the requisition. He is not ordered to pay the *epimelêtai* one thousand drachmae, but rather to turn over to them a finished crown of that value which he has had made. For this use of ποιέω in the middle voice, cf. LSJ and Dem. 21.16: στεφάνους οὗς ἐποίησάμην τῷ χορῷ. Another example of non-military expense is found in IG II².1672, line 40; Demades' successor, in 329/8, paid out funds for the *peribolos* of the Eleusinian sanctuary, and, although the Treasurer himself did not have to supervise the work, it should be noted that this was one of Lycurgus' projects and that Lycurgus himself was taking part in the management, not just at the top (cf. lines 300–3, where he moves decrees both in the *boulê* and in the *ekklêsia*) but in every-day routine matters such as giving a builder two months' pay in advance (cf. lines 11–12; *pace* Kahrstedt, *Magistratur* 12).

²⁵ For a running account of the *Nikai* from beginning to end, a description of the kind of work involved and how it was done, and an estimate of how much each statue cost, see H. A. Thompson, *HSCP*, Suppl. I, pages 183–210 and D. B. Thompson, *Hesperia* 13 (1944) 173–209.

²⁶ Cf. IG II².457 (see above, note 9). Lycurgus was responsible only for the resolution of the *Nomothetai* which created the Board in Charge of the *Nikai* and Processional Vessels; he was not himself the chairman of that Board nor was he a Treasurer of Athena in 334/3 (cf. Kirchner, IG II².1493, note). This fact tends to weaken the theory that Lycurgus' authority and influence came from his membership on, or chairmanship of, the many boards that were carrying out the several aspects of his program (cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatsk.* 1147, note 4 with reference to A. Böckh, *Staatsh.* 1³ [1886] 514–15). Except for some personal participation in the building program (see above, note 24) he seems to have acted mainly in his capacity as Administrator of the Revenue (or of some other high office) which gave him the right to make proposals in the *boulê* (i.e., πρόσσδος εἰς τὴν βουλὴν). He owed his influence less to his being able to pull strings through legally constituted minor offices than to his rare personal integrity which inspired the people's trust. As Ferguson has already observed (*Treasurers of Athena* 139, note 2) Lycurgus' extraordinary power rested largely on πίστις (cf. [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 841b–c: πιστευσάμενος τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν χρημάτων; and 852b: πολλὰ δὲ <χρήματα> τῶν ἰδιωτῶν διὰ πίστεως λαβὼν καὶ παραδανείσας . . .). The same had been true of Eubulus' influence; cf. Aeschin. 3.25; Plut. *Præcepta* 812f.

²⁷ In addition to the Military Treasurer there were ten treasurers of Athena, ten members of the Board in Charge of the *Nikai*, Processional Vessels and Canephoric Ornament, and the members of the *boulê*.

It has been generally assumed²⁸ that the Board in Charge of the *Nikai* and Processional Vessels, with whom Demades served, also held office for the quadrennium 334/3 to 331/0. If this is true, their terms were concurrent, and this would also hold for the *Athlothetai* who managed the Panathenaea of 331/0 after serving four years. It may be suggested that, since the Military Treasurer was associated with the *boulê* in the matter of the Panathenaic *athla* (see above, note 22) and the *Athlothetai* co-operated with the *boulê* in the making of the prize-amphorae,²⁹ the Military Treasurer and the *Athlothetai* must also have worked together, and for the whole quadrennium.

The date at which the office of Military Treasurer became quadrennial (if it was not so from the beginning)³⁰ is open to question. Demades may have been the first to hold the office for this length of time, but another possible candidate is Lycurgus' brother-in-law, Callias of Bate, son of Habron.³¹ Ps.-Plutarch's expression, *ταμιεύσας στρατιωτικῶν ἐπὶ Χαιρώνδου ἄρχοντος* (338/7), does not in itself suggest other than a one-year term. On the other hand, *ταμιεύσας* may be the misunderstanding of a later age, caused by the fact that after 307/6 the Treasurership was an annual office; it may stand for an original expression that meant Callias *began* his office when Chaerondas was archon. Be that as it may, one should especially note that Chaerondas' year marked the beginning of the Panathenaic *pentetêris* 338/7 to 335/4, which immediately preceded Demades' four-year term, that this was also Lycurgus' first quadrennium as Administrator of the Revenue, and that Callias' election coincided with, if it was not caused by, his brother-in-law's rise to power. When Lycurgus

²⁸ Cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatsk* 1057, note 1. Dittenberger (*SIG*² 620; also see Kirchner's note on $\pi^2.333$) has suggested that the Board in Charge of *Nikai* and Processional Vessels was elected for a term of four years. The resolution of the *Nomothetai* ($\pi^2.333$) which created the Board also provided that it furnish κόσμον [ἐκάστου τοῦ] ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐν τῇ τετραετίᾳ (lines 16–17) for Dionysus. Just below this (in line 23) another provision mentions the money ἐκ τοῦ δερματικοῦ, and we are reasonably sure from $\pi^2.1496$ (see above, note 15) that the accounts of this fund were kept on a quadrennial as well as an annual basis. Any board in charge of activities which are to extend over a four-year period might be expected to hold office for the whole quadrennium.

²⁹ *Ath. Pol.* 60.1.

³⁰ Cf. Ernst Meyer, *RE*, 2^{te} Reihe, 4 (1931) 264–65. The office of Military Treasurer is attested for 344/3 (*IG* $\pi^2.1443$, lines 12–13); the Fund itself existed earlier still (cf. *IG* $\pi^2.207$ c).

³¹ [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 843A.

took the helm in 338,³² the resumption of war with Macedon had already caused a decline in the authority of Eubulus, who had exercised his control of the public administration mainly through the Directors of the Theoric Fund.³³ Three things—the decline of the old, established party; the automatic shift of economic weight from the Theoric to the Military Fund, which had been caused by the outbreak of war;³⁴ and finally the election of a special new Administrator of the Revenue with unprecedented authority and tenure—combine to suggest that 338 was a likely time for other organizational changes, especially those that might have been helpful to, or even suggested by, Lycurgus.

Another possible time for such a change would have been during Lycurgus' first quadrennium, when it is assumed that many existing offices and institutions were reformed and reorganized.³⁵ To mention just a few, there was the law of Epicrates (*ca.* 336/5) which thoroughly reorganized the *ephêbia*,³⁶ Lycurgus' law of 335/4 which regulated the various cults and their finances, and the law of Hegemon (336/5) which formally relieved the Directors of the Theoric Fund of many of their duties and

³² This is the commonly accepted date for the beginning of Lycurgus' twelve years at the head of the financial administration, based on the text of [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 841b–c. There is no reason to suppose that he did not hold office, whichever one he held, for four-year periods from "Panathenaea to Panathenaea" just as other financial officers did, or that his overall administration did not extend from 338/7 to 327/6. But cf. J. J. Buchanan, *Theorika* (Locust Valley [New York] 1962) 74–77, for the suggestion that Lycurgus held office for twelve years from 337/6 to 326/5.

³³ Cf. W. Schwahn, *RE*, 2^{te} Reihe, 5 (1934) 2236–37 and above, note 17.

³⁴ It is assumed that, after the peace of Philocrates, the state surpluses were again funneled into the Theoric Fund. This was not the case after the peace of Demades. The shock of Chaeronea had been too great. The Fund remained a shadow. Demosthenes, who served as a director after the peace, paid for sacrifices out of his own pocket (*Dem.* 18.113); and we have already found the Military Treasurer prepared to pay stipends for the celebration of the Pitcher Festival. It seems likely that Lycurgus' program of national recovery precluded a complete return to a peace-time basis. There must have remained, if not on the books, at least in the air, much of Demosthenes' emergency decree (*FGH* 328, F 56): τὰ δὲ χρήματα ἐψηφίσαντο πάντ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά, Δημοσθένους γράψαντος. There is nothing to support Ferguson's view (*Hellenistic Athens* 10) that the Theoric Fund's "vital connexion with all receipts and outlays speedily regained for it the chief control."

³⁵ Cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* 471–76; Glotz–Cohen, *Hist. grecque* 199–205.

³⁶ After his destruction of Thebes, Alexander may have had in mind to quash this program of military training when he demanded that the Athenians hand over Lycurgus. He allowed Demades, nevertheless, to go bail for the other democratic leaders; and perhaps Phocion was able to bring the king around to his own point of view, viz., that no such training would make the young men better able or more willing to hold their ranks in battle (cf. Plut. *Phoc.* 23.2).

powers.³⁷ It is, of course, no more than a suggestion, but perhaps the divestiture of the Theoric Board was not this last law's sole aim; as a corollary it may have sought to concentrate into a single office the administration of such financial matters as the collection and disbursement of funds. This central office could be administered most efficiently by a single *tamias*, and it may have been thought proper, since he was second only to Lycurgus, that he should hold office for a like term (see above, note 17).

IV

Lycurgus probably already knew, when he moved the adoption of the resolution of the *Nomothetai* in the last month of 335/4³⁸ (and of his own first quadrennium), that Demades was about to succeed to what was to become one of the key offices in the

³⁷ Cf. *Aeschin.* 3.25, for a catalogue of things controlled by the Directors of the Theoric Fund "before the law of Hegemon"; Schwahn, *RE*, 2^o Reihe, 5 (1934) 2236-37. Buchanan (*Theorika* 72) finds it "difficult to surmise any political motivation behind Hegemon's law other than an intended slap at Demosthenes" who was, at the time the law was passed, one of the directors of the Theoric Fund.

There is no need to seek any other motivation behind Hegemon's law than that it was a straightforward attempt to streamline the financial administration in recognition of the fact that the Theoric Board, which had functioned well enough under the guidance of Eubulus in the years before Chaeronea, was now, after that disaster and under the direction of Lycurgus, no longer an efficient body for the administration of the state's revenues (see above, note 33).

From what can be gleaned from the epigraphical evidence concerning the law itself, we can say definitely that the office of the *antigraphes* was recreated (see Buchanan 73) and that the Superintendents of the Shipyards, who under Eubulus answered to the Theoric Board, now were responsible directly to the *boulê* (cf. *IG* II².1628, lines 296-301). Far from being a punitive measure against Demosthenes, it was a financial law which remained operative at least until 326/5 and probably until the oligarchic reorganization in 321. There is no reason to believe that Demosthenes was against the law in any way. Buchanan all but admits as much when he says (page 74) that "the alterations in Athenian fiscal policy wrought by Lykurgos . . . may, incidentally, have contributed to the diminution of the *theorikon*'s importance," and (page 78) "Lykurgos' administration . . . gave a new direction to Athenian finance, one which played down the importance of the *theorika*." I maintain that Lycurgus' policy (and therefore Demosthenes', too) merely continued a "diminution" which was already under way and that the main point of Hegemon's law was to introduce the reorganization of the administration which the eclipse of the Theoric Fund had made necessary. There was nothing in it that would have failed to win the support of Lycurgus and Demosthenes.

³⁸ Cf. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* 80: *IG* II².333, line 12: [Ἐπὶ Ἐδαιέτου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιوخίδος δεκάτης Σκιροφορ[ιώνος ἐκ]τῆι ἱσταμένον· κτλ. Meritt has restored six letters [Ἀντιοχ] where the Corpus indicates a lacuna of five letters. To preserve the suggested *stipich*. 82 of the Corpus, one might restore [Ἐπ' Ἐδαιέτου κτλ.].

administration of that law. It was soon found that, although their ultimate motives may have been different, they agreed on actions—so much so that Hyperides and his partisans would have had difficulty in telling them apart. For while Demades may have hoped that there would never be an open, armed breach of the peace with Macedon, and while Lycurgus was almost openly preparing for just such a conflict at some advantageous time in the future, they were both nevertheless dedicated to keeping the peace in the years 334–330 at least.

A practical example of how Demades' specific activities as Military Treasurer dove-tailed with the general policy of Lycurgus can be seen even in the scant evidence we have from the text of π^2 .1493. Lycurgus had created a Board for the restoration of the *Nikai*; and it is assumed that, in addition to his religious motive, he had in mind the accumulation of wealth against a national emergency, much as Pericles had done (see above, note 8). But an immediate concern was to keep the Athenians from squandering the funds on themselves as fast as they were accumulated, or worse, from using them in some ill-advised, ill-timed action against Macedon. The restoration of the *Nikai* (with two talents in gold apiece) and the making of new sacred vessels for the processions and sanctuaries would remove the wealth from a fund or treasury, from which it could be too easily spent at the whim of any assembly, and yet have it available in a form that could be used in a crisis. With such a general policy Demades was surely in agreement; he feared the rabble-rousers as much as did Lycurgus. Therefore he converted the surpluses of the Military Fund into gold and turned it over to the Treasurers of Athena and the Board in charge of the *Nikai κατὰ ἐκάστην πρυτανείαν* and did not allow large amounts to accumulate in the Fund itself. It is presumed that he ordinarily kept on hand only the minimum that would be necessary for a particular prytany.

V

On the basis of the foregoing argument one may conclude that the reconciliation between Lycurgus and Demades, which has already been suggested for the year 330, when they went together as *hieropoioi* to Delphi,³⁹ should be dated some four years earlier.

³⁹ Cf. Tarn, *CAH* 6 (1927) 448. Demades and Lycurgus served together not only as *hieropoioi* on the sacred embassy to Delphi for the dedication of the new temple in

It has also been suggested in this paper that Demades served in the internal administration of the state as an elected officer in a manner which was altogether in harmony with Lycurgus' program of reform, reconstruction and revitalization (at least so long as the program remained outwardly peaceful). The proposed restoration of *IG* II².1493 shows that Demades was the Military Treasurer in 334/3. This evidence, when taken in conjunction with what is otherwise known of Demades' activities as a financial officer, suggests that he held office for four years, or, as Aristotle says, "from Panathenaea to Panathenaea."

VI. AN ENIAUTOLOGICAL APPENDIX

The proposed restoration of *IG* II².1493 offers some new information about the prytanizing tribes of 334/3. Koehler had already noted that the fifth was either Aeantis or Leontis. The ninth was known to be Acamantis from *IG* II².335 as restored by Schweigert.⁴⁰ Therefore, only *ἔκτης*, *ἑβδόμης* and *ογδόης* are possible in lines 14 and 18 of II².1493. Of these, *ογδόης* can be immediately eliminated—it would be out of order in line 14 and will not fit in line 18 if one observes syllabic word-division. It seems absolutely certain, then, that Hippothontis held the sixth prytany and Cecropis the seventh, and that payments were made consecutively in the fifth, sixth and seventh prytanies. It is probable that payments were also made in the eighth, ninth and tenth.

All this would be very fine if it were not for the first two lines of *IG* II².336, which read:

[*Ἐπὶ Κτησυκλέους ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς*]
[*Ἰπποθωντίδος τετάρτης πρυτανείας*]

The archonship is certain, based on the secretary, Mnesiphilus of Phaleron (line 3), and the *τετάρτης* is sure, based on the equation Maemacterium [11] = Prytany [IV] 2[1] = 129th day.⁴¹ But clearly either *Ἰπποθωντίδος* is wrong and must be changed, or

330 (cf. *SIG*³ 296), but also in the following year (329/8) as *epimelētai* of the games in honor of Amphiaras at Oropus (cf. *IG* VII.4252 = *SIG*³ 298). In his eagerness to make the reconciliation seem as complete as possible, Tarn declares that the decree which honored the *epimelētai* of the games was moved by Demosthenes. This is true enough, but it was Demosthenes of Lamptrae, son of Democles (*PA* 3593).

⁴⁰ E. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 339–40.

⁴¹ Cf. Meritt, *Athenian Year* 82.

the argument of the present paper, based as it is largely on the supposedly close chronological relationship between the two accounts (II².1493 and 1496) to the Lycurgan law (II².333), would be seriously weakened; either II².1493 does not belong to the year of Ctesicles or Hippothontis does not belong with the fourth prytany.

The *Ἱπποθωντίδος* was restored in the heading by Schöll,⁴² relying evidently on the statement of Reusch:⁴³ "Prytania functa est Hippothontis, quod apparet ex v. 21." Reusch reasoned that a prytanizing tribe in the act of drawing up a *pséphisma* for presentation to the *ekklésia* could not possibly know the identity of the tribe which would follow them in office. Therefore, since Hippothontis is designated in line 21 as the tribe which would be prytanizing at the time of the next meeting of the *ekklésia*, Hippothontis must be the tribe responsible for drawing up the motion in the first place, and they must be referring to themselves.

This is altogether reasonable, but a look at line 21 reveals that the restoration [τῆς Ἱπποθωντίδος] has little to recommend it except its length:

- 20 [τοὺς δὲ π]-
 21 [ρ]υτάνε[ις τῆς Ἱπποθωντίδος δοῦναι πε]-
 22 [ρ]ὶ αὐ[τοῦ τὴν ψῆφον κτλ.]

Prof. Meritt referred me to II².103, lines 33-35, for a more appropriate formula:

- 33 [τὸ]-
 34 [ς δὲ πρυτάνε]ις [τὸ]ς [τῆ]ς [Ἐρεχθείδος δοῦ]-
 35 [ναι τὴν ψῆφον κτλ.]

On this basis one may with some confidence suggest a new reading for line 21 of II².336:

[ρ]υτάνε[ις τοὺς τῆς .ἰ.ηίδος δοῦναι πε]-

and for line 2:

[.ἰ.ηίδος τετάρτης πρυτάνειας]

⁴² Cf. Schöll, *Sitzungsber. Bayer. Akad.*, 1886, page 123, note 2, which was not available to me.

⁴³ Adam Reusch, *De diebus contionum ordinariorum apud Athenienses* (Diss. Strassburg, 1879) 12.

The length of the first two lines in the old heading was respectively 28 and 30 letters; with the suggested change it would be 28 and 26.

We may summarize what we know of the prytanizing tribes of Ctesicles' archonship as follows:

IV	Aegeis or Oeneis
V	Aeantis or Leontis
VI	Hippothontis
VII	Cecropis
VIII	
IX	Acamantis