

DOUGLAS KELLY

CHARIDEMOS'S CITIZENSHIP: THE PROBLEM OF *IG* ii² 207

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 96–109

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CHARIDEMOS'S CITIZENSHIP: THE PROBLEM OF *IG ii² 207*

Coming originally from the small foreign state of Oreos and from a background that invited, if it did not justify, stigmatizing as low and disreputable, Charidemos went on to become not only an Athenian citizen but also a *strategos* of note and a solid member of Athenian élite. The career of this outsider and adventurer is, like the careers of other Athenian military men of the time, revealing about the conditions for success in Athenian politics. Yet the basis for Charidemos's brilliant career, the gift of Athenian citizenship, has been variously dated and this must be set in its proper context for Charidemos's achievements, such as they were, to be appreciated. Since this controversy turns largely upon the problem of interpreting *IG ii² 207*, this paper pursues some of the questions about how historians may use even intractable epigraphic data, a pursuit in which the work of H.B. Mattingly will offer stimulus and example.

The circumstances in which Charidemos acquired Athenian citizenship have been reconstructed from two disparate kinds of evidence: first *IG ii² 207*, and second, Demosthenes 23 *Against Aristokrates*. *IG ii² 207* is a cluster of four pieces that yield two decrees: the first (a) concerns honours for one Orontes and *symbola*; the remaining three (b)-(d) a deal in which Athens is buying grain from an Orontes and three Athenian *strategoí*, Chares, Charidemos and Phokion, are acting for Athens. Piece (a), dealing with Orontes's honours and *symbola*, is known only from a copy made in 1820 by Pittakys. That his text was driven out of circulation by the inferior version of Rangabé, who had nothing to go on but Pittakys's published facsimile, is an interesting minor passage in the history of epigraphy. Justice has since been done to Pittakys, in this matter at least, by M.J. Osborne's masterly reediting of *IG ii² 207* (a) in accordance with Pittakys's facsimile,¹ the only available source of evidence. In line 12 there is, in Pittakys's reading, a reference to the archon of 341/0 BC (ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος), but this dating has been rejected. Pieces (b)-(d) of *IG ii² 207* are grouped together as part of the one decree, best regarded as

¹ M.J. Osborne, 'Athens and Orontes', *BSA* 66 (1971) pp.297-321 (with Pittakys's facsimile on p.300); *Naturalization in Athens* (hereafter *NA*) i (Brussels: 1981) pp.52-54.

separate from that in (a),² but this decree gives no explicit indication of the year to which it belongs and so is dated by association with (a).

Demosthenes's *Against Aristokrates*, securely dated to 352/1 BC,³ is a speech written for Euthykles who brought an action of *graphe paranomon* against Aristokrates's proposal that any person who killed Charidemos should be extradited from allied territory and brought to Athens for trial. The context for this proposal, which was conceived of as an honour, was the request of Kersobleptes (ruler of eastern Thrace c.360-c.342) that the Athenians elect as *strategos* for a new war against Amphipolis his brother-in-law and in-house mercenary commander, Charidemos.

The question of when and why Charidemos received Athenian citizenship needs to be directed not only at the lawcourt invective of *Against Aristokrates* but also it is involved in the problems thrown up by *IG ii² 207*, which extend from Pittakys's alleged misreading of the crucial archon name in line 12 of (a) to the chequered career of Orontes, the traitor who double-crossed his colleagues in the Cyprian War of the 380s and resurfaced in the Satraps' Revolt of the late 360s as first a leader and then, reverting to character, as traitor and poltroon.

In the pioneering days of Athenian prosopography, J. Kirchner placed Charidemos's acquisition of Athenian citizenship in 364-362, making it the reward for mercenary service in the war against Amphipolis under Timotheos's command.⁴ H.W. Parke modified this: Demosthenes (141) plainly links Charidemos's citizenship with the Athenians' relationship with Kersobleptes (reigned c.360-342) and in particular with Kersobleptes's cession of the Thracian Chersonese to Athens. This invaluable gift of good farmland for settlement came as a welcome change in 357 from a string of frustrations and failures in Athenian efforts to reestablish their power in the Hellespontine and Thraceward region. Charidemos thus became an Athenian around 357.⁵

² Osborne, *NA ii* (Brussels: 1982) pp.61-63.

³ Dion. Hal. *ad Amm.* 1.4 (352/1). A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*² (hereafter *DZ*) i (Leipzig: 1885) pp.440-445, placed the speech soon after midsummer, 352. References to Demosthenes 23 *Against Aristokrates* in the text will be given simply by numbers in brackets.

⁴ J. Kirchner, *RE iii.2* (1899) col.2135; *PA* 15380, p.424; cf. Schäfer, *DZ* i p.419.

⁵ H. W. Parke, 'When was Charidemus made an Athenian citizen?', *CR* 42 (1928) p.170, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (Oxford: 1933) pp.125-132 and 146. Parke's dating has been accepted by J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 BC* (Oxford: 1971) pp.570-572, q.v. for details of Charidemos and his three sons' membership of the liturgical class.

This conclusion has not been left unchallenged. In a notable series of studies that deal with Orontes and form part of the sub-structure of his comprehensive treatment of Athenian citizenship-decrees, M.J. Osborne has sought to place Charidemos's citizenship back to c.361 or even, on second thoughts, as far back as c.364/3.⁶ In Osborne's view Charidemos did not obtain his citizenship as a *quid pro quo* for services rendered but in one of a number of bad Athenian gambles in conferring honours on dynasts and their retainers in the north in the hope that these could be induced to bestow favours on Athens.⁷ There is nothing that attests that Charidemos's citizenship fell into this class, but Osborne rejects evidence for the later dating (to c.357), and argues in favour of his own reconstruction, which has a number of ramifications for matters relating to Athens, Charidemos and Orontes.

The keystone in the argument is *IG ii²207* (a) line 12. Pittakys, our only witness with any right to be heard, read the crucial part of this line as:

[τοὺς θε]σμοθέτας τοὺς ἐπὶ Νικομάχου ἄρχοντος

Rangabé later changed this, on what basis it is not known, from the archon of 341/40 (Nikomakhos) to the archon of 349/8, thus:

ἐπὶ Κα(λλι)μάχου.

This was a reading that Rangabé produced from what he believed to be the original: ENIKAMMAXOY. Osborne has shown Rangabé's reading to be baseless and thereby rejected interpretations that place *IG ii² 207* (a), the decree honouring Orontes, in 349/8. He has not accepted Pittakys's reading of the name of Nikomakhos, archon of 341/0, finding this unacceptable for a variety of reasons.⁸ His reasoning must now be reviewed.

In *IG ii² 207* (b)-(d) Charidemos is unequivocally an Athenian *strategos* and therefore (which needs no proving) an Athenian citizen (lines 12, 14 and 21). Only in that capacity

⁶ M.J. Osborne, 'Athens and Orontes', *BSA* (1971) pp.297-321; 'Orontes', *Historia* 22 (1973) pp.515-551; 'The Satrapy of Mysia', *Grazer Beiträge* 3 (1975) pp.291-309; *NA ii* pp.65-80 and iii (Brussels: 1983) pp.56-58 (where to the *testimonia* on Charidemos's citizenship, pp.56-57, add Arist. *Rhet.* 1399b 1-4, which cites Theodektes). See also n.19 below on other important evidence.

⁷ For the grants which Osborne regards as being of this speculative type see *NA iii Testimonia* 36, 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 65, 66, together with iv pp.188-189. In the case of Charidemos (T51) Osborne is thus able to place the award of citizenship c.364, before Charidemos himself could have done anything to deserve it; cf Osborne, *NA iv* pp.190-191.

⁸ Osborne, *BSA* 66 (1971) pp.313-321. Older views of the dating of *IG ii² 207* (either to 350/49 or 361/0) were reviewed by W. Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien* (Marburg: 1892) pp.213-219, who himself proposed 353/2, without discussing the problem of the archon's name. See also H. Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*² ii (Munich: 1975) no.324; H.-J. Gehrke, *Phokion (Zetemata* 64; Munich: 1976) p.35 n.50, on attempts to date *IG ii² 270* to 349/8.

could Charidemos be listed along with, and in between, the two Athenian *strategoí* Chares and Phokion and also in company with the *strategos* Proxenos (line 23). This text deals with *symbola* that Orontes is to use in his dealings with Athens and with the purchase of grain for an expeditionary force under the command of Chares, Charidemos and Phokion. The grain is to be paid for with the proceeds of *syntaxeis* from Lesbos (lines 13-15). In Osborne's highly probable view, this decree in (b)-(d) comes a very short time after that in (a), which deals with honours for Orontes as well as *symbola*. In these transactions attested in (b)-(d) Charidemos is already an Athenian. Osborne regards the party on the other side, Orontes, as the Orontes well-known to fame, notorious for his part in the Cyprian war and in the Satraps' Revolt.⁹ In pages not to be neglected by connoisseurs of academic polemic Osborne has upheld his faith in Diodorus Siculus's mention of Orontes as satrap of Mysia (15.90.3: Ὀρόντης μὲν τῆς Μυσίας σατράπης), which he takes to mean in fact a hyparchy or subordinate post in the satrapy of Daskyleion in north-west Asia Minor. Osborne defends very strongly Diodorus's accuracy, or what for Diodorus must amount to accuracy, in this particular phrase,¹⁰ and may be thought to have the advantage over S. Hornblower with his advocacy of Pompeius Trogus *Prologus* 10: deinde in Syria praefectum Armeniae Orontem¹¹ – if (and it is a big if) either author is referring to the same Persian grandee. Yet the text of Diodorus 15.90-91 on the Satraps' Revolt is defective and lacunose in other respects which Osborne does not defend and there is other evidence of a higher order that demands at least a fraction of the intensive attention that Osborne has bestowed on Diodorus while withholding it from so extensive and informative a text as *Against Aristokrates*.

Since Osborne believes the Orontes of *IG ii² 207* and of Diodorus 15.90-91 to be one and the same person and so engaged in a grain deal with Athens (a banal change from the more colourful activities for which he was noted) he must date *IG ii² 207* to the 360s: hence his earlier suggestion that in (a) line 12 we should read ἐπὶ Νικο(φήμ)ου, the archon of 361/0, whose name at least has a syllable or two in common with what Pittakys read, or else, Osborne's later suggestion, ἐπὶ Τιμοκράτου, the archon of 364/3.¹² Now in the absence of the stone that Pittakys transcribed, Osborne's rewriting of the archon's name in

⁹ The sources on Orontes are conveniently collected in Osborne, *NA ii* pp.63-65.

¹⁰ Osborne, *NA ii* pp.66-72.

¹¹ S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford: 1982) pp.176-179, who did not deal with the problems of *IG ii² 207*.

¹² Osborne, *BSA* 66 (1971) pp.318-319; *NA i* p.54 (361/0); *NA ii* pp.75-76 with n.260 (ruling out the archons of 365/4 and 362/1 and so settling on 364/3).

line 12 must rest not on epigraphic observation but on the validity of his historical hypotheses. If these are persuasive, then his reading of *IG* ii² 207 (a) line 12 may be taken as a plausible conjecture as to what was on the stone, though in the absence of positive evidence his reading can claim no more than the status of a conjecture that commends itself, which is not to be despised: the *apparatus critici* of our literary texts give us enough of these. To Osborne's historical reasoning we must now turn. Not all problems relating to Orontes and the Satraps' Revolt can be dealt with here but only those that bear upon Charidemos's citizenship. In this regard, it will be argued, Osborne's case cannot carry conviction. His elaborate reconstruction of Orontes's career has gone on its way without the necessary scrutiny of his dating of Charidemos's citizenship to c.364, although this is part of the interlocking hypotheses he has built up around Orontes.

First, in his effort to reconstruct a plausible career for Orontes that has him die unobtrusively after his inglorious part in the Satraps' Revolt, Osborne wishes to dismiss the evidence of Demosthenes 14 (*On The Symmories*) 31, where in this speech, delivered in 354/3, Demosthenes refers to the possibility of the Great King raising an army of Greek mercenaries for use against Egypt, Orontes or other rebels in his empire:

“It may be that many of the Hellenes would be glad to serve under him against Egypt, against Orontas, or against certain other foreign powers”.

(tr. A.W. Pickard-Cambridge)

Osborne claims that Demosthenes is here giving a hypothetical example based on well-known cases in the past of such recruiting by the King,¹³ but Demosthenes is here making observations about what might be expected to happen in the present. That is the force of his present tenses and his potential optative (for which ἂν ἐθέλησαι stands): there is no way that these words can refer to the past. An Orontes in rebellion c.354/3 is troublesome admittedly for Osborne's reconstruction but only because he wishes to refer all the evidence to the one and the same Orontes, who would be too old (and one might think, too untrustworthy) for a second rebellion about this time. Osborne's way out of the difficulty here might have been allowing a plurality of men called Orontes rather than attempting to make this text of Demosthenes refer to the past when it refers to the present.

Since Osborne's dating of *IG* ii² 207 requires him to have Charidemos as an Athenian citizen by 364/3 he had also to get around the difficulties of Demosthenes 23, *Against Aristokrates*, the main quarry for evidence on Charidemos's early career. In this lengthy and

¹³ Osborne, *BSA* 66 (1971) pp.316-317 with n. 126; *Historia* 22 (1973) pp.544-547.

robustly argued speech Demosthenes repeatedly insists that Charidemos had been working hand-in-glove with Kersobleptes since Kotys's death in c.360 (163-183; cf. 8-17, 129-137, 191). Kersobleptes is made out to be as fickle and villainous as his minister Charidemos, the one as undeserving of trust as the other is of honours. On two occasions Demosthenes links Charidemos's gift of citizenship with Kersobleptes (141, 203). In the second of these passages Charidemos and the unspeakable Euderkes¹⁴ make up the climax of a list of gifts of citizenship that have recently debased the award by their indiscriminate frequency (203). Osborne's procedure is to ignore this passage. In contrast, he attempts to tease out of the first (141) indications that Charidemos obtained his citizenship thanks to Kotys, who died c.360, assuming that Demosthenes knew this but somehow did his best, or almost, not to say it.¹⁵

To reject the "absolutely literal interpretation" of this section Osborne invokes his hypothesis that Charidemos's citizenship was another piece of Athenian political speculation, in this case cultivating Kotys in about c.364 by honouring the friend of his son Kersobleptes. That Kersobleptes's own gift of citizenship is set c.360¹⁶ is not felt to pose any difficulty and, despite Osborne's contention, awarding citizenship to king Sitalkes's son Sadokos in 431 is not a "close parallel" to the alleged award c.364 to Charidemos, a foreigner friendly with Kotys's son. To support further his linking of Charidemos's citizenship with Kotys and so place it c.364, where his dating of *IG* ii² 207 requires it, Osborne finds that "by Demosthenes's own admission" Charidemos had been on close terms with Kotys and that, with Kotys dead and gone in 352, Demosthenes in a speech written in that year chose to link Charidemos's citizenship with the Athenians' current preoccupation, Kersobleptes. Lastly, Demosthenes's warning that Charidemos, who owes his citizenship to Kersobleptes, will turn out to be as bad as did Philiskos, who owed his to Ariobarzanes (141-143), is held by Osborne to be owing to Demosthenes's need to equate the two, Charidemos and Philiskos, and so is not evidence for dating Charidemos's citizenship c.357.¹⁷

¹⁴ Osborne, *NA* iii p.60, puts Euderkes's grant "ca.360", inconsistently with his dating of that of Charidemos.

¹⁵ Osborne, *NA* ii p.59 n.159 (barely citing §203); ii pp.77-78 on §141.

¹⁶ By Osborne, *NA* iii pp.59-60.

¹⁷ By Osborne, *NA* iii pp.59-60.

None of this is persuasive. Demosthenes makes no bones about Charidemos's association with Kotys, alleging Charidemos had served with Kotys during Timotheos's campaign in the Chersonese of c.364¹⁸ after turning down a job-offer from Timotheos (149-150). Demosthenes also recounted how, defaulting on his promise to help Athens take the Chersonese from Kotys, Charidemos had leagued himself after his escape from Asia Minor in 360/59¹⁹ with Kotys and besieged Krithote and Elaious, towns in the Chersonese friendly to Athens (158-162). Demosthenes then makes clear how in the confusion after Kotys's assassination Charidemos got the young Kersobleptes into his clutches, first carrying on a war against Athenian forces in and outside the Chersonese and then bolstering Kersobleptes's opposition to his pro-Athenian brothers and to the Athenian claim on the Chersonese (163-168). In Demosthenes's eyes Kotys was notorious for reckless hostility to Athens (114-115, 163), deserving to be set alongside Athens's worst enemy, Philip of Macedon (111-113).

Thus Osborne fails to see that, if Charidemos had owed his citizenship to Kotys, Demosthenes would have had copious material to vituperate him with on this score. Yet he does not. Osborne also ignores an important part of Demosthenes's argument. In order to discredit the proposal that any assassin of Charidemos could be extradited from allied territory, Demosthenes argues that it would have been foolish for any politician at the time to have made such a proposal in favour of dynasts who in the past had made a show of friendship towards Athens: Kotys (118-119), Alexander of Pherai (120), Philip (121-122). The same argument is applied to Philiskos, whose assassin had actually taken refuge in Lesbos, an Athenian ally (141-143). Similarly, he pointed out how Kotys's assassins had been honoured with Athenian citizenship and gold crowns (119, 127). Now if Kotys had secured Charidemos his citizenship, then Demosthenes would have had a ready made way of proving how absurdly impolitic Aristokrates's proposal was. He could have contrasted the award of citizenship and a gold crown to Charidemos (145, 151, 185) with the same award

¹⁸ For the dating see Schäfer, *DZ* i pp.152-159; K. Klee, *RE* vi A.2 (1937) col. 1328, s.v. 'Timotheos (3)'; Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien* pp.200-201. This first campaign against Kotys (Dem. 23.149-150, 153) must fall before the time of *IG* ii² 110 (= Tod, *GHI* ii no.143; Osborne, *NA* iii T56), which shows Timotheos was still engaged "in the war against the Chalkidians and Amphipolis" (lines 8-9) in the sixth prytany of 363/2.

¹⁹ The year his confidant Kephisodotos (*PA* 8313) was *strategos* (Schol. Aes. 3.51). On Kephisodotos's deal with Charidemos see Dem. 23.153, 156-158, 163. Aeneas Tacticus, 24.3, narrates the capture of Ilion on this occasion by Χαριδήμω Ὠρεΐτη (cf. 24.20 Ἀθηνόδωρος Ἰμβριος). Osborne, *NA* iii pp.56-58, ignores this well-informed and contemporary source that wrecks his dating.

to Kotys's assassin and pointed out how any assassins of Charidemos would be likely to do what the assassins of Kotys and Philiskos had done and seek refuge with some city allied to Athens. Demosthenes does not do this, and Osborne does not explain why, if he were right about Charidemos and Kotys, Demosthenes should have ignored such promising material and instead indulged in pointless obfuscation by covering up Charidemos's links with the hated Kotys, creating difficulties for himself by pairing Charidemos with Kersobleptes, who had no small claim on Athenian gratitude for his cession of the Chersonese in 357. Osborne's mistake here largely comprises singling out an individual passage (141) in the speech, which he declares to be "the sole basis" for associating Charidemos's citizenship with Kerobleptes, and ignoring the whole thrust of Demosthenes's argument about Kersobleptes. It is of no help to be told that "Demosthenes is not after all a historian": he was, after all, an advocate of some standing who had to convince an Athenian jury against the arguments of opponents who would not have let pass the kind of needless blithering that Osborne attributes to him.

As things stand, Demosthenes had to get around the difficulty that Charidemos's associate Kersobleptes had in fact bestowed one great favour on Athens, the cession of the Chersonese in 357. He did this by emphasizing Kersobleptes's tergiversations before this generous act (169-178), skating over the act itself and representing Kersobleptes and Charidemos as currently engaged in a sinister plot, in collusion with venal politicians in Athens (15-17, 103, 105-106, 189, 192), in order to intimidate the friends of Athens in Thrace and so enable Kersobleptes to bring the whole of Thrace under his sole rule. There was a further difficulty for Demosthenes the advocate to surmount: his client Euthykles had not previously opposed the award of honours to Charidemos (187-188). It was thus necessary to explain to the jury, with fine irony, that Euthykles had no objection to the Athenian people bestowing honours on dubious recipients in the hope of inducing them to be of service (190). For in this speech the precise occasion on which Charidemos got his citizenship is ignored and that Charidemos has received honours from Athens is explained away by the ingenious piece of sophistry that Charidemos is the only man who has received rewards from Athens not for benefits conferred but for his inability, through no merits of his own, to bring to a finish his nefarious designs against Athenian interests (185).

Osborne believes that a "long disquisition" on Charidemos's earlier career (148-151) recounts the award of Athenian citizenship to Charidemos in its proper chronological place, when Demosthenes has just given a blistering account of Charidemos's part in Timotheos's war against the Chalcidians, and would so put it c.364/3, as afterwards Charidemos was off

in Asia.²⁰ However, it was not in the interests of his case for Demosthenes to be clear about exactly when Charidemus got this honour. Osborne has, moreover, not noted that, far from keeping to chronological order in his narration of Charidemus's misdeeds, Demosthenes here and elsewhere follows the pattern of interspersing his narrative with passages of indignant expostulation that round off each stage of a long narrative with wonderment as to how honours could ever have been bestowed on one so unreliable as Charidemus. Thus the first block of narrative (148-157) is preceded by abusive argument (144-147) and followed by more of the same (151-152); then more narrative (163-173) and more proof (178-178), with the last piece of narrative (179-183) being followed by a string of arguments of increasing emotional intensity, (184-195, 196-201, 202-214). The passage that Osborne regarded as dating Charidemus's gift of citizenship to c.364 (151) is in fact a piece of denunciation that, far from being chronological, is timeless. It was not for Demosthenes to acknowledge when and how Charidemus had ever in the past earned the reward of Athenian citizenship, since he needed to insist that Charidemus had always been as undeserving as he was now of the honours that some in Athens were proposing for him in 352/1.

Thus there is nothing in the speech to countenance Osborne's view that Charidemus got his citizenship by 364/3, in the lifetime of Kotys, and there is in fact much in the speech that excludes it.

First, the speech presents Charidemus as a freelance mercenary who has operated in Asia Minor and Thrace without any obligation to Athens. Thus when in 360/59 Charidemus made a deal with an Athenian strategos, Kephisodotos, to provide him with the ships he needed to get away from the scene of his own bungling at Skepsis, Kebren and Ilion (154-158), this was an agreement (upon which Charidemus characteristically defaulted, we are told) between an Athenian *strategos* on the one hand and an outsider on the other (152-161). Athenian citizens, not even Athenians who have served as *strategoï*, do not make deals of this kind with the demos. Osborne finds in Demosthenes's words here (154-157) that "Charidemus has some expectations of Athens and that Athens has some control over him".²¹ Athens plainly had no control over Charidemus, who went straight over to serve with Kotys (158-162), and the only expectations Athens had of Charidemus were those

²⁰ Osborne, *NA* ii p.78.

²¹ Osborne, *NA* ii p.78 n.272. Osborne also supposes that Demosthenes's jibe at Charidemus's generalship on this occasion: "He suffered a disaster of the kind that any ordinary person would avoid, let alone anyone claiming to be general" (155 not, as in Osborne, 154), "inadvertently betrayed" that Charidemus had already been an Athenian *strategos*. Osborne regards this as "obviously... not a point worth insisting on". The joke is to do with Charidemus's military pretensions in general, not any Athenian *strategia* c.364/3.

whetted by his promise to win the Chersonese (153, 158, 164). Charidemos also played skilfully on Kephisodotos's desire to take strong action against Iphikrates and Kotys (156). When it is recalled that Charidemos was not prosecuted for this warlike act, let alone convicted, it will become plain that at the time Charidemos was neither an Athenian citizen nor an Athenian *strategos*. That is why he could escape scot-free despite such allegations at a time when heavy penalties were visited upon Athenian officials who had failed to satisfy the demos's expectations about what could be accomplished in the north.²² Demosthenes explicitly contrasted Charidemos's present honours with Kephisodotos's disgrace for his part in these events (167-168). Charidemos in 360/59 is a footloose outsider still and so the opposite of the Athenian *strategos* Diopetithes, who in 342/1 was under some risk of prosecution for his activities in and around the Chersonese (Dem. 8.2, 17, 20 and 28-30).

Also because at the time Charidemos was an outsider, his letter to the Athenian *strategos* Kephisodotos in 360/59 promising to help regain the Chersonese could blandly say, by way of establishing Charidemos's credit, that he had rejected offers of employment from Alexander of Pherai (162). At the time this Alexander was Athens's most hated and feared enemy (Dem. 50.4; Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.35). This was no way for an Athenian citizen to write to the demos, but it had some point coming from a mercenary leader in the open market.

Second, it emerges that down to 352/1, the time of *Against Aristokrates*, Charidemos himself has not been resident in Athens. He has followed his trade and lived in foreign parts and continues to do so (57, 126, 136, 138). That is why Aristokrates conceived the idea of honouring him by the provision that anyone who assassinated him was to be subject to extradition from the territory of an Athenian ally. Osborne professes himself unable to see much point in such a honour,²³ but its purpose can be seen with reference to similar provisions in Athenian decrees that honour friends of Athens who have been made citizens and who continue to live in their own states or outside Athens. These friends of Athens were not remote from the danger of assassination and a measure of the kind Aristokrates proposed at least conferred a nominal degree of security on the honorand by holding out the

²² Besides Kephisodotos, Athenian officers who came to grief for failures in the north at this time include Ergophilos, Timomachos, Timotheos, Kallisthenes, Autokles, Theotimos and Menon (Dem. 36.53, possibly the *strategos* of 362/1: Dem. 50.12). On this spate of prosecutions see R.K. Sinclair, *Democracy and Participation in Athens* (Cambridge: 1988) pp.149-151 and 171.

²³ Osborne, *NA* ii p.83. A similar provision is found in each of the following citizenship decrees (numbering and date as in Osborne, *NA* i): D9, Hipparchos and Archippos of Thasos, c.388; D14 Arybbas of Molossia, c.342; and D22 Peisistheides of Delos, c.334. Demosthenes had to admit (23.89, 95, 99) that such provisions were not unknown.

threat to bring assassins to trial in Athens. The honour, such as it is, makes sense only if the honorands live outside Athens and are worth special protection. There was in Athenian law an antiquated and cumbersome provision for seeking to bring to trial anyone who killed an Athenian on foreign soil,²⁴ but Aristokrates's proposal was different, being meant, like comparable instances, to hold out the prospect of a quick process to avenge the murder of a person living abroad, as Charidemos was at the time. Thus Kersobleptes's proposal to elect he absentee Charidemos *strategos* had come as a novelty. Although he had been an Athenian citizen since c.357 there had been no question of making him *strategos*, in spite of the military reputation that Demosthenes so eagerly besmirched. Yet if Charidemos was to be elected *strategos* and submit himself to *logos* and *euthynai* he would need to take up residence in Athens. He was in the event elected *strategos* for 351/0 and later is found in the liturgical class. This in itself bespeaks his residing and owning property in Athens. Prior to this he could be stigmatized as a rootless adventurer on the lookout, like all mercenaries of his type, to seize a Greek city and set himself up in it as a petty dynast (61, 138-139). He could also in the *Against Aristokrates* be designated, with appropriate sarcasm, as a "benefactor" (εὐεργέτης) of Athens: this is not a title that one expects in the 350s to be bestowed on a real Athenian citizen, as opposed to an "honorary" one, who, despite the honorific status of Athenian citizenship conferred on him, continues to live abroad and so to appear to the Athenians as a source of further benefits.²⁵

The evidence of *Against Aristokrates* indicates that by 352/1 Charidemos had received Athenian citizenship but had yet to become an Athenian *strategos*. Osborne's attempt to fit Charidemos into his reconstruction of Orontes's career by making the former an Athenian as early as c.364 will not stand up, since it does violence to the vast body of evidence in *Against Aristokrates*, a voluminous work that, like Demosthenes 14.31, deserves better than preemptory treatment. It is not at all clear that the Orontes "satrap of Mysia" (whatever that means) at the time of the Satraps' Revolt (Diod. 15.90.3) is the same person as the turncoat of the Cyprian War. Nor is it clear that the Orontes of Demosthenes 14.31, even when the

²⁴ Dem. 23.82-85. Cf. D.M. MacDowell, *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators* (Manchester: 1963) pp.28-30, 84, 149.

²⁵ Cf. Osborne, *NA* iv pp.142-143, 148-149, 188-189 on the Athenians' habitual expectation that conferring citizenship was in response to services rendered or expected. That "benefactors" at this time were naturally not native Athenians emerges from passages such as Dem. 20 (*Leptines*) 67, 109 and instances of "benefactor" being applied to outsiders (Dem. 20.30, 41, 45, 54, 60, 63, 67). Cf. *IG* ii² 110 (363/2): Menelaos of Pelagonia honoured as "benefactor". Cf. M.B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxenes of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto: 1978) pp.4-5 on the rarity of the title "benefactor" without "proxenos".

text is correctly read, is to be lumped with either or both of these. Persian prosopography is, even in this relatively well-attested period, still full of pitfalls. In Xenophon's *Anabasis* there are two Persian grandees named Orontes: one of them Artaxerxes's son-in-law (2.4.8), the other the royal kinsman who plotted to betray Kyros (6.1-11, 9.29). Given that our Greek sources are far from abundant and give detail on only a random scatter of Persians, it would be prudent not to press any identification of Persian homonyms in the absence of positive evidence. The Orontes's son of Artasyros of Baktrian race" who moved the city of Pergamon back to its old site during the Satraps' Revolt (*OGIS* 264 = Osborne, D12 *Testimonium* E) might, or might not, be a different man from the Orontes of the Cyprian War.

What these considerations imply for the dating of *IG* ii² 207 is that neither the career of Charidemos nor that of one Orontes or more provides any justification for Osborne's attempt to replace Pittakys's reading of the archon's name in (a) line 12 with an archon from the 360s. There remains the possibility to be canvassed that Pittakys's reading was right, for once *IG* ii² 207 is disencumbered from its unnecessary association with Orontes the rebel satrap of the late 360s, a different context for it can be proposed.

In *IG* ii² 207 (b)-(d) Chares, Charidemos and Phokion are in command of an expedition apparently in the course of being dispatched (lines 12-13, as restored). The time is before the month of Thargelion, which is specified as the time-limit for presenting the *symbola* from Orontes and delivering the grain being bought from him (lines 8-11). Thargelion may be expected to fall in about May/June, if the Athenian calendar was not then in too great disorder, so we are dealing with an expedition that is setting out just before that time.

That the *syntaxeis* from Lesbos are to be used to pay for the grain (line 13) does not mean that Lesbos or its vicinity was necessarily the scene of operations.²⁶ The large and populous island of Lesbos was at the time of this decree a reliable Athenian ally and so could be expected to provide the money that the present undertaking demanded. When this was not made explicit by the extant parts of (b)-(d) but the decree in (a) does, as read by Pittakys, provide an archon-date, Nikomachos of 341/0 (line 12). It is natural to link the decrees in (a) and (b)-(d) closely in time because of the occurrence in either of Orontes and his *symbola*.

²⁶ Compare the Athenians' gratitude to Tenedos in 340-339 for having made available a loan and a contribution of *syntaxis* (apparently in advance), obviously for operations against Philip: *IG* ii² 233 (Tod, *GHI* no.175) 9-31. Around this time Athens had sent an expedition to protect Prokonnesos, the Chersonese and Tenedos: Dem. 18.302, with Schäfer, *DZ* ii (Leipzig: 1886) p.498. Diopeithes in the Chersonese was, Demosthenes complained (8.23), not allowed to get his hands on allied *syntaxeis*.

It so happens that in 340/39, the very next year, Chares and Phokion are attested as serving as *strategoï* in the same theatre of war: both were sent in turn to the aid of Byzantion, which, together with Perinthos, was under siege by Philip while the satraps of western Asia Minor had orders from the King to give aid to Perinthos.²⁷ Philip's attack on Perinthos apparently began in about July of 340, his siege of Byzantion lasted from about October 340 to the early spring of 339.²⁸ Chares had been in command of a squadron meant to protect the grain fleet that Philip seized at Hieron in about September of 340 and he and Phokion also operated in northern waters after Philip broke off his siege of Byzantion.²⁹ Chares had in 341/0 earlier been active in the Chersonese.³⁰

Thargelion is month XI in the Athenian calendar and, on the assumption that the decrees in

IG ii² 207 (a) and (b)-(d) belong closely together in time, the decree on the grain-deal with Orontes in (b)-(d) is to be dated just before Thargelion in 341/0, the archon-year attested for (a). In that case the expedition of Chares, Charidemos and Phokion attested in (b)-(d) falls just before May or thereabouts in 340. In this decree there may be discerned Athenian preparations, at a time, as was to be expected, of great strain on Athenian finances, in order to meet Philip's threats to the security of the Hellespont and Bosporos. Diopieithes had been active in the Chersonese in 342 and 341, brazenly exploiting opportunities left by Philip's preoccupation with his Thracian war and justified by his Athenian backers because of the increasing threat that Philip's campaigning posed to the security of the Hellespont (Dem. 8.2-12, 19, 34-37, 46, 76; 9.70, 73). Phokion himself was *strategos* in 341/0, commanding in this year an expedition to Euboia (Schol. Aes. 3.103).

In the following archon-year, 340/39, Chares and Phokion were each in turn involved in the relief of Byzantion. Further in 339/8, Chares and Proxenos (the *strategos* in line 23 of *IG ii² 207* [b] associated with Chares, Charidemos and Phokion) together held command of forces meant to hold a pass east of Amphissa against Philip (Polyaen. 4.2.8). No part by Charidemos in the events in 340/39 is attested but he may be seen from the evidence of *IG ii² 207* to have been serving on an important Athenian expedition with Chares and Phokion late

²⁷ Plut. *Phoc.* 14; Philochoros, *FGH* 328 FF 53-54 and 55 a and b (dating Philip's moves to the archon-year 340/39); cf. Griffith in N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia ii* (Oxford: 1979) at pp.566-581.

²⁸ Griffith, *ibid.* pp.568 n.4 and 578 n.4.

²⁹ Griffith, *ibid.* pp.580-581.

³⁰ *IG ii² 228* (= Tod, *GHI* no.174) 11-12.

in the archon-year immediately before 341/0. What Charidemos did in 340/39 is not known – but a man who was elected commander when the slaves were to be freed for last-ditch resistance after the defeat of Chaironeia (Plut. *Phoc.* 16) and who attained the high distinction of being put on Alexander's death-list and then singled out for exile (Arr. *Anab.* 1.10.4) may be expected not to have been idle in this year. A tenure by him of the *strategia* in 340/39 is likely but conjectural, although there is some observable continuity amongst experienced Athenian *strategoí* around this time. On solid ground, it is hoped, is the argument that Charidemos did not become an Athenian citizen until c.357 and that there is no reason to date *IG ii² 207* to the 360s. The frustrating business of writing the history of the Satraps' Revolt must proceed with the course to that text, which may better be fitted into the events in and around 341/0. Who the Orontes of *IG ii² 207* was, with his *symbola* and his *arche* ([a] line 15), is a matter of guesswork: apparently a hyparch or a local dynast subject to one of the satraps of western Asia Minor. His helpfulness to Athens at this time is not surprising when, with the satraps aiding Perinthos, the logic of events made Philip's enemy their friend.³¹

DOUGLAS KELLY

The Australian National University

³¹ I am grateful to Professor Osborne for his response to this paper and for his kindness in sending me a copy of Pittakys, *EA* pp.1283 and 1308. That I should draw upon his copious researches in order to argue against his view of these matters is the way these things go.