

MICHAEL CLARK

KAI TO MH TEINEIN AGAN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 108 (1995) 281–284

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

καὶ τὸ μὴ τείνειν ἄγαν

In a recent volume of this journal V. Gabrielsen has sought to refute my proposed redating of the Athenian naval inventory *IG II² 1604* by rearranging some, but not all, of my basic points.¹ He held that the date 377/6 B.C. traditionally assigned to 1604 remains tenable, and, if it must be abandoned, then the date 378/7 is to be preferred to 379/8 (the date I suggested). Although there rarely is much benefit in rehashing contentious issues, this matter is so important that I wish to restate briefly the points that seem to me most significant for the dating of this *stele*, highlighting those that Gabrielsen has avoided.

I take it as now proven that the editio's date of 377/6 rested upon very weak evidence.² It is generally agreed that physical characteristics of the *stele* make a date much later than 370 very unlikely. Further, the absence of references to ships captured at the Battle of Naxos apparently places 1604 before 376/5.³ For the following reasons,⁴ I conclude that 1604 very likely dates to 379/8:

(i) Having only some 15-20 ships allotted to trierarchs, the inventory ought to pre-date the outbreak of full-scale war against Sparta in 378.

(i.a) Ordinary Athenian patrols and embassies (in peace as well as in wartime) required about as many triremes as were allotted to trierarchs on 1604.

(i.b) In addition, there is some evidence for fairly major Athenian fleet operations during the first two years of the war against Sparta.

(ii) Two trierarchs active on 1604 (Kallibios Kephisophontos Paianieus and Philinos Phlueus) held other public offices in 378/7 and 377/6 that would seem to have precluded their fulfilling trierarchic duties in the same years.

(iii) A Chian named Antimachos had been using an Athenian trireme (1604.79). The same man evidently took part as the Chian confederate ambassador in treaty negotiations with Thebes in 378/7 (*IG II² 40.10* with add. p. 657). It seems a reasonable assumption, therefore, that Antimachos used the trireme at some stage in the Confederacy's diplomacy (in the earliest of which negotiations the ambassador from Chios would have been particularly active).⁵

(iv) Diplomacy connected to the creation of the Confederacy had begun already in 379/8 (and continued actively for a few years thereafter).

¹ Michael Clark, "The Date of *IG II² 1604*," *ABSA* 85 (1990) 47-67 at 47-55; contra Vincent Gabrielsen, "The Date of *IG II² 1604* again," *ZPE* 93 (1992) 69-74. I shall also refer by date to his "The Diadikasia-Documents," *C&M* 38 (1987) 39-51.

² See Clark (1990) 47-51. Gabrielsen (1992) 71 seems to concede this point.

³ Contrast *IG II² 1606* and 1607 *passim*, 1610.23f. and 31.

⁴ For what follows, see Clark (1990) 51-54. I do not provide full references here, especially since Gabrielsen repeats many of them.

⁵ For a fuller discussion of this point, see Clark (1990) 53-4).

To summarize these clues, then, (i) and (ii) militate against the dates 378/7 and 377/6, while (iii) and (iv) point to a date no earlier than 379/8. The year 379/8, then, seems the most likely candidate for 1604.

Gabrielsen rearranged some of those basic points in such a way as virtually to ignore point (iv). Thereby he passed over the crucial inference that the combination of points (iii) and (iv) makes it possible to date 1604 to 379/8 (as well as to 378/7, evidently his preferred date, or indeed to some later year). That is a critical omission.⁶

In conjunction with that omission belongs Gabrielsen's attempt to downplay the significance of point (ii).⁷ For here is the crux. Since point (iv) supports a date as early as 379/8, there is no longer any need for scholars to explain away the apparent conflicts raised by point (ii).⁸

Now if otherwise there were some valid ground for greatly preferring 378/7 or 377/6 to the equally available 379/8, special pleading against point (ii) in order to retain one of those two years might serve some useful purpose. But Gabrielsen gives no reason for needing to retain 378/7 or 377/6 against 379/8.⁹ If I were to make his case for him, I could point only to one weak reason for preferring 378/7 or 377/6 to 379/8.¹⁰ It is this: let us suppose we had no

⁶ Gabrielsen (1992) nowhere stated what grounds I gave for dating 1604 specifically to 379/8 (and indeed after his brief introduction the very date 379/8 disappeared entirely from his text, *pace* note 15). My discussion at (1990) 53-4 showed that we can plausibly associate Antimachos' use of a trireme on 1604 with any of several confederate negotiations conducted with islanders in 379/8. Nevertheless Gabrielsen's abrupt conclusion at p. 74 left no room to consider any of these possibilities. Instead, he tried to link Antimachos' use of the trireme specifically and exclusively to his diplomacy with Thebes in 378/7. There are less crucial problems with Gabrielsen's discussion, too. He did not explain how the Theban negotiations could have involved Antimachos' use of an Athenian trireme. In fact on the relevant inscription, *IG II² 40*, we find no indication whatever that Antimachos was operating a trireme in these negotiations even though another man (evidently an Athenian) is explicitly identified as trierarch at line 8. Do we really need to have a second Athenian trireme under Antimachos involved in the Theban negotiations (and if so, why is that fact not registered on *IG II² 40*)? In any case, it is at least as likely *a priori* that the Chian used this trireme in negotiations with one of the many confederate cities lying on the coast.

⁷ Gabrielsen contended (72f.) that no substantive conflicts existed between the trierarchies of Kallibios and Philinos on 1604 and their services as *tamias* of Athena and secretary of the Boule in 378/7 and 377/6. His main point was that each man could have attended to official business at Athens while hiring a mercenary trierarch, because "all trierarchs were permitted to transfer their active duty to a contractor." Actually, this practice was prohibited ([Dem.] 51.7-17). The law invoked at 51.12 against contracted trierarchies may have concerned desertion in general; cp. 51.8 for the conviction of several trierarchs who had transferred their duties to contractors. The rich sometimes could flout the prohibition with impunity, but that is different from legal permission. And in any case the practice hardly shows that Athenian *strategoí* would enroll a man as trierarch without regard for his concurrent duties as a state official. My discussion of this issue at (1990) 52-3, which Gabrielsen neither cited nor addressed directly, shows more clearly how significant are the conflicts raised by point (ii). On the issue of personal service, M. Amit, *Athens and the Sea* (Brussels 1964) 110-112 is more balanced than Gabrielsen.

⁸ As for example J.K. Davies, *Historia* 18 (1969) 331 had felt necessary.

⁹ Gabrielsen (69) justified his study by stating that "the question of date [of 1604] is interwoven with certain issues relating to (i) the book-keeping practices of the naval administration and (ii) the working of the trierarchy, which are worth clarifying." But neither issue seems ever to be raised again.

¹⁰ Incidentally, the dating of 1604 is not affected by Gabrielsen's attempt (72 note 15) to suggest a specific link between some debts of Mantias of Thorikos on 1604 and a newly attested trierarchy of Mantias' (on which

other evidence for the date of 1604 than the fact that Antimachos "used to have" a trireme (1604.79 εἶχεν; Gabrielsen [1992] 73 is misleading about the tense of the verb). If by chance a record of that use was inscribed more or less unaltered on several successive inventories (before finally disappearing), as is just possible, there might be a slightly higher probability that 1604 would date to a later rather than the earliest possible year. But that argument is so weak as to be virtually useless — even in the absence of other evidence. Accordingly the most logical solution is to avoid the conflicts represented in point (ii) by shifting the *stele* to a year such as 379/8, in which no such conflicts occur.

In a similar vein, Gabrielsen ignored point (i.a) and downplayed (i.b). I shall not re-examine these in detail; either one believes that Athens' war-making in 378/7 and 377/6 required more than some 15-20 triremes to be allotted, or one does not.¹¹ In general, however, it seems obvious that the entire thrust of Gabrielsen's article is to search for any means to avoid the date 379/8 for 1604. This is what allows him to maintain the traditional date 377/6 — even though he has conceded that critical assumptions underpinning the editio's dating are "strictly unwarranted".¹²

see Clark [1990] 54-5). For there is no reason to suppose that any of Mantias' debts on 1604 accrued specifically during this newly attested trierarchy.

¹¹ Gabrielsen tried to show that the 15-20 ships allotted on 1604 would have sufficed during a period of naval war against Sparta by referring (p. 70) to two unrelated Athenian fleet operations each involving fully 30 triremes. And although he acknowledged (note 9) that an additional 20-odd ships could be at the ready in Piraeus, these did not otherwise enter his calculations of ships likely to be allotted in 378/7 and 377/6. Very damaging to his argument is his own contention (p. 71) that already from 378/7 Thebes was contributing to the joint war effort with Athens by using triremes borrowed from other states. And who better than Athens to have loaned triremes to Thebes? Since two slightly later (and more fragmentary) naval inventories than 1604 preserve records showing that Athens did indeed loan some of her triremes to Thebes during this brief alliance (*IG II²* 1605.12, 1607.49 and 155), Gabrielsen would have a difficult time explaining how 1604 could date to 378/7 or 377/6 when there is no reference on 1604 to any triremes on loan to Thebes. In fact he does not even address the problem.

It is relevant that in an earlier article Gabrielsen had assumed that *IG II²* 1604 dates from a period of warfare (377/6). At (1987) 43 Gabrielsen asserted that the many unallotted ships on 1604 "remained undistributed for the whole year probably because there were not enough trierarchs." Apparently this was meant to demonstrate that there were relatively few potential trierarchs in Athens in that general period, for he was seeking to show that the litigants appearing on the *diadikasia* inscriptions were too numerous to have been trierarchs. His assertion raises several glaring but unanswered questions; J. Eastman wonders, for example, how he would have explained the abundance of Athenian trierarchs a few months into the next year at the Battle of Naxos. In any case, Gabrielsen's implausible assertion could not have been reached, it seems to me, unless it rested upon a natural (if unstated) assumption: That one would have expected many more Athenian ships to be allotted on 1604 *especially during a time of war*. By (1992) Gabrielsen seems to have reversed himself—at least on his last unstated assumption (see this note, above).

Incidentally, in his later article (69 note 2) Gabrielsen made a point of suggesting that I had reaffirmed the view he advanced already in 1987, that debt collections in Athens were "carried out by 378/7" (in Gabrielsen's paraphrase). He is mistaken. At (1990) 55-6 I put those collections squarely *in* 378/7 (which is where the evidence points). Gabrielsen himself, by contrast, had dodged between "termination in 379/8" and "terminated by 378/7" at (1987) 49-51; he was trying to link those collections to the *diadikasia* inscriptions (which are generally dated to the 380s).

¹² He concedes that the restoration of *IG II²* 1622.435-7 does not establish the date of 377/6 for 1604, "even if" the restoration "were correct" (p. 71). But he remains reluctant to abandon 377/6: "If the traditional date of 1604 needs to be altered" (73); "in so far as the conventional date may prove to be unsatisfactory" (69).

Finally, I may summarize the most important consequences of dating *IG II² 1604* to 379/8. I drew attention to two particular issues already a few years ago (Clark [1990] 55-67). Because 1604 is the earliest extant fourth-century naval inventory, an early date such as I propose tends to undermine two theories about Athens in this period — firstly that the Peace of Antalcidas in 386 put severe restrictions on Athens' navy and naval policies, and secondly that the practice of inscribing naval inventories was resumed only with the creation of the Confederacy in 378.¹³

University of Vermont

Michael Clark

¹³ I owe thanks to Jennifer Eastman, Philip Ambrose, Robin Schlunk and Barbara Rodgers for commenting on earlier drafts of this article.