

IAN WORTHINGTON

THE DATE OF CHAEREPHILUS' CITIZENSHIP

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130 (2000) 296–298

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## THE DATE OF CHAEREPHILUS' CITIZENSHIP

According to Dinarchus (1.43), the metic Chaerephilus<sup>1</sup> owed his grant of Athenian citizenship to a proposal by Demosthenes. The passage in Dinarchus needs to be quoted in full since other parts of it are relevant to the argument of this paper:<sup>2</sup>

εἴπατέ μοι πρὸς Δίος, ὦ ἄνδρες, προῖκα τοῦτον οἴεσθε γράψαι Διφίλῳ τὴν ἐν πρυτανείῳ σίτησιν καὶ τὴν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν σταθησομένην εἰκόνα; ἢ τὸ ποιῆσαι πολίτας ὑμετέρους Χαιρέφιλον καὶ Φεῖδωνα καὶ Πάμφιλον καὶ Φεῖδιππον, ἢ πάλιν Ἐπιγένην καὶ Κόνωνα τοὺς τραπεζίτας; ἢ τὸ χαλκοῦς ἐν ἀγορᾷ στήσαι Παιρισάδην καὶ Σάτυρον καὶ Γόργιππον τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου τυράννους, παρ' ὧν αὐτῶ χίλιοι μέδιμνοι τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ πυρῶν ἀποστέλλονται κτλ.

Gentlemen, tell me, by Zeus, do you think this man [Demosthenes] proposed public maintenance in the Prytaneum for Diphilus and the statue to be erected in the Agora as a free gift? Or the conferment of your citizenship on Chaerephilus, Pheidon, Pamphilus, and Pheidippus, or again on Epigenes and Conon the bankers? Or the bronze statues in the Agora of Paerisades, Satyrus, and Gorgippus, the tyrants of the Pontus, from whom one thousand medimni of corn per year are sent to him . . . ?

Chaerephilus and his sons were enrolled in Demosthenes' deme of Paeania, since it seems to have been customary for a new citizen to be enrolled in the deme of his *prostates*.<sup>3</sup>

Exactly when this grant to Chaerephilus occurred is controversial. Schäfer<sup>4</sup> believed that it was during the famine of 330–326, since Chaerephilus was wealthy enough to donate corn to the city and such large-scale benefactions in that period were rewarded with citizenship. A grant of corn, or money for the purchase of corn, to Athens during the food crisis seems to have been rewarded with citizenship, and the family was wealthy enough to perform such a benefaction since Chaerephilus and his sons were enrolled in the *hippeis* class once they became citizens. Although Schäfer's theory was viewed with some support by Davies,<sup>5</sup> it was rejected by Lewis,<sup>6</sup> while Osborne dates the grant to the late 330s.<sup>7</sup> There are chronological problems, as Davies points out, especially concerning the liturgical activities of two of Chaerephilus' sons, which indicate they were in full possession of the family property, yet which appear to predate Chaerephilus' manumission of a slave in the late 320s (see below). However, I believe that the date for the citizenship grant can be narrowed and that it should be assigned to the period 331 to 330; hence, Lewis' scepticism on the dating is misplaced.

Dinarchus' allegation that Chaerephilus bribed Demosthenes in order to procure citizenship in effect widens the date for the grant to anytime from the late 350s, when Demosthenes became a political force, to 324/3, the time of the Harpalus affair which led to Demosthenes' trial in 323 and thus the context for Dinarchus' speech. However, the allegations of Dinarchus at 1.43 are, I suggest, the key to the dating problem. In this section, Dinarchus refers to a grant of *sitesis* for Diphilus, Athenian citizenship on the

<sup>1</sup> PA 15187, J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford: 1971), pp. 566–567, M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* 3 (Brussels: 1983), T75.

<sup>2</sup> Text and translation from Ian Worthington, *Greek Orators Volume 2, Dinarchus and Hyperides* (Warminster: 1999).

<sup>3</sup> See Davies, *APF*, pp. 430–431 for some examples.

<sup>4</sup> A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*<sup>2</sup> 3 (Leipzig: 1887), pp. 296–297 with n. 4.

<sup>5</sup> *APF*, p. 566.

<sup>6</sup> D. M. Lewis, *Attic Manumissions*, *Hesperia* 28 (1959), p. 230 – 'I see no way of dating it closer than between 340 and 320s.'

<sup>7</sup> *Naturalization* 3, pp. 75–76.

metic salt-fish seller Chaerephilus, his three sons Pheidon,<sup>8</sup> Pamphilus,<sup>9</sup> and Pheidippus,<sup>10</sup> and the bankers Epigenes<sup>11</sup> and Conon,<sup>12</sup> and on the Spartocid tyrants of Pontus. All of these grants, Dinarchus alleges, were the result of bribes to Demosthenes – in the case of the Pontic tyrants, Dinarchus says that Demosthenes received 1,000 medimni in corn per year. Dinarchus does not single out these people merely as examples of the Athenians' xenophobia or of their social snobbery in his case against Demosthenes, but, I suggest, to remind the jurors of the recent corn shortage. While not a famine as such, people nevertheless went hungry, and to combat the shortage bestowed citizenship on individuals who ordinarily would not have stood a chance. At Demosthenes' trial in 323 the jurors would remember this. Demosthenes' venality is thus emphasised: at a time when the Athenians were faced with hunger, Demosthenes cared little for their own well-being, but only for his own pocket. In return for bribes, he proposed that Diphilus receive free meals for life at state expense, that several metics be granted citizenship and, for the same ends, he willingly took an annual bribe *in corn* from the Spartocid tyrants. This last grant may be dated to 330, exactly when the famine began to hit.<sup>13</sup>

Whether Demosthenes was so venal is irrelevant to Dinarchus; indeed, he is probably guilty of falsification since those named are likely to have received citizenship for their *largesses* to the city. However, the passage is important for my purposes, for in citing Chaerephilus and his sons within the context of the food shortage Dinarchus connects Chaerephilus' citizenship to the famine and thus that period – indeed, probably all whom he names were granted citizenship around the same time.<sup>14</sup>

Davies is concerned that Chaerephilus' grant of citizenship in this period affords very little time for his sons to come into their own and to be so liturgically active, especially when inscriptional evidence attests to a certain Chaerephilus, son of Pheidon, manumitting a slave in the late 320s:<sup>15</sup>

Φίλων ταριχοπώ ἐ[ν] Κο  
λλυ οἰκῶ ἀποφυγῶν ὡ  
Χαιρέφιλον Φείδωνο  
Παια φιάλ σταθμό: Η ὡ

This causes obvious dating complications if this is the Chaerephilus who was granted citizenship on Demosthenes' motion. However, the difficulty is resolved by the plausible assumption that the manumitter was the son of Chaerephilus' own son Pheidon and thus the grandson of the naturalised Chaerephilus. It does not necessarily follow that Chaerephilus, already elderly, lived much longer after he was awarded citizenship, not least because he does not seem to have been very active liturgically. Nor also was his son Pheidon, who, as Davies suggested (cf. Osborne), may have died relatively young in the 320s, aged about 45. His death would allow Pheidon's son, Chaerephilus, to inherit his father's property and thus be able to manumit a slave at a later date.<sup>16</sup>

Davies is not especially attracted to this theory, not least because of the contemporary references to two of Chaerephilus' sons' liaisons with Pythionice (Timocles, frags. 14 and 17, Antiphanes, frag. 26),

<sup>8</sup> PA 14184, Davies, *APF*, p. 567, Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, T76.

<sup>9</sup> PA 11555, Davies, *APF*, pp. 567–568, Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, T77.

<sup>10</sup> PA 14163, *APF*, 567–568, Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, T78.

<sup>11</sup> PA 4782, Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, T80.

<sup>12</sup> PA 8700, Davies, *APF*, p. 430, Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, T81.

<sup>13</sup> Osborne dates the citizenship grant for Satyrus and Gorgippus, the sons of Paerisades I, to the 330s: *Naturalization* 3, PT135 and PT136.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Osborne on Epigenes' and Conon's citizenship during the famine period: *Naturalization* 3, T80 and T81.

<sup>15</sup> Lewis, *Attic Manumissions*, p. 219 (Face A, lines 510–513); cf. pp. 230 with 236–237, and Osborne, *Naturalization* 3, p. 76.

<sup>16</sup> I agree with Davies that this is probably also the Chaerephilus who is recorded in a Delphic inscription: *FdD* III. 4, line 204.

who later became the courtesan of Harpalus, Alexander's imperial treasurer. Antiphanes was dead by 330 and Pythionice had left Athens for Babylon by 327. Yet, there is no need to assume, as Davies seems to do,<sup>17</sup> that the sons enjoyed Pythionice's company always as citizens – at the end of the day, the money of wealthy metics was the same as that of wealthy citizens. Hence, the sons' relationship with Pythionice could have begun before their citizen status, and continued after their father's death until 327 at the latest.

Thus we have the following dating scenario: the family could not have become citizens without performing some substantial benefaction for the city – whether Demosthenes was bribed or not, it was the Athenian Assembly which made the final decision. A corn donation appears the likeliest explanation, and so a date for the citizenship grant much before 330 is extremely unlikely. I would suggest 331 as the earliest date, since by then the potential for a corn shortage the following year would be known in Athens. This gave Chaerephilus the opportunity to elevate his family politically and socially – it would be hard to believe this was not his aim when he donated corn or money for corn! Certainly, his son Pamphilus quickly entered political life (see below). Thus, if Chaerephilus had received citizenship in 331, even 330, and died not too long after, then this would allow his sons to inherit the family property. Pheidon's death shortly after would explain why only two of Chaerephilus' sons performed various liturgies and also allow his son, named Chaerephilus after his grandfather, to inherit his property and be the one who manumitted the slave.

This scenario also affects Lewis' reservations about some of the liturgical activities of the two remaining sons. For example, *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 417*, 14 records that Pamphilus contributed one hundred drachmae to the *eutaxia* liturgy, which Lewis dates between 340 and 320.<sup>18</sup> This contribution may now be put to a point after 330,<sup>19</sup> and I suggest either 329 or 328, for Pamphilus was a member of the Boule in 327/6,<sup>20</sup> and such a financial gesture must be seen as a means of enhancing his election.

Also, his brother Pheidippus is likely to have been trierarch in the early rather than later 320s. *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1631*, d622–624 records him as owing 1,200 drachmae for the sole trierarchy of *Kytheria Aristokratous* in 322.<sup>21</sup> Kirchner in *PA* assigned this trierarchy to 323/2, but this does not necessarily follow. Retiring trierarchs did not always discharge their debts but had them either doubled or simply carried over to another year; many had debts outstanding over a number of years.<sup>22</sup> Since it is hard to accept that Pheidippus waited patiently to become trierarch for several years while his brother Pamphilus performed liturgies and was a member of the Boule, it is plausible that Pheidippus' trierarchic debt was carried forward over a period of time, rather than from the previous year. Thus, he too was liturgically active from the early 320s.

University of Missouri-Columbia

Ian Worthington

<sup>17</sup> *APF*, p. 566.

<sup>18</sup> *Attic Manumissions*, p. 230.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Davies, *APF*, p. 567, to c. 330.

<sup>20</sup> B. D. Meritt, *The Inscriptions, Hesperia* 3 (1934), p. 3 no. 5, lines 5–6, with Gomme's restoration of the demotic:  
[ὧν προέδρων ἐπεψή]φιζεν Πάμφιλος Π[αιανεύς  
[. . . ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμ]ωι.

<sup>21</sup> Φείδιππος Παια : ἐπισκε[υήν τριή]  
ρους Κυθηρίας, Ἀριστοκ[ράτους ἔ]  
ργον : ΧΗΗ.

<sup>22</sup> See Davies, *APF*, p. 321 on Conon Potamios (*PA* 8717); cf. the *strategos* Leosthenes: Ian Worthington, *The Earlier Career of Leosthenes and IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1631, Historia* 36 (1987), pp. 489–491.