

VINCENT GABRIELSEN

THE DATE OF IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604 AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 93 (1992) 69–74

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE DATE OF IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604 AGAIN<sup>1</sup>

In a recent article, M.Clark proposes a new date for the earliest extant Athenian naval record from the fourth century B.C., IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604.<sup>2</sup> Mainly on the basis of certain features of the inscription he rejects the year to which it is traditionally assigned, 377/6,<sup>3</sup> and holds that the document probably was drawn up by the epimeletai ton neorion serving in 379/8. In what follows, I shall argue that, in so far as the conventional date may prove to be unsatisfactory, the alternative year favoured by the criteria at our disposal is 378/7, not 379/8. A difference of one or two years, one might reasonably object, does not matter greatly. In this case, however, the question of date 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.

### II.

1. One important feature of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604 (henceforth referred to as 1604) is the considerable number of ships recorded as *anepiklerotai*, i.e. unallotted to a trierarch. Of the grand total of c. 100 ships originally listed in the inscription, 47 (possibly 48) can be seen - or safely inferred - to have been unallotted.<sup>4</sup> Of the remaining ships some had been allotted to a trierarch; the latter fact is indicated either by the formula "trierarch + name of an individual", or by means of some other information furnished by the dockyard officials: e.g. "somebody hauled up" a ship (1604.15). The number of allotted vessels could have been

---

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Mr David L.Silverman for his useful corrections of, and comments on, a first draft of this article.

<sup>2</sup> M.Clark, "The Date of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604", *BSA* 85 (1990) 47-67. Clark takes issue with J.K.Davies' view ("The Date of ii<sup>2</sup> 1609", *Historia* 18 [1969] 309-333, esp. pp. 313-14) that the naval inscriptions list outstanding liabilities going back to (but no farther than) 378/7 because no public records were kept before that year. He suggests (pp. 55-6) that the absence of earlier liabilities may, instead, be due to a collection of debts carried out by 378/7. Surprisingly, Clark seems not to be aware of V.Gabrielsen, "The Diadikasia-Documents", *C&M* 38 (1987) 39-51, esp. pp. 48-51, where I had proposed (on evidence identical to that adduced by Clark) the possibility of a large-scale debt collection undertaken in the period c. 380s - 379/8. Moreover, in the same article I concluded that the traditional interpretation of the diadikasia-documents as referring to antidoseis of trierarchs or all liturgists is unsupported. Clark (Appendix II, pp. 66-7) may disagree with this conclusion, but he will still have to argue against it.

<sup>3</sup> For the accepted date see U.Köhler, "Aus den attischen Seeurkunden", *AM* 6 (1881) 21-39, esp. p. 29 - correcting A.Boeckh, *Urkunden über das Seewesen des attischen Staates* (Berlin, 1840), pp. 22, 58-9, who had proposed 360/59 - and J.Kirchner's note to IG II<sup>2</sup> 1604.

<sup>4</sup> See V.Gabrielsen, "The Diadikasia-Documents", *C&M* 38 (1987) 39-51, esp. p. 43, and "The Number of Athenian Triarachs after ca. 340 B.C.", *C&M* 40 (1989) 145-159, esp. pp. 149-50.

nearly 20, perhaps slightly more.<sup>5</sup> As for the final group of ships there is insufficient information to decide their current status.

These observations can guide us to the approximate date of 1604, if they are combined with other evidence about Athenian naval activity during the period of time to which the document is now universally accepted to belong, the early 370s. To begin with, late in 376, an Athenian force of 83 ships under Chabrias was victorious in the naval engagement off Naxos.<sup>6</sup> Plutarch (Phoc. 6) and Palyaenos (3.11.2) preserve the exact date of the battle, 16 Boedromion (in this specific year the entire month of September);<sup>7</sup> the victory was particularly memorable because it coincided with the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries. Since the fleet of 83 ships operated in the archon-year 376/5, the great number of unallotted ships in 1604 is at odds with naval activity in that year, not, as Clark 51-2 thinks, in 377/6.

Clark excludes also 378/7 as a possible date for the inscription on the supposition that a sizeable fleet may have been commissioned during that year. Certainly, as Diodoros reports, a force under Chabrias was in 378/7 active in Euboia from where it proceeded to the Cyclades and won over to the Athenian side "Peparethos, and Sciathos and some other islands which had been subject to the Lacedaemonians".<sup>8</sup> But we do not know how many ships were involved in this venture. Diodoros (15.30.2) simply says: "The Athenians, seeing affairs proceeding to their liking, dispatched a force to Euboia to serve at once as protection for their allies and to subdue the opposition."

Squadrons comprising 20-30 ships, we should note, were quite frequently employed by the Athenians with admirable success in the fifth and fourth centuries: e.g. in 366, Timotheos captured Samos and some cities in the Chersonese with 30 trieris (Isoc. 15.111-12); in 349/8, Chares sailed with 30 ships to assist the Olynthians (FGrH 328: Philochoros F 49); finally, considering the Spartan commander Teleutias' bold attempt (388) to raid the Piraeus at night with 12 ships, Xenophon (Hell. 5.1.20) says that Teleutias judged it safer to sail against 20 ships which were at Athens than against 10 elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> Thus, to hold that

---

<sup>5</sup> Clark 51, but in spite of the argument in note 20, the letter-spaces in some lines are enough to accommodate a ship's name with trierarch; cf. lines 12-13 concerning the ship *Doxa*.

<sup>6</sup> Xen. Hell. 5.4.61, but mainly Diod. 15.34.3-15.35.2, who (presumably basing his account on Ephoros) gives the number of ships and notes that 18 Athenian trieris were captured, thus contradicting Demosthenes (20.77-78), who claims that not a single ship was lost on the Athenian side. Aesch. 3.222 might imply that the force numbered less than 65 ships, but the meaning of this passage is not entirely clear.

<sup>7</sup> E.J.Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life* (London, 1968), p. 118.

<sup>8</sup> Diod. 15.30.5; Tod 123.84ff. with commentary on p. 66, and R.Sealey, *A History of the Greek City States 700-338 B.C.* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1976), p. 412. Cf. Clark 51-2.

<sup>9</sup> See G.L.Cawkwell, "Athenian Naval Power in the Fourth Century", *CQ N.S.* 34 (1984) 334-345, esp. pp. 334-5. The passage from Xen. Hell. 5.1.18-23 indicates, in addition, that 20 or so ships with their crews and trierarchs were in the list of active ships in readiness at the *neosoikoi* for being quickly commissioned; references in the naval records to hulls lying in the dockyards and fitted with *hypozomata* (ἀύτη ὑπέζοται: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1621.37 [restored], 68, 90) may be to such ships. cf. Boeckh, *Urkunden* 37; J.S.Morrison and R.T.Williams, *Greek Oared Ships, 900-323 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 294-5.

Chabrias' activities in 378/7 would have required the deployment of a large force remains a mere supposition, which is hardly enough to eliminate the possibility that 1604 may belong to that year.

An obstacle to our assigning the naval record to 378/7 might be thought to be Polybius' report under that year (2.62.6) about the manning of 100 triereis against Sparta.<sup>10</sup> However, since this was a common war effort of the Athenians and the Thebans, the fleet of 100 ships, just as the accompanying force of 10,000 men, was in all likelihood the joint force of the two allies (Thebes could borrow ships from other states), not the fleet which Athens alone was able to muster.

To sum: the evidence and arguments presented so far may show that, while 1604 cannot belong to 376/5, both 378/7 and 377/6 still remain within the range of possible dates.

2. Not much help is offered by the fact that 1604 lists three persons elsewhere attested as officials. One is Mantias Thorikios who in our document is obliged to surrender equipment belonging to an unalotted ship (lines 9-10), and nails from another hull in need of repair (line 46). An entry from a later naval inscription (probably of 341), which records an outstanding debt incurred by Mantias in his capacity as treasurer (*tamias*) of some naval officials, is restored to furnish 377/6 as the year of his tenure (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1622.435-7).<sup>11</sup> But the restoration is now questioned, mostly on epigraphic grounds, and even if it were correct, an identification of this liability with either of those in 1604 is strictly unwarranted.<sup>12</sup>

The capacity in which Mantias incurred his debts in 1604 is indeterminable. Clark (pp. 49-51) believes Mantias had been trierarch because his obligations are listed with the formula *dei paratheinai* ("he must provide"), which in this and in a slightly later document is used with debts owed by trierarchs, not officials.<sup>13</sup> But first and foremost, if the argument is to have any force, it must be shown that the same formula was never used with the liabilities of naval officials. This seems not possible, because in the surviving fragments of the inscriptions trierarchic debts by far outnumber those of officials; hence, if our sole identification criterion of a defaulter's capacity is the formulaic expression used, it would

<sup>10</sup> Diod. 15.29.7 is definitely wrong in giving 200 triereis.

<sup>11</sup> In IG II 803, Köhler supplemented the archon's name (cf. 1622.437) as *Κα[λλέου (377/6)*, whereas Boeckh, *Urkunden*, Urk. X, p. 381, note, cf. p. 22 had restored *Κα[λλιμήδου (360/59)*.

<sup>12</sup> Clark 48-9, where, by way of example, he proposes the alternative restoration *Χ]αρι{α} κλ[είδου*, for the archon-name (363/2), and *ταμία[ς*, or perhaps *ταμία[ς κρεμαστῶν*, for Mantias' office, but holds (p. 49, n. 12) that whenever the inscriptions identify an official merely as *tamias*, the *tamias trieropoikon* is meant. Whatever its purpose, however, this example is quite odd: (i) in Charikleides' archonship (363/2) the *tamias trieropoikon* was Phanostratos Thoraieus (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1622.564-72); (ii) the only two certain appearances of the *tamias kremaston* ("treasurer of hanging equipment"), D.R.Laing, *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 341-2; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1629.464-5, belong to a year after the construction of Philon's *skeuotheke* which was to be used for storing "hanging equipment" (initiated in 347/6: IG II<sup>2</sup> 505 + Add. p. 661; IG<sup>2</sup> 1688, esp. l. 2); therefore, this office may be related to the new building.

<sup>13</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1607.60, 61; 1608.62-3.

indeed be hazardous to dismiss, on the basis of this alone, the possibility that he may be an official.

Second, the epimeletai of 353/2 had deposited into a storehouse equipment captured by Thrasyboulos. This they noted in their record by using the following expression: [Αἰχμά]λωτα τάδε παρελάβο/[μεν κ]εῦη καὶ κατέθεμεν / [εἰς τὸ] οἶκ[η]μα, ἃ Θρασύβουλο[ς] / [ἐκόμικ]εν (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1613.268-71). The verbs κατατίθημι and παρατίθημι can be used synonymously to mean "deposit" (LSJ s.v. παρατίθημι [6], cf. also παρακατατίθημι, conveying the same meaning). So, the explanation why the liability of some persons to surrender ship's equipment, in 1604 and elsewhere, is described with the expression *dei paratheinai* instead of the usual *dei paradounai* may be sought not in the capacity of such debtors, but in the specific manner they had to discharge their obligation: i.e. to place in the dockyards equipment in their possession.<sup>14</sup> Although there is no solid evidence to suggest that Mantias' debts in 1604 accrued while he was trierarch (Clark 50), I concede that one of his two obligations could have been incurred during a trierarchy; of which year it remains unknown.<sup>15</sup>

Two other known office-holders are listed as trierarchs in 1604: Philinos Phlyeus (lines 29-30) was treasurer of Athena in 377/6 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1410.2-3; 1411.7-8); Kallibios Paianieus (lines 87-8) was secretary of the boule and thus a member of that body in 378/7 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 43.2-3). So, the first excludes 377/6, the second 378/7 as the year of 1604, provided we can establish that trierarchic service and office-holding were impracticable with the same year. Admittedly, we have no evidence to show whether officials became automatically exempt from the trierarchy, even though one may expect some archai to have been debarred from sailing as active trierarchs.<sup>16</sup> It may be useful to note that, although there are many trierarchs among the office-holders registered in R.Develins' Athenian Officials 648-321 B.C. (Cambridge, 1989), I have not encountered a single individual whose trierarchy and tenure as arche can be securely attested within the same year.

<sup>14</sup> For similar instances see V.Gabrielsen, "IG II<sup>2</sup> 1609 and Eispheora Payments in Kind?", ZPE 79 (1989) 93-99.

<sup>15</sup> The assignment of a newly attested trierarchy of Mantias' to 379 (Clark 54-5) cannot but be arbitrary as long it remains uncertain whether the festival of the Great Delia had become quadrennial before 375/4; see the inscription reported by O.Alexandri, AD 25 B, 2 (1970) 60 and pl. 56a (dated to shortly before 377, cf. D.M.Lewis apud Clark 54), together with IG II<sup>2</sup> 1635 (= Tod 125) 34-5, relating to 375/4; on the festival see J.Coupry, *Inscriptions de Délos, VII: Période de l'amphictyonie attico-délienne. Actes administratifs, Nos 89-104-33* (Paris, 1972), p. 43. Since Mantias' debt in 1604.9-10 concerns a ship which was unallotted in the year of our inscription, it may stem from a trierarchy performed in the previous year. Confirmation that his newly attested trierarchy really belongs to 379/8, then, would furnish one more indication that 1604 is the record of 378/7.

<sup>16</sup> P.J.Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristoteleian Athenaiion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), p. 682. Dem. 28 says that only the 9 archons were exempt, but from that speech it appears that he talks about the grant of honorific exemption; Dem. 14.16 says that those exempt from the trierarchy are orphans, epikleroi, the property of cleruch and corporations, and adynatoi; for the meaning of adynatoi see V.Gabrielsen, "Trierarchic Symmories", C&M 41 (1990) 105-6; cf. E.Ruschenbusch, "Symmorienprobleme", ZPE 69 (1987) 75-81.

However, there are two serious obstacles. First, all those enjoying exemption from the liturgies could, and some did, disregard their privilege. This is true of permanent, honorific *ateleia*,<sup>17</sup> as well as of temporary respite allowed to men who had just performed a service or who fulfilled a number of other criteria.<sup>18</sup> Second, all trierarchs were permitted to transfer their active duty to a contractor (*misthosis trierarchias*), an arrangement which enabled even men far above the age-limit for military service to undertake a trierarchy.<sup>19</sup>

Neither a trierarchy nor an *arche* need require a man's personal involvement throughout the year. An illustration of how someone could attend to both duties simultaneously is offered by the case of Meidias, who in 348 discharged a voluntary trierarchy while serving as cavalry commander. In spite of Demosthenes' attempt to discredit Meidias' conduct, it appears that Meidias commanded his ship in person when not needed in the cavalry and let the Egyptian Pamphilos in charge of it when he had to perform his duties as *hipparchos* (Dem. 21.163-7).

To conclude, then, the presence, in 1604, of Philinos Phlyeus and Kallibios Paianieus constitutes no firm proof that our inscription cannot date to 377/6 or 378/7.<sup>20</sup> Equally indecisive are the activities of Mantias Thorikios, whether as official or trierarch. Finally, the great number of unallotted hulls in 1604 is really only incompatible with Athenian naval activity in 376/5.

3. If the traditional date of 1604 needs to be altered, it may be done with reference to a different piece of evidence which points to the year 378/7 as a more likely candidate. The *epimeletai* who drew up our record noted that the Chian Antimachos had in his possession the *trieres Aphrodisia* (line 79). The same person is mentioned again in a fragmentary inscription preserving the last part of a decree, very probably about an alliance with Thebes, followed by a rider (IG II<sup>2</sup> 40 + Add. p. 657). On the basis of the latter document and of Antimachos' nationality, it is correctly inferred that he cannot have been in charge of the *trieres Aphrodisia* as Athenian trierarch.<sup>21</sup> Probably, he had acted as an intermediary in the negotiations taking place prior to the establishment of alliances in 378/7 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 43; Tod 123) - perhaps, as Clark 54 suggests, one of the *syndroi* of the allies.

---

<sup>17</sup> Dem. 20.44: some enjoy their privilege nominally; Chabrias disregarded the *ateleia* bestowed on him after his victory at Naxos (376/5): Dem. 20.75, 84-5, 146 with 21.64.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Lys. 21.1-5: the speaker says that he would not have spent a quarter of the amount he did spend on liturgies, if he had confined his services to what was required by law. Cf. also Ps.-Xen. Ath.Pol. iii.4; Lys. 19.29; Isae. 5.41; 7.38; Dem. 14.16; 20.8; [Dem.] 50.9; for choregoi, specifically, see Ath.Pol. 56.3.

<sup>19</sup> Isoc. 15.5, cf. Dem. 21.80, 155, 163-7; [Dem.] 50.42, 52; 51.7-8, 13.

<sup>20</sup> J.K.Davies, *Historia* 18 (1969) 331, holds that Philinos was simultaneously trierarch and *tamias*.

<sup>21</sup> Pace J.Cargill, *The Second Athenian League: empire or free alliance?* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1981), p. 54, n. 10, of the persons mentioned in the rider only the Athenian Aristomachos is explicitly called trierarch, IG II<sup>2</sup> 40.8. Cf. also A.P.Burnett, "Thebes and the Expansion of the Second Athenian Confederacy: IG II<sup>2</sup> 40 and IG II<sup>2</sup> 43", *Historia* 11 (1962) 1-17, esp. pp. 5-6; G.L.Cawkwell, "The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy"; *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 47-60, esp. pp. 49-50.

We cannot tell whether Antimachos was involved from the very start in the diplomatic activity leading to the conclusion of the first symmachies, notably with Chios and Byzantium, now placed in early 378, or whether he also took part, soon after, in the negotiations concerning the membership of Mytilene.<sup>22</sup> All we can say with a fair degree of certainty is that his diplomatic services were rendered shortly before the enactment of IG II<sup>2</sup> 40. Lines 10-12 of this document, which, to my knowledge, all editors date to 378/7,<sup>23</sup> contain a provision to honour Antimachos by issuing an invitation to him to come for a meal in the prytaneion "on the morrow". It looks, then, as if after the successful completion of his mission early in 378/7, Antimachos had returned the trieres in his charge to the dockyards for his name to appear in the record drawn up by the epimeletai at the end of that year, 1604.79: "Aphrodisia, old. This ship was in the possession of the Chian Antimachos".

University of Copenhagen

Vincent Gabrielsen

---

<sup>22</sup> W.K.Pritchett, *CSCA* 5 (1972) 164-9 = SEG xxxii.50, tentatively identified by Clark 53 as the treaty with Chios; IG II<sup>2</sup> 41 = Tod 121: alliance with Byzantium. For the date see S.Accame, *La lega ateniese del secolo IV a.C.* (Rome, 1941), pp. 16f., 32ff., 27ff.; Burnett, *Historia* 11 (1962) 1-3, 16-17; Cawkwell, *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 47-56.

<sup>23</sup> See, briefly, H.Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, II (München, 1962), pp. 203-5, no. 255; P.Harding, *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome II: From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 46-7, no. 33; cf. SEG xvi.43, xxi.228, xxxi.62, and Accame, *Lega* 38-44; Cargill, *League* 52-6, 60, 105; Develin, *Athenian Officials*, under the year 378/7.

Diod. 15.28.4-5 has one Theban alliance: *συμμαχούντων τοῖς Θηβαίοις τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τῶν κοινωνοῦντων τοῦ συνεδρίου*, and then, after the raid of Sphodrias in spring 378 (15.29.5; Xen.Hell. 5.4.34), another one, 15.29.7-8: *προελάβοντο δὲ καὶ τοὺς Θηβαίους ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν συνέδριον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἴσοις πᾶσιν*, cf. also Plut. Pel. 14-15.1. On the nature of these alliance (and for a defence of Diodoros' chronology) see Cawkwell, *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 50-1, 56; Cargill, *League* 59-60.