

# Selected papers in Greek and Near Eastern history

DAVID M. LEWIS

*Formerly Professor of Ancient History  
in the University of Oxford*

oooooooooooooooooooo

Edited by

P. J. RHODES

*Professor of Ancient History in the  
University of Durham*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
**UNIVERSITY PRESS**

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK  
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011-4211, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain  
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 1997

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1997

First paperback edition 2002

*Typeface* Adobe Caslon.

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Lewis, David M. (David Malcolm)

Selected papers in Greek and Near Eastern History / David M. Lewis;  
edited by P. J. Rhodes.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0 521 46564 8

1. Greece – Civilization – To 146 BC. 2. Middle East –  
Civilization. 3. Civilization, Ancient. I. Rhodes, P. J. (Peter  
John) II. Title.

DF78.L46 1997

938–dc21 96-399750 CIP

ISBN 0 521 46564 8 hardback

ISBN 0 521 52211 0 paperback

## CONTENTS

<i>List of plates</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Systems of reference</i>	<i>xii</i>
GENERAL	
1 Boeckh, <i>Staatshaushaltung der Athener</i> , 1817–1967	1
2 On the new text of Teos	7
3 The origins of the First Peloponnesian War	9
4 The federal constitution of Keos	22
5 The Athens Peace of 371	29
6 Preliminary notes on the Locri archive	32
7 Temple inventories in ancient Greece	40
8 Democratic institutions and their diffusion	51
ATHENIAN	
9 Public property in the city	60
10 Cleisthenes and Attica	77
11 Review of J. S. Traill, <i>The Political Organization of Attica</i>	99
12 Review of P. Siewert, <i>Die Trittyen Attikas und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes</i>	102
13 The Kerameikos ostraka	110
14 Megakles and Eretria	114
15 The Athenian Coinage Decree	116
16 Athena's robe	131
17 The treaties with Leontini and Rhegion	133
18 Entrenchment-clauses in Attic decrees	136
19 Apollo Delios	150
20 After the profanation of the Mysteries	158
21 Aristophanes and politics	173
22 Who was Lysistrata?	187
23 A note on <i>IG</i> i <sup>2</sup> 114 [= i <sup>3</sup> 105]	203

24	The epigraphical evidence for the end of the Thirty	205
25	The financial offices of Eubulus and Lycurgus	212
26	The dating of Demosthenes' speeches	230
27	Law on the Lesser Panathenaia	252
28	The Athenian <i>Rationes Centesimarum</i>	263
29	The chronology of the Athenian New Style Coinage	294
30	Review of M. Thompson, <i>The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens</i>	321
	NEAR EASTERN	
31	The Persepolis Fortification Texts	325
32	The King's dinner	332
33	Datis the Mede	342
34	Persians in Herodotus	345
35	The Phoenician fleet in 411	362
36	Persian gold in Greek international relations	369
37	The first Greek Jew	380
38	Review of J. N. Sevenster, <i>Do You Know Greek?</i>	383
	Bibliography	389
	Publications of David M. Lewis	400
	Indexes	
1	Index of texts treated in detail	412
2	General index	414

## PLATES

- |   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | Apollo Delios: <i>IG</i> i <sup>3</sup> 130, frag. b (Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford) | 151 |
| 2 | The epitaph of Myrrhine: <i>IG</i> i <sup>3</sup> 1330 (Epigraphic Museum, Athens)                       | 188 |
| 3 | The base of Demetrios' Lysimache: <i>IG</i> ii <sup>3</sup> 3453   | 192 |
| 4 | Law on the Lesser Panathenaia: <i>SEG</i> xviii 13 (American School of Classical Studies at Athens)      | 253 |

oooooooooooooooooooo

## *Boeckh, Staatshaushaltung der Athener, 1817–1967*

A venerated teacher, in whom the best of the Berlin tradition is still alive, once said firmly to me that he supposed that the essentials of the things that interested me had changed very little since Boeckh. I would not now endorse this view, and this morning I am neither fighting a campaign to encourage more reading of Boeckh as a source of information, even in Fränkel's third edition, nor advocating the sort of piety which led Fränkel to reprint all Boeckh's errors with warning footnotes. However, I do think that there are reasons to commemorate the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the *Staatshaushaltung*, particularly before an epigraphical congress.

We see in it first the first great example of *Alterthumswissenschaft*, an attempt to grasp and describe essential elements in the life of a people where there were no classical forerunners to define the scope of the subject. The general impulse to see ancient life as a whole certainly came to Boeckh from his teacher Wolf. His early works however do not make straight for this goal. In Göttingen, Schleiermacher had given him Platonic interests, and student poverty in Berlin made him, in a strange collocation, the tutor of the fifteen-year-old Meyerbeer, who wanted to learn Greek and Latin for the sake of musical theory.<sup>1</sup> Plato and musical theory produced an interest in Pythagoreanism, in itself and in Plato; and problems of authenticity, in Plato and the tragedians, also interested him in these early years. A nearer approach to universalism came as he started serious work on Pindar, though that also started from musical interests. At least by 1808,<sup>2</sup> he had formed his aim of writing *Hellen*, which would be the crown of his studies,

\* Published in *Acta of the Fifth Epigraphic Congress, 1967* (1971), 35–9 (Basil Blackwell).

<sup>1</sup> (F. W.) M. Hoffmann, *August Boeckh: Lebensbeschreibung und Auswahl aus seinem wissenschaftlichen Briefwechsel* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901), 11.

<sup>2</sup> The date from Thiersch's letter, *ibid.* 230, the definition, *ibid.* 35.

presenting the results of his investigations of the Greek people in as full a form as possible, and in 1809 he gave the first of those lectures which developed over fifty-six years into what we know as the *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, in which he defined the aims and principles of philological study. These lectures seem to have changed over the course of time in formulation rather than in essentials. He eventually adopted from Reichardt a definition<sup>3</sup> which pleased him and which he would have always assented to: ‘Die Alterthumswissenschaft ist weder eine Geschichte der Literatur, noch der Kunst, noch der Religion u.s.w. – solche Geschichten hat man schon ohne dieselbe – || sondern eine Geschichte des Volkslebens, das aus dem Ineinandersein und Zusammenwirken aller dieser Momente besteht.’

At least one friend was already warning him in 1808 that none of the data needed for *Hellen* had ever been collected,<sup>4</sup> and by 1815 the horizon had shrunk drastically. Serious work on *Hellen*, he wrote then,<sup>5</sup> had started in 1813, and he now realised that many, many years of *Vorbereitung* would be needed. He had begun with an investigation of Greek political conditions, found no satisfactory preliminary work had been done; all was in raw chaos. He therefore wanted to make clear to himself the different branches of political life and had got stuck on financial matters, without doubt the most obscure and where he found the least enlightenment available. In general terms this sounds reasonable enough, but other more specific reasons have been offered for his choice of subject. Sandys,<sup>6</sup> without giving evidence, gives Wolf’s prolegomena to his *Leptines* as an inspiration, and there obviously is a relationship, but the dedication of the *Staatshaushaltung* is to Niebuhr, who had already similarly broken new ground in his *Roman History*, and a letter to Niebuhr<sup>7</sup> claims that the impulse to the book came from Niebuhr’s companionship and observations that Niebuhr had made on Heeren’s views on ancient trade. This particular debt is not acknowledged in the text, and I confess to suspecting some exaggeration here. There is some evidence<sup>8</sup> to suggest that Boeckh’s brash enthusiasm had recently been irritating Niebuhr, and Boeckh may have thought tact in order. Since however this letter is the one which goes on to say<sup>9</sup> ‘Die Akademie der Wissenschaften ist und bleibt eine Leiche, und selbst der

<sup>3</sup> *Encyclopädie*<sup>2</sup>, 21.    <sup>4</sup> Hoffmann, *August Boeckh* 230f.

<sup>5</sup> To von Reizenstein, *ibid.* 35.    <sup>6</sup> *History of Classical Scholarship* iii, 98.

<sup>7</sup> Hoffmann, *August Boeckh* 209.    <sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 78f.    <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 211.

Magnetismus wird sie nicht auferwecken', a remark which I do not find in Harnack's history of the Academy, I am probably wrong to think that Boeckh was unsure of his ground with Niebuhr, and we should give his acknowledgement of debt full weight.

Boeckh created as much of a public stir by discussing what had previously not been discussed as Niebuhr had done by discarding large quantities of evidence which had been previously thought reliable. 'Als dies Werk zuerst erschien, war alles so neu, ging so weit über alles hinaus, was für irgendein Volk, irgendeine Zeit versucht war, dass die Bedeutung nur von ganz wenigen Philologen, vielleicht mehr ausserhalb der zünftigen Kreise gewürdigt ward.'<sup>10</sup> In England, for example, the book could be translated by G. C. Lewis,<sup>11</sup> who held a utilitarian view that the assembly of facts was an essential preliminary to a really scientific treatment of politics and morals,<sup>12</sup> with a firm preface to point out that Boeckh's economic ideas did not go beyond those to be expected of an educated Athenian of the age of Aristotle and that this had led him into several serious errors, but that the book was very useful all the same. Boeckh, who was sparing in the connections he made between ancient || and modern life and held a fairly straightforward view about the mere contemplation and understanding of Greek life being educational, seems to have been left unmoved by criticism of this kind, and the second edition continued, for example, to convert drachmae conscientiously into thalers and gröschen despite Lewis's protests at the uselessness of the process.

As far as philologists were concerned, Boeckh's friends and pupils were moved to veneration, but, as Wilamowitz implies, there was less reaction elsewhere. It is clear this demonstration of what *Alterthumswissenschaft* could do was meant to be read in Leipzig. The reference in the preface to modern philologists who confined themselves to *Sprachforschung* and had reduced themselves to *Silben- und Buchstabenkritik* is a clear reference to Hermann from a fortunate Boeckh who had not yet discovered that wide issues may sometimes turn on *Buchstabenkritik*, and a letter<sup>13</sup> shows that a

<sup>10</sup> Wilamowitz, *Geschichte der Philologie* 54.

<sup>11</sup> Lewis of course found Niebuhr's attitude to facts very peculiar; see Momigliano, *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* 249-62.

<sup>12</sup> Lewis to Grote, *Letters of the Right Hon. Sir George Cornwall Lewis, Bart to various friends* (London: Longmans, 1870), 159.

<sup>13</sup> Hoffmann, *August Boeckh* 234.

*tour de force* on Digamma at the end of volume II was meant for Hermann. ‘Ob freilich Hermann sich dadurch überzeugen lassen wird, ist eine andere Frage, denn er versteinert sich sichtbar. Ich wünsche, dass es uns nicht ebenso gehen möge.’ From the fact that errors in the text of the first Kallias Decree which Hermann pounced on nine years later were already present in the treatment of 1817, I deduce that Hermann at this stage did not bother much with the *Staatsbaushaltung*.

Mention of the first Kallias Decree leads to my second main point, the use of inscriptions in the book. Though Letronne was shortly to do something similar, I think it reasonable to claim the *Staatsbaushaltung* as the first book on a Greek subject which used inscriptions freely not as curiosities but as integral parts of the evidence. The use is natural, the approach is modern, their evidence is not much forced. Of course, as yet, they are not helping all that much. In 1817, for instance, one small fragment of the assessment of 425 was all that was known of the tribute-lists. But even in the main text inscriptions take their place as equals beside the orators and the lexicographers.<sup>14</sup>

This use as evidence is of course far from the only part inscriptions play in the book. More than a quarter of the first edition is taken up by the twenty-two *Beilagen* on various inscriptions. This is not the antiquarian operation that the publication of Greek inscriptions had previously been. The principles of selection are fairly rigorous, and Boeckh strives to keep the texts relevant to the book. Even the two closing non-Attic texts are in themselves not alien to *Finanzwesen*, though the commentary on the Orchomenian text spends most of its time in territory where one feels that the editor of *CIG* has taken over from the author of the *Staatsbaushaltung* and is giving a prospectus of the riches which lie ahead. The *Beilagen* should have achieved their purpose in showing that inscriptions were really worthwhile. ||

It is hard to evaluate the quality of epigraphic work done in 1817 and to forget that one now knows the answers or some of them. I would say that Boeckh did pretty well with these texts, if one excludes his basic tendency to treat the copy or copies as manuscripts. Given that tendency, many of his

<sup>14</sup> I am regretfully inclined to say that they take their place rather above the historians.

The Thucydidean revival had not yet really begun, but this hardly excuses Boeckh for having discussed the attendance at the Athenian assembly without noting Thuc.

viii.72, an omission which he did note in time for the addenda, or for concluding firmly that the charges of embezzlement brought against Pericles were justified in a passage which had to wait until the second edition for a citation of Thuc. ii.65 and a retraction.

corrections are good, even brilliant, and relatively few are very unfortunate. As he was to show in the debate with Hermann, he was prepared to suspend judgement and view without surprise the kind of Greek which might be put on stone. On institutions quite a lot went wrong for lack of evidence; no one could have deduced the existence of the conciliar year from the accounts he possessed. What I find really impressive is his general grip on the nature of the document which he is describing and how it fits into the general picture; this is sometimes very good. Speculation is well controlled, much better than in *CIG*, with only one serious exception.

Lastly we must consider the relationship of the *Staatshaushaltung* to *CIG*. By his own account, Boeckh had been working on the book since 1813. He found himself involved with inscriptions throughout; they were not only useful, they were indispensable. When he came to the Academy in 1814, it was natural that inscriptions should come to the top in a discussion of what the revitalised Academy should do for a liberated Prussia and a liberated Europe, and the drafts of proposal for the Corpus which were circulated in the spring of 1815<sup>15</sup> clearly owe much to the direction his interests had taken.

Kein Zweig der Altherthumskunde bedarf nicht ihrer Hülfe: die Inschriften enthalten wichtige Urkunden für die innere und äussere Geschichte der Staaten, ihre inneren Einrichtungen, Gesetze jeder Art, Privatverhältnisse und dergleichen, welche nur aus ihnen mit der möglichsten Vollständigkeit erkannt werden können. Ein Theil der Paläographie beruht auf ihnen; selbst für die Geschichte der Sprache sind sie von äussersten Wichtigkeit. Aber da sie in wenigen Händen sind, ist das Studium der Inschriften gegenwärtig von den Philologen fast gänzlich vernachlässigt, und die Inscriptionenlehre erscheint den meisten wie eine geheime Wissenschaft. Es ist einleuchtend, dass durch dieses Unternehmen . . . dieses Studium wieder ein Gemeingut der Philologen werden wird.

The path which has led from *Hellen* to the Corpus is clear to trace. Boeckh is still engaged in *Vorbereitung*. A Corpus would, after all, take about four years with plenty of help from colleagues.

We do not of course hear of *Hellen* again, and neither the Corpus itself nor its effect on Boeckh's later life fall within my subject. Momigliano<sup>16</sup> has

<sup>15</sup> (C. G.) A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1900), ii 375 n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> *Contributo* 180f., 384ff.

drawn our attention to his indifference to the ideas of his pupil Droysen and to the general lack of philosophical curiosity in his later correspondence, but no one would be rash enough to distinguish the relative parts played by age and inscriptions in the *Versteinerung* which he had seen in Hermann and feared for himself. I should however stress one rather surprising respect in which his convictions remained firm. However much attention he paid to inscriptions, || the founder of Greek Epigraphy continued to hold emphatically that their study was a means to an end. The preface to *CIG*<sup>17</sup> criticises Wolf for having made *epigraphice* the twenty-third of the twenty-four philological arts. Boeckh denies that it is an art or a discipline at all, since its subject-matter is not uniform. ‘Neque ullum in sese (habet), sed aliarum (servit) disciplinarum finibus.’ Posthumously, in the *Encyclopädie*, the line is much the same.<sup>18</sup> Epigraphy has no topic peculiar to it; it is impossible to define. ‘Sie ist daher keine Disciplin, sondern ein Aggregat von Kenntnissen.’ I do not find the attempt he makes here to include epigraphy under *Literaturgeschichte* at all helpful or convincing, but I am sure that it is good for us to be made to wonder from time to time whether epigraphy exists. Presumably it does, or we would not be here this week. As it falls to me to be speaking particularly early in the week, I will, if I may, extract two thoughts from what I have been saying. Firstly, it should be our aim not to be *eine geheime Wissenschaft*, and, secondly, we should all have our *Hellen*, individual or communal, that is, we should know why we came to be looking at inscriptions in the first place.

<sup>17</sup> p. vii.    <sup>18</sup> §102.