



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Peter J. Rhodes

διοίκησις

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **37 • 2007**

Seite / Page **349–362**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/370/4978> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2007-37-p349-362-v4978.5

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

PETER J. RHODES

διοίκησις

C. SCHULER in a recent article studies references to διοίκησις or διοίκησις τῆς πόλεως and to officials ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει.¹ I agree with much of what he says, in particular that the term διοίκησις can be used with different shades of meaning in different contexts, and that we cannot automatically infer from its use that a state had a centralised financial structure or a budget. However, one point on which I think he is mistaken is his claim that sometimes διοίκησις denoted a particular treasury.²

I begin with Athens, which deserves a more detailed treatment than SCHULER provides. In the fifth century there was a central state treasury, into which revenue was paid by the *apodektai* and out of which expenditure was paid by the *kolakretai*. Separate from that were the sacred treasuries, in particular the treasury of Athena and from (I believe, but the date does not matter here) 434/3 the consolidated treasury of the Other Gods, into which some revenue destined for them could likewise be paid by the *apodektai*³ and out of which expenditure was paid by their own treasurers; and until c. 411 (when it was amalgamated with the state treasury) the treasury of the Delian League, controlled by the *hellenotamiai*.

In the fourth century the Delian League no longer existed. Instead of the central state treasury there were a number of separate treasuries for different institutions or purposes, and the *apodektai* performed a μερισμός, an apportionment of the revenue, among these in accordance with a law.⁴ One such treasury was the stratiotic fund (τὰ

¹ C. SCHULER, *Chiron* 35, 2005, 385–403. My thanks to Dr. P. W. FAWCETT and Dr. S. D. LAMBERT, with whom I was already discussing διοίκησις when SCHULER's article appeared, and to Dr. LAMBERT for his helpful comments on a draft of this response; also to Prof. SCHULER for his generous reception of my response.

² First claimed on p. 392 with reference to IK Prusa ad Olympum 1001: «eine spezielle Kasse». He does not believe that διοίκησις had that sense in fourth-century Athens: pp. 388–9. L. MIGEOTTE, *Chiron* 36, 2006, 379–94, argues that there was a tendency to centralise financial control in the cities of the hellenistic period; often there was a distinction between sacred and secular funds, with one man or board having overriding responsibility for each, and in larger and more complex states there could be, subordinate to these, lesser officials with more limited responsibilities.

³ IG I³ 84, 15–18; cf., from the period of the *merismos* in the fourth century, Agora XVI 75 = RHODES – OSBORNE 81, (A) 19–20.

⁴ Ath. Pol. 48.2, cf. P. J. RHODES, *The Athenian Boule*, 1972, 99–104. We do not know how long or on what scale monies might remain in the hands of the *apodektai* between their receiving

στρατιωτικά), whose treasurer perhaps by analogy with the other military officials was appointed by election rather than by lot; that seems to have provided a model for the theoric fund (τὸ θεωρικόν) and its treasurer, instituted (I believe) by Eubulus and Diophantus in the late 350's.⁵ The existing financial structure was not abolished (though an elected official with the title *antigraphus* does seem to have been abolished);⁶ but the theoric treasurer became a powerful man, partly because his treasury contained any surplus money which there was in Athens (previously surpluses had probably gone to the stratiotic fund, as Demosthenes wanted them to go later), partly because he was elected and could be re-elected, and he seems to have joined with the council in the supervision of the old financial boards such as the *poletai* and *apodektai*.⁷ The law of Hegemon in the 330's weakened the theoric treasurer⁸ – apparently by substituting a board of ten for a single man, by letting the stratiotic treasurer as well as this board join with the council in the supervision of the old boards, and by limiting tenure of this or any similar office to four years. A new post for a single man was created c. 336 (but is not mentioned in the Athenaiion Politeia, so we do not know what its institutional basis was), first held by Lycurgus, and apparently entitled ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει.⁹

it and their distributing it to the various treasuries, but in any case these were monies in transit rather than what we should normally think of as a treasury.

⁵ For arguments in favour of my view of the theoric fund and its treasurer see RHODES, *The Athenian Boule* (n. 4), 105–8, 235–40; the paper by D. M. LEWIS which I cite was published posthumously in his *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*, 1997, 212–29. Institution by Eubulus and Diophantus depends on Justin, 6.9.1–5, schol. Aeschin. 3. Ctesiphon 24 (65 DILTS).

Other treasuries which received allocations in the *merismos* included τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκόμενα τῷ δήμῳ (e.g. IG II² 106. 18–19, of 368/7) and τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκόμενα τῇ βουλῇ (e.g. IG II² 120. 21–2, of 362/1), the treasuries from which the assembly and the council funded expenditure decided on in their decrees; τὰ τριηροποικία (treasurer Dem. 22. Androktion 17 and e.g. IG II² 1622. 388–9, referring to 346/5); the treasury from which jurors' stipends were paid (cf. Dem. 39. Boeotus I 17).

⁶ Aeschin. 3. Ctesiphon 25: cf. below. The *antigraphus* listed among Athens' secretaries in inscriptions from 335/4 onwards is a different official: RHODES, *The Athenian Boule* (n. 4), 237–9. On *antigraphus* in the post-classical world, in Priene and elsewhere, see P. FRÖHLICH, in: P. FRÖHLICH – C. MÜLLER (edd.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, 2005, 235–6.

⁷ Ath. Pol. 43.1, 47.2 (referring to the time after the law of Hegemon).

⁸ Cited by Aeschin 3. Ctesiphon 25.

⁹ The title is used of Xenocles, one of the friends of Lycurgus who held the office after him, in Agora XVI 77. Lycurgus is described as ταχθεὶς ... ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει τῶν χρημάτων by Hyp. fr. 118 JENSEN = KENYON = 23 BURTT, cf. Hyp. 5. Dem. 28 with D. WHITEHEAD, *Hypereides: The Forensic Speeches*, 2000, 448–50. One of Lycurgus' lost speeches is cited in the lexica as περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως: Lyc. fr. 2 BURTT = V CONOMIS.

Lycurgus held the office c. 336–332 (RHODES, *The Athenian Boule* [n. 4], 235–7, following LEWIS, *Selected Papers* [n. 5], 212–29). I do not think we should infer from the stories of his deathbed *euthynai* ([Plut.] X Or. 842e–f: e.g. J. K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families*,

In hellenistic Athens the *merismos* seems to have survived in the form of separate accounts within a central treasury.¹⁰ There is no evidence for a post ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει between 321 and 307 (but we cannot be sure that none existed); there are references to a single man in that position between 307 and 261; there are references either to a single man (whom I believe always to be one member picked out for mention from a board) or to a board from 261 to 169;¹¹ from 229 to 169 publication of the assembly's decrees was paid for either by that board or by the stratiotic treasurer, and after 169 always by the stratiotic treasurer.

Apart from that office, there are references of other kinds to διοίκησις in Athenian texts. In a speech by Lysias we read that the council behaves well when it has sufficient funds εἰς διοίκησιν, but when it is in difficulties it tends to condemn men who ought not to be condemned.¹² Demosthenes in his speech Against Timocrates complains that Timocrates used the διοίκησις as a pretext for hasty legislation (but in fact there was no urgency, since there was nothing ἀδιοίκητον); and that Timocrates' law providing easier conditions for public debtors τὴν διοίκησιν ἀναερῆ τὴν θ' ἱερὰν καὶ τὴν ὀσίαν, or in other words τὴν διοίκησιν καταλύει. Demosthenes contrasts with that the existing law under which διοικεῖται τὰ κοινὰ satisfactorily, and when the revenue from taxes is insufficient for the διοίκησις additional payments are collected.¹³ The speech Against Neaera reports Apollodorus' attempt to invoke the rule that τὰ περιόντα χρήματα τῆς διοικήσεως should go to the theoric fund in peace-time but to the stratiotic fund in war-time;¹⁴ and other speeches in the Demosthenic corpus use

600–300 B.C., 1971, 415 cf. 351) that he was unable to hold it only for two consecutive terms and was appointed again for c. 328–324. In the first prytany of 329/8, at the end of the quadrennium in which (if my chronology is right) he was certainly not ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει, the Eleusinian *epistatai* and the treasurers of the Two Goddesses made a payment to their architect Λυκούργου κελεύσαντος (IG II² 1672, 11): either he held some other position which allowed him to give that order or recommendation (the meaning of κελεύειν is not always as strong as «order»: N.B. IG I³ 78, 33, where it is contrasted with ἐπιτάττειν), or else this is a careless expression of the fact that he was the proposer of a decree or law containing that order (at a later point in the same inscription payment was made for a sacrifice in accordance with a decree of the council which he proposed: IG II² 1672, 302).

¹⁰ Cf. RHODES, *The Athenian Boule* (n. 4), 109–10.

¹¹ Cf. P. J. RHODES – D. M. LEWIS, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, 1997, 38–9; RHODES, in: E. DĄBROWA (ed.), *Greek and Hellenistic Studies*, 2006, 36–7. That there was a board in democratic periods and a single official in oligarchic was originally argued by W. S. FERGUSON, *Klio* 5, 1905, 170–2; limited to the period before 229, FERGUSON apud S. DOW, *Prytaneis*, *Hesperia* Supp. 1, 1937, 13 n. 1. That view has been widely accepted: it and my doubts are noted by SCHULER (n. 1) 389 with n. 13.

¹² Lys. 30. Nicomachus 22.

¹³ Dem. 24. Timocrates 28; 96–8, 102.

¹⁴ [Dem.] 59. Neaera 4 (using the simpler procedure of a decree rather than a law because his ostensible purpose was to insist on what he claimed to be the correct application of the existing law).

διοίκησις of routine expenditure in non-state contexts.¹⁵ Aeschines says that his brother Aphobetus cared well and justly for the Athenians' revenues when he was appointed ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν διοίκησιν, that before the law of Hegemon those elected as theoret treasurers took over various offices, were responsible for various public works, καὶ σχεδὸν τὴν ὅλην διοίκησιν εἶχον τῆς πόλεως, and that Demosthenes as *teichopoios* had almost 10 talents ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως.¹⁶ In a similar manner to the last of those passages, Dinarchus claims that after Chaeronea Demosthenes had himself appointed as an envoy, scraping together 8 talents (ἐκ) τῆς διοικήσεως.¹⁷

Slightly different is the statement of Ath. Pol. that all but a few of the *archai* περὶ τὴν ἐγκύλιον διοίκησιν are appointed by lot but all the military officials are elected:¹⁸ in its context this must denote simply the regular administrative officials of the state, without any particular reference to finance.

In these texts, then, διοίκησις refers to regular administration in general, particularly to the funding of that regular administration, and sometimes by extension to the actual monies used to fund it – and texts can slide between the abstract sense of funding and the more concrete sense of the actual monies. The surpluses of the διοίκησις, with which Apollodorus was concerned, will have been monies left over after the prescribed *merismos* to spending authorities had been made, and the monies which Demosthenes obtained from the διοίκησις will have been monies allocated in the *merismos* (or by a new law which modified the *merismos* to provide for the expenditure of his particular office) for the duties which he had undertaken. Aphobetus may possibly have been the *antigraphheus*, who «every prytany gave an account of the revenues (πρόσοδοι) to the demos»;¹⁹ Eubulus was in charge of a particular treasury, but that treasury was τὸ θεωρικόν, and he is credited with more than the administration of that treasury. Similarly Lycurgus and the friends who succeeded him seem to have had the kind of general oversight of Athens' finances which is attributed to Eubulus, but there is no evidence to suggest that there was some particular treasury for which they were responsible. The one text which could be used to support the view that these financial officials were responsible for a particular treasury is a passage in which Hyperides alleges that Demosthenes might admit to having received some of Harpalus' money, and say that he had borrowed it εἰς τὸ θεωρικόν or alternatively εἰς τὴν διοίκησιν; but in the light of the other evidence I do not think this compels us to accept the conclusion that διοίκησις could denote a specific treasury, i.e. a specific col-

¹⁵ Dem. 45. Stephanus I 32, [Dem.] 50. Polyycles 12.

¹⁶ Aeschin. 2 FL. 149, 3. Ctesiphon 25 (some of the offices mentioned, such as that of the *apodektai*, certainly continued to exist; one which seems to have been abolished was that of the *antigraphheus*: cf. above), 31.

¹⁷ Din. 1. Dem. 80.

¹⁸ Ath. Pol. 43.1 (the list of elected civilian officials is not complete: for another see 54.5).

¹⁹ However, in RHODES, A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia, 1981, 516, I suggested that he was ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν.

lection of money in a particular place under the control of particular officials, rather than the generality of the state's funds.²⁰

What the formal powers of the men ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει were is in fact far from clear. For the men ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν we know of the treasury for which they were responsible and of their involvement with the council, as well as Aeschines' claim that before Hegemon's law was enacted they controlled the whole διοίκησις of the city; and we can say that directly by administering the treasury which contained whatever spare money there was in Athens, and indirectly by working with the council in financial matters, they did have considerable influence on the διοίκησις in the sense of the financing of Athens' various activities. However, for the men ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει we have virtually no information apart from the general claims about what Lycurgus and the friends who succeeded him achieved, in terms of increasing Athens' revenues and spending them on worthy objects. The office is not mentioned in the Ath. Pol. (perhaps because it was created not by a law but by one or more decrees),²¹ although it existed at the time when that work was written. By that time what was now a board ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν had been joined by the stratiotic treasurer in involvement with the council,²² but presumably not by ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει – so the new official was not concerned with the διοίκησις in that particular way.

But there is one hint in the decree for Xenocles. Vital to the fourth-century διοίκησις was the μερισμός, the apportionment of funds among the different treasuries for different objects of expenditure. We read of Xenocles that when he was ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει he ἐμέρισεν so that the Kerykes could sacrifice on behalf of the demos and the Kerykes. LEWIS argued that this means not that he had done what would normally be the work of the *apodektai* but that he had been reorganising the *merismos*.²³ I agree that if all he had done was make a payment in accordance with the currently prescribed *merismos* that would hardly be cause for honourable mention – and I should say that he modified the *merismos* to make provision for an appropriate payment to the Kerykes, either by some kind of executive action or, perhaps more probably, by proposing a law comparable to the law of Aristonicus which had provided funding for the Little Panathenaea.²⁴ The *merismos* was regulated by law, or by a series of

²⁰ Hyp. 5. Dem. 13, on which see WHITEHEAD, Hypereides (n. 9), 400–2: he does not conclude that there was a treasury known as διοίκησις.

²¹ Cf. RHODES, Commentary (n. 19), 515–6.

²² Ath. Pol. 47.2, 49.3.

²³ Xenocles: Agora XVI 77, 10–15, with LEWIS, Selected Papers (n. 5), 227–9: ἐμέρισε|[ν τὰ εἰς τὸ ἰ]ερά θῦσαι [τ]ὸ γένος τὸ Κ]ηρύκων ὑπ[έ]ρ τε τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθην[αίων καὶ ὑ]π[έ]ρ τοῦ γέν[ο]ς τοῦ Κηρύκων. The infinitive θῦσαι dependent on ἐμέρισεν in the text as restored is awkward, and the aorist θῦσαι ought to refer to a single occasion rather than to sacrifices performed regularly thereafter, but as the last of the texts cited in n. 25 shows a law could be used to modify the *merismos* on a single occasion.

²⁴ Aristonicus: Agora XVI 75, 1–25 = RHODES – OSBORNE 81, A. However, T. EIDE, SO 59, 1984, 21–3, suggests that in Agora XVI 77 we have an anticipation of the hellenistic usage by

laws;²⁵ and a man did not have to hold any official position to propose the enactment of a new law. Just as any citizen had the right to propose a decree in the assembly, on a matter placed on the agenda by the council, and before that the right, if he was not himself a member of the council, to ask for permission to address the council (which might result in a councillor's proposing a *probouleuma* in response to what he said),²⁶ so any citizen had the right both to propose in the assembly that there should be a session of the *nomothetai*, and subsequently to propose a law for consideration by the *nomothetai*.²⁷ However, it may be that among the instructions given to the men ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει when they were appointed was an instruction that they should make recommendations concerning the *merismos* – which would then have to go through the normal legislative process, but these recommendations would have the advantage that they came from the man who had been given that responsibility, and if at this time there was a regular schedule of sessions of the *nomothetai* (cf. n. 27) he might have been given the right of direct access to the *nomothetai* in connection with the *merismos*, without having to go through the assembly first.²⁸

For completeness' sake I note that, as in the passage cited from Ath. Pol., the word διοικησις need not always have financial implications: Isocrates sometimes uses it as a synonym for πολιτεία, as in his Panegyric when he says that he is championing a διοικησις which is πατρία; but on other occasions he uses it to refer to conduct of affairs or administration in general, and sometimes he uses it in its more specialised sense to refer to administration and its funding.²⁹

which μερίσαι is equivalent to δοῦναι, implying that Xenocles controlled a fund out of which he paid the money for the sacrifice. Dr. LAMBERT reminds me of IG VII 4253 (= SIG³ 287). 10–16, where Phanodemus is praised because he νενομοθέτηκεν for the quadrennial festival and the other sacrifices at the sanctuary of Amphiaraus – and this surely means that he initiated the legislation (cf. S. D. LAMBERT, ZPE 150, 2004, 109 n. 4, suggesting that there could be another instance of this in SEG 16, 57 [revision of IG II² 433]), not (as suggested by S. V. TRACY, Athenian Democracy in Transition, 1995, 45 n. 55) that he was merely a member of the board of *nomothetai* which approved the legislation.

²⁵ Cf. IG II² 222. 41–6 (dated c. 334 at OSBORNE, Naturalization, D 22), 330. 15–23, VII 4254 (= SIG³ 298). 35–41. See RHODES, The Athenian Boule (n. 4), 50 n. 1. It is not clear what procedural rules underlie the assumption that a decree of the assembly can order the *proedroi* to secure the appropriate additional (προσ-) legislation at the next meeting of the *nomothetai*.

²⁶ Cf. RHODES, The Athenian Boule (n. 4), 57, 63.

²⁷ Proposal in the assembly: if when laws could be enacted at any time in the year (Dem. 20. Leptines 91) the assembly had to order a session of the *nomothetai* (as suggested by Dem. 3. Ol. III. 10), any citizen attending the assembly should have been able to propose that; alternatively, we should perhaps infer from the decrees cited in n. 25 that in the Lycurgan period the *nomothetai* were appointed at the beginning of the year and had a schedule of sessions during the year. Proposal of law: Dem. 20. Leptines 93, 24. Timocrates 23; inscribed laws, like inscribed decrees, are regularly attributed to an individual proposer.

²⁸ I owe the suggestion of direct access to Dr. LAMBERT.

²⁹ διοικησις = πολιτεία, Isoc. 7. Areopagitic 58, cf. 4. Panegyric 41, 12. Panathenaic 153, 239, 15. Antidosis 232; administration in general, 1. Demonicus 37, 7. Areopagitic 11, 9. Evagoras 46,

Fourth-century inscriptions are compatible with the literary texts which have a financial reference. The grain-tax law contrasts the proceeds of the sale of the grain, which are to be earmarked for the stratiotic fund, with other sums, which are to be subject to *merismos* and are to go εἰς τὴν διοίκησιν. As in the literary texts, I see this as denoting not some specific fund but the generality of the state's financial administration: this new revenue is to be treated as the bulk of the state's revenues is treated, and apportioned among the particular treasuries in the ordinary way.³⁰ A fragmentary inscription of the 330's contains two laws concerned with sacred finances, at any rate the second proposed by Lycurgus: this second law includes the expressions μερίζεσθ[αι] (8) and ἐκ τῆς διοικῆ[σεως] (9), and there are references later to sacred monies including [τῶν ἱερῶν] χρημάτων τοῖν θεοῖν (14: Eleusinian Demeter and Kore) and [τοῦ]ς [ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημᾶ]των τῆς Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης (19).³¹ Here there seems to be a distinction between the sacred treasuries and the general finances of the state, but in those general finances the system of *merismos* among separate treasuries was still in operation, and there is still nothing to suggest that διοίκησις denotes some particular treasury. A fragmentary decree, in which Athens thanks Tenedos for lending money and promises not to exact further monies until the loan has been repaid, uses in a sentence which cannot be fully restored the adjective which we have found in Ath. Pol.: εἰς τὴν ἐνκύκλ[ιον διοίκησιν].³²

Literary texts with a non-Athenian reference, cited by SCHULER,³³ point in the same direction. The reference to Polydamas of Pharsalus in Xenophon's Hellenica distinguishes between τὰ ἱερά and τὴν ἄλλην διοίκησιν.³⁴ Aristotle's Politics can refer to particular areas or objects of expenditure as διοικήσεις,³⁵ and the administration of the state and its funding are called διοίκησις τῆς πόλεως in the Oeconomica and the Rhetoric to Alexander.³⁶

Fourth-century Athens provides a good starting-point, because of the amount of detailed information available; and it is possible, but we cannot assume uncritically, that the term διοίκησις will be used in the same way in other places at later dates. I now

12. Panathenaic 128, 130, Ep. 9. 4; administration and its funding, 7. Areopagitic 54, 15. Antidosis, 146.

³⁰ SEG 47, 96 = RHODES – OSBORNE 26. 51–61: contr. R. S. STROUD, The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C., *Hesperia Supp.* 29, 1998, 81.

³¹ IG II² 333, edited and discussed by S. D. LAMBERT, *ZPE* 154, 2005, 137–44 No. 6: line references are to his text of frs. cef.

³² IG II² 233 = RHODES – OSBORNE 72. 20. The σύνταξις of the Second Athenian League is mentioned in the previous line.

³³ SCHULER (n. 1) 389–91.

³⁴ Xen. Hell. 6.1.2–3.

³⁵ Arist. Pol. 6, 1321 b 31–3 (saying καλοῦσι δ' ἀποδέκτας τούτους καὶ ταμίας, but Aristotle need not be thinking particularly or only of Athens), cf. 1322 b 32; cf. also 3, 1287 a 4–8 (where English translators regularly overlook the financial aspect and refer simply to administration).

³⁶ [Arist.] Oec. 2, 1350 a 6–11; [Arist.] Rh. Al. 1434 a 13–15.

therefore review the hellenistic inscriptions from places other than Athens discussed by SCHULER.

He begins with the decree of an unknown state for Corrhagus. Among the benefits conferred by Corrhagus, he had obtained from a king *καὶ τὸ εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ πόλεως διοίκησιν ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ τοῖς νέοις ἔλαιον*, and because *πόλεως διοίκησις* is distinguished from sacred funding and the provision of oil both CORSTEN and SCHULER take that to be a particular treasury which provided the funds for particular purposes.³⁷ Certainly it is possible either to use *διοίκησις* in a broad sense, to include all the state's sacred and secular expenditure, as in Dem. 24. Timocrates 96, or else to use it in a more restricted sense, with sacred and perhaps other items filtered out into separate categories, as in Xen. Hell. 6.1.2 or the Athenian inscriptions RHODES – OSBORNE 26, IG II² 333. However, we should not jump to the conclusion that when special items have been filtered out what remains must be a single treasury with a title such as *διοίκησις τῆς πόλεως*: we have seen that it was not the case in fourth-century Athens, and it will not necessarily have been the case elsewhere. What remains is the generality of the state's routine expenditure, which may all have come from a single treasury but need not, and if it did all come from a single treasury that treasury need not be entitled *διοίκησις*.

In a decree probably of Clazomenae, when *ὁ ταμίᾳς* pays for presents to envoys *ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως*,³⁸ and in Magnesia, when the *οἰκονόμοι* make sacred payments *ἐκ τῶν πόρων ὧν ἔχουσιν εἰς πόλεως διο[ίκησιν]*,³⁹ I see the reference as being to the general funds of the state, but beyond the fact that the officials in question are able to draw on them it is not made clear how those funds are organised. In Teos there are *ταμίαι* who make payments in some instances *ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως* but in one instance (to pay for a statue of Antiochus III) *ἐκ τῶν τιμῶν τῶν βασιλέων ἢ ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως*:⁴⁰ the same treasurers have access both to the ordinary funds of the state and to an earmarked fund for the honouring of the kings. Some payments in Teos are regulated by a law: for presents to foreign envoys *τοὺς [δὲ ταμί]ας πέμψαι αὐτοῖς ξένια τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἐκ τ[ῆς διοικ]ήσεως*, and for envoys' travel *ἐφόδιον ταχθῆν ... ἐκ τῆς διοικ[ήσεως]*⁴¹ – but here I think SCHULER is right to conclude that the law in question is a law about

³⁷ «Both money for the sacred things and the city's *διοίκησις* and the olive oil for the young men»: IK Prusa ad Olympum 1001. 11–12 (2nd century), with T. CORSTEN in IK Prusa ad Olympum II (IK 40, 1993), p. 90, SCHULER (n. 1) 391–2.

³⁸ I. Magnesia 53. 70–1 (c. 208/7)

³⁹ I. Magnesia 98. 66–7, cf. 89. 84–6, 94. 9–11 (2nd century). On Magnesia cf. MIGEOTTE (n. 2), 388–9.

⁴⁰ «From the royal honours or from the *διοίκησις*»: SEG 41, 1003, ii. 19–21, 87–90; 62–3 (end 3rd / beginning 2nd century).

⁴¹ «The treasurers shall send them the presents stipulated in the law, paid for from the *διοίκησις*»: BCH 49, 1925, 305–8 no. 3 = SEG 4, 601. 14–16. «The prescribed travel allowance ... from the *διοίκησις*»: I. Magnesia 97. 25–7 (2nd century).

expenditure for that particular purpose, not a general law about the διοίκησις.⁴² In Syros διοίκησις is qualified by an adjective which we have found used of it in Athens: payment for inscription is to be made by a named treasurer ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνκυκλίου διοικήσεως, καθότι ἄν συντελέση ὁ ἐγδότης, «from the regular administration as the contract-placer shall accomplish».⁴³

Inscriptions from Andros are revealing. Several decrees of the third century or later order the treasurers to pay for publication ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς διοικήσεως, but one orders them instead to pay ἀπὸ τῶν προσόδ[ων τῶν] τῆς πόλεως.⁴⁴ I agree with SCHULER⁴⁵ that the two formulations refer to the same monies, with the emphasis on expenditure in κοινὴ διοίκησις and on revenue in πρόσοδοι; these are the funds available to the assembly, perhaps (as SCHULER says) but not necessarily distinguished from sacred funds; the funds may be in a particular treasury, but if so the name of that treasury is not κοινὴ διοίκησις any more than it is πρόσοδοι. We are indeed dealing with the state's routine expenditure, not with an overall state budget, but that does not mean that we are dealing with a single named treasury.

In Smyrna and in Erythrae there was a διοικήσεως ψήφισμα. In decrees of Smyrna the assembly was to decide how many days' travel allowance was to be paid to an envoy, and the ταμίαις was to pay κατὰ τὸ τῆς διοικήσεως ψήφισμα, while in another decree the payment for crowns was to be made by τὸν τα[μί]αν τῶν ὀσίων [ἀ]πὸ τοῦ ἐψηφισμένου διαφόρου εἰς τὰ ἀναλώματα, κατὰ τὸ ψή[φισ]μα τὸ γραφὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πορ[ι]σμοῦ – «from the sum decreed for expenditure, in accordance with the decree written about the πορισμός» – in a stated month each year.⁴⁶ PETZL translates πορισμός as «Beschaffung der Haushaltsmittel» (budgetary supply); SCHULER translates «Verteilung der Mittel» (apportionment of means).⁴⁷ My one-word translation of πορισμός would be «provision»: each year the decree about provision made a certain sum of money available for items of expenditure including the awarding of crowns, and I should guess that τὸ τῆς διοικήσεως ψήφισμα was that same decree, referred to in different words on different occasions. (SCHULER, however, sees the decree about the διοίκησις primarily as specifying the daily rate for envoys' travel allowances, though perhaps also as specifying the source from which such allowances were to be paid.) In a decree of Erythrae the generals in office for the second third of the following year are ordered to write ἐν τῷ [ι] περὶ τῆς] διοικήσεως ψηφίσματι from what source

⁴² SCHULER (n. 1) 393.

⁴³ IG XII 5, 653. 61–3 (1st century).

⁴⁴ E.g. IG XII 5, 715. 8–9 (3rd century); 714. 19–21 (to be dated not 4th / 3rd century, with SCHULER, but second or third quarter 3rd century: G. REGER, *Hesperia* 63, 1994, 309–21, who re-edits the text, cf. SEG 44, 699).

⁴⁵ SCHULER (n. 1) 393.

⁴⁶ IK Smyrna 579. 43–4 (2nd century); cf. 581. 68–71 (2nd century), 578. 31–4 (3rd / 2nd century).

⁴⁷ G. PETZL in IK Smyrna II 1 (IK 24. i, 1987), p. 24; SCHULER (n. 1) 394 with n. 37.

funds are to be made available to pay for an inscription.⁴⁸ Smyrna and Erythrae must have been engaging in an apportionment of funds comparable to but not necessarily identical with the *merismos* of fourth-century Athens. With what is prescribed in that decree of Erythrae we may compare three Athenian decrees which order expenditure and call on the *nomothetai* to make an adjustment in the *merismos* to provide for that expenditure: ἐν δὲ τοῖς νομοθέται[ς] τ[οὺς προέδρ]ους οἱ ἄν προεδρεύωσιν [καὶ τὸν ἐπ[ισ]τάτην προσνομοθετῆ[σαι τὸ ἀρ]γύριον τ[ο]ῦτο μερίζειν τ[οὺς ἀποδ]έκτας τῶι ταμίαι τοῦ δήμ[ου εἰς τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον.⁴⁹ SCHULER and I agree that there was an apportionment of monies between different funds or different objects of expenditure in Erythrae; I think it more likely than he does⁵⁰ that there was a comparable apportionment in Smyrna.

In Apollonia Salbace in Caria, when the public revenues (πρόσοδοι) were not being rightly administered but were being lost in an exceptional way, a man called Pamphilus proposed a decree to redeem the situation, and men were elected year by year to administer (διοικεῖν) each matter in accordance with his decree so that there should no longer be a deficiency.⁵¹ L. and J. ROBERT did not discuss the financial arrangements; SCHULER thinks of a new board created to plan and supervise the state's expenditure, and of a decree comparable to the ψήφισμα περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως of Erythrae.⁵²

Following L. ROBERT, SCHULER argues that, when there is an overall disposition of a state's finances, that is denoted not by διοίκησις (though he came close to believing that it was in the case of Erythrae, and I see no reason to rule out the possibility that the word was used in that sense in some places) but by other words.⁵³ For instance, in Miletus a board of ἀνατάκται performed an annual ἀνάταξις of the revenues to different funds (and in fact the verbs διοικεῖν and μερίζειν are both used in connection with their activities): τοὺς δ' ἀνατάκτας τοὺς διο[ι]κοῦντας τὰς τῆς πόλεως προσόδους ἔξαιρειν καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἐν τῇ ἀνάταξι στατήρας τριακοσίους ἀντὶ τῆς ἐσομένης ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων προσόδου καὶ μερίζειν ἐν τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν τῶν ταμιῶν ἑκάστῳ κατὰ μῆνα τὸ ἐπιβάλλον.⁵⁴ In hellenistic Athens μερίζειν, used in the

⁴⁸ IK Erythrai und Klazomenai 112. 12–16 (2nd century).

⁴⁹ «In the meeting of the *nomothetai* the *proedroi* who are presiding and their chairman shall have it additionally enacted that this sum of money is to be allocated by the *apodektai* to the treasurer of the demos for each year»: this quotation from IG II² 222. 41–6 (c. 334). Cf. n. 25, above.

⁵⁰ SCHULER (n. 1) 396.

⁵¹ La Carie II 167. 18–24 (2nd century).

⁵² SCHULER (n. 1) 397.

⁵³ SCHULER (n. 1) 397–8.

⁵⁴ «The ἀνατάκται who conduct the διοίκησις of the city's revenues shall each year separate out in their anataxis three hundred staters from the income which will result from the fund, and allocate the sums due in their provisions for expenditure to each of the treasurers month by month»: Milet I 3, 145. 19–23 (206/5). Cf. instructions to the ἀνατάκται in 147. 57–60 (211/0),

fourth century of the apportionment of monies between different treasuries, could be used of payment for an individual item, and in one decree that payment is to be made κατά τὴν διάταξιν.⁵⁵ In Delos, in its period of independence from the fourth century to the second, there was an annual διάταξις, in accordance with which particular sums could be made available for particular purposes: for instance, ἄλλον στάμνον, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνος καὶ Μαντινέως (sc. τραπέζας), ἐπὶ Δημάρου, Ποσιδεῶνος, ἔθεσαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ταμίαι Μένυλλος [καὶ] Φωκαιεὺς κατά τὴν διάταξιν εἰς ἀπόδοσιν τῶν δανείων τῶν ὀφειλομένων τῷ θεῷ παρὰ τῆ πόλει X.⁵⁶ There was an earmarked fund εἰς τὸ χῶμα;⁵⁷ there was a fund at the disposal of the assembly, presumably comparable to fourth-century Athens' τὰ κατά ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκόμενα τῷ δήμῳ;⁵⁸ the original διάταξις for the year could be modified.⁵⁹ The beginning of a decree from Sardis in the time of Augustus is formulated: περὶ τῆς δια[τ]άξε[ως τῶν] ε[ἰς τὰς θυσί]ας καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας προσεπευξημένων προσόδων, «concerning the disposition of the revenues which have accrued for the sacrifices and contests».⁶⁰

In other states, as in Athens, there could be a single official or a board with the title ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει vel sim., and SCHULER is right to insist that we cannot infer that the state had a centralised financial structure under the control of that official or board, but we need to examine all the evidence for the financial officials and structures of the state in question.⁶¹ In a decree of Cyme we find a ταμίαις ἐπὶ τὰς διοικήσιος, who is able to make payments from a plurality of πόροι, one of them being designated εἰς τὰμ φυλακὰν τὰς πόλιος:

--- τὸ δὲ ἀγ[άλωμα τὸ] ἐσόμενον εἰς τε τ[--- καὶ ---]
τοῖς πρεσβευτά[ισι] παρακαλέσαι τὸν ταμίαν Εὐῖππον προεισε-
νέγκαι ἐπὶ πόρῳ τοῖς πρώτοις πορισθησομένοισι εἰς τὰμ φυλακὰν τὰς
πόλιος μετὰ πρύτανιν Ἑρακλειδαν, τοῖς δὲ χρεοφυλάκας ἀναγρά-

150. 99–104 (185/4?). On the ἀνατάκται and other treasurers of Miletus cf. ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ (n. 2), 382–4: Miletus had a public bank, within which there were separate accounts.

⁵⁵ IG II² 844. 30–2 (μερίσαι), 66–7 (μερίσαι ... κατά τὴν διάταξιν) (217/6; 2nd century). For instances of μερίσαι in the early fourth century, when incoming money had to be made available immediately for expenditure, see RHODES, *The Athenian Boule* (n. 4), 100–1.

⁵⁶ «Another jar, from the bank of Hellen and Mantineus, in the year of Demares, in the month Posideon, deposited in the sanctuary by the treasurers Menyllus and Phocaeus in accordance with the διάταξις, for the repayment of loans due to the god from the city, 1,000 dr.»: I. Délos 442, A. 41–2 (179). On the διάταξις in Delos see C. VIAL, *Délos indépendante*, 1984, 140–3.

⁵⁷ E.g. I. Délos 399, A. 47 (192): τὸ περιγεγόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰς τὸ χῶμα ἐξαιρεθέντος («the surplus from the funds set aside for the jetty»).

⁵⁸ In IG XI 287, A. 8–10 (250), a list of sums deposited from various sources ends καὶ ἐξ ἐ(κ)κλησιῶν ΧΗΗ («and from the assemblies, 1,200 dr.»).

⁵⁹ I. Délos 442, A. 26–7 (179): εἰς ἀπόδοσιν τῷ θεῷ εἰς τὰ ὀφειλόμενα δάνεια παρὰ τῆ πόλει ἀντὶ τῶν ἀποδόσεων ἂν πρότερον ἐψ[η]φίσατο ὁ δῆμος («for repayment to the god, towards the loans owed by the city, in place of the repayments previously voted by the people»).

⁶⁰ L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 9, 1950, 7–25 (reign of Augustus): I quote lines 2–4.

⁶¹ SCHULER (n. 1) 398–9.

παι αὐτῶ τὰν πόλιν ὀφέλλοισαν τόκῳ ἔκτω· καὶ τὸν ταμίαν τὸν ἀποδειχθησόμενον ἐπὶ τὰς διοικήσεις ἀποδομέναι αὐτῶ τό τε ἀρχαῖον καὶ τὸν τόκον ἐκ τῶ πόρῳ τῶ γεγραμμένῳ.⁶²

Just as in Athens there are periods of fluidity in arrangements for payment, in Priene in the early third century we find payments made by two *νεωποῖαι*, by ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως, by one *νεωποῖης* and by one *οἰκονόμος*; and the variation continues later, including a plurality of *οἰκονόμοι*. I have suggested that there were regularly boards of *νεωποῖαι* and *οἰκονόμοι*, with one member of the board able to act as duty officer;⁶³ but none of the later texts refers to a board with either of those titles, and SCHULER may be right to claim that each title came to be held by a single official. In one text a *νεωποῖης* is instructed to pay from sacred funds, but there does not seem to have been a clean division between sacred funds under the *νεωποῖαι* and secular under the *οἰκονόμοι* / ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως. One first-century text shows a single man serving both as *οἰκονόμος* and as *νεωποῖης*.⁶⁴ Protogenes of Olbia held a particularly powerful position with regard to that city's finances for three years, presumably in an emergency: ἐπὶ τε τῆς κοινῆς οἰκονομίας καὶ ταμείας γενόμενος καὶ χειρίσας τὰς μεγίστας τῆς πόλεως προσόδους ... πλεῖστα δὲ χειρίσας τῶν κοινῶν, τρία δὲ ἔτη συνεχῶς πάντα διώικισεν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως, τοὺς μὲν λόγους ἐν τοῖς ὠρισμένοις χρόνοις ἀποφέρων.⁶⁵ Sometimes states in financial difficulties relied on subventions from a king in addition to their ordinary revenues. Thus in a decree from Teos, when a plot of land was to be provided for Dionysiac artists, 3,000 drachmae were to be paid immediately from monies already transferred from the fortification fund for corn-buying, and the remaining 3,000 drachmae were to be paid by the *ταμίαι* of the following year from the first instalment of the king's grant εἰς τ[ὴν τῆ]ς πόλεως διοίκησιν:

⁶² «The expenditure to be incurred for --- the treasurer Euippus shall be called on to make an advance payment to the envoys against the πόρος, to be set against the first sums which shall accrue to the πόρος for the protection of the city after the prytany of Heraclides, and the debt-guardians shall record the city as owing him interest of a sixth; and the treasurer appointed to be in charge of the διοίκησις shall repay to him the principal and the interest from the stated πόρος»: IK Kyme 12. 1-7 (2nd century).

⁶³ RHODES - LEWIS (n. 11) 386.

⁶⁴ Two *νεωποῖαι*, I. Priene 3. 22-4 (296/5); one ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως, 4. 43-8 (294/3); one *νεωποῖης*, 8. 45-7 (286/5), 4. 58-9 (285/4), and later 18. 31-6 (c. 270-262); one *οἰκονόμος*, 6. 27-31 (early 3rd century); plural *οἰκονόμοι* 18. 17-19 (c. 270-262). *νεωποῖης* to pay from sacred funds, I. Priene 17. 48-50 (after 278); one man holding both positions, 115. 7 (1st century). See RHODES - LEWIS (n. 11) 386, SCHULER (n. 1) 399, ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ (n. 2) 387-8; for the earliest texts I follow the revised datings of C. V. CROWTHER, Chiron 26, 1996, 195-250.

⁶⁵ «He was in charge of the public οἰκονομία and treasury and handled the greatest revenues of the city ... he handled most of the public matters, and for three successive years he conducted the διοίκησις of everything rightly and justly, submitting his accounts at the prescribed times»: SIG³ 495. 161-72 (c. 230).

τοὺς ταμίας τοὺς [ἐ]-
 [ν]εστήκοτας δοῦναι τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομένοις δρα(χμᾶς)
 [X]XX ἐκ τοῦ μετενηγμένου ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ὀ[χυ]-
 [ρ]ώσεως, ὃ δέδοται εἰς τὴν τίμην τοῦ σίτου· τὸ δὲ ὑπ[ο]-
 [λι]πὲς δρα(χμᾶς) XXX δότωσαν οἱ εἰσιόντες ταμίαι ἐκ τ[ῶν]
 [πρ]ώτων δοθησομένων αὐτοῖς ἐγ βασιλικοῦ εἰς τ[ὴν]
 [τῆ]ς πόλεως διοίκησιν.⁶⁶

The fact that there was a separate fund for fortification, in which there were on this occasion surplus monies which could be diverted to another purpose, does not mean as SCHULER supposes⁶⁷ that ἡ τῆς πόλεως διοίκησις was another designated fund: the king provided a grant towards the routine expenditure of the state, and that may have been kept in a single treasury, whose name we do not know, but alternatively it may have been apportioned among various funds by some kind of *merismos / diataxis*.

διοίκησις and the verb διοικεῖν, then, refer to the regular administrative activities of the state and to their funding, or in more concrete terms to the monies used to fund them – either to the totality or to what remains when particular activities and / or funds have been filtered out for separate mention. A decree περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως may embody an apportionment of monies between different funds or objects of expenditure, referred to elsewhere by terms such as μερισμός or διάταξις. An office (for one man or a board) ἐπὶ τῆ διοικήσει may well be one of the major financial offices in a state, but the position of that office with regard to one or more treasuries and to other financial offices must be determined separately for each state on the basis of the evidence. There may well have been states in which all the regular expenditure, or all except for one or two purposes, came from a single treasury, i.e. a single collection of money kept in a particular place and controlled by a particular official or board of officials, but the use of the term διοίκησις does not guarantee that that was the case, and there is no need to suppose that διοίκησις was ever a term which denoted a treasury of that kind or of another.

Addendum

After I had completed this paper I saw L. ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ, *Studi Ellenistici* 19, 2006, 77–97. His main point is that in the hellenistic period cities commonly did more to plan for expenditure on different objects than has often been recognised. In the course of his

⁶⁶ «The treasurers in office shall pay to those who are to be appointed 3,000 drachmae from the monies transferred from the fund for fortification, which have been made available for payment for corn; the remaining 3,000 drachmae shall be paid by the in-coming treasurers from the first monies to be given to them from the king's grant for the διοίκησις of the city»: SEG 2, 580 = B. LE GUEN, *Les Associations de technites dionysiaques à l' époque hellénistique*, 2001, I. 202–10 no. 39. 12–18 (3rd century).

⁶⁷ SCHULER (n. 1) 401.

discussion he studies many of the texts cited above and many further texts too; he notes such phenomena as the diataxis in Delos and the anataxis in Miletus, and adds the plea of Xanthus that it could not easily help Cytinium because, inter alia, its *oikonomia* had been fixed by decree for nine years (διὰ τὴν γεγενημένην οἰκονομίαν μετὰ ψηφίσματος εἰς ἔτη ἑννέα: O. CURTY, *Les Parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*, 1995, no. 75, 54–5).

Among the texts which he cites using the term *dioikesis*, he includes those of Smyrna and Erythrae which mention a διοικήσεως ψήφισμα. One text he cites which I had not cited is IG XII 2, 527, 46–59 (Eresus, 2nd half 3rd century; with restorations by A. WILHELM and L. ROBERT): sums of money are to be set aside each year for specified purposes «from the revenues» (ἐκ/ἀπὸ τῶν προσόδων), while payment for the inscription is to come «from the monies which are handled year by year for *dioikesis*» ([ἐκ τῶν] χει[ρ]ι[ζ]ομέν[ων] κατ' ἐνι[αυτὸν εἰς διοίκησιν χρημάτων]). ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ refers to this last as a «fonds». I think what we have here is comparable to such texts as the decree for Corrhagus (IK Prusa ad Olympum 1001) – the monies for *dioikesis* are those remaining from the revenues and available to be used for regular administration after special funds have been filtered out, and they may be, but are not necessarily, kept in a single treasury – and ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ's discussion on pp. 84–5 suggests that he would agree with that. In a decree of Teos which I discuss above, SEG 41, 1003, ii. 19–21, ΜΙΓΕΟΤΤΕ seems to take «the sum fixed» with «from the *dioikesis*» (pp. 92–3: «la somme fixée a partir de la *dioikèsis*»), but I think that, as in the texts which I cite in n. 41, above, ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως is to be taken with the verb of paying: «pay from the *dioikesis* the sum fixed» (cf. the translation of J. MA, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 1999, 314).

Department of Classics
University of Durham
 38, North Bailey
 GB-Durham, DH1 3EU