

IOANNIS A. VARTSOS

LYCURGUS THE ATHENIAN AND HIS PROGRAMME FOR ATHENS

The most obvious place to begin a description of Lycurgus' programme is in the area of financial administration, for the one government office he is known to have held himself and to have continued to influence, was concerned with the *fiscus*, and one may guess that it was in large part through the control of funds that Lycurgus was able to put his stamp on the many several projects and programmes. He was also famous for increasing the state revenues, but unfortunately no more is known about how he spent money than how he raised it¹- or indeed about what the official powers of his office may have been².

What does seem clear is that the Athenians, in the critical period before the battle of Chaironea, created a special, super-office with extraordinary powers and tenure for a man in whose ability and integrity they had unusual confidence. Lycurgus probably took office as Administrator of the Revenue (*ο ἐπί την διοίκησιν*) at the time of the Great Panathenaia, just weeks before the battle, and at the same time the regular office of Treasure of the Military Fund (*ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν*) was assumed by Lycurgus' brother-in-law, Kallias of Bate³. It is probable, but less certain, that Demosthenes was elected as one of the ten Directors of the Festival Fund (*οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν θεωρικῶν*). It seems that the whole financial administration had thus passed into the hands of men who favoured the militant policy then being pursued.

This policy was completely reversed by the battle, but at the same time the men remained in office for the rest of the quadrennium. And Lycurgus, although his office was not renewable, nevertheless managed to have friends elected to succeed him, so that he actually administrated the city's finances for a period of twelve years, 338-326. From an inscription honouring Xenocles of Sphetos, one of Lycurgus'

1. Andreades 1933, pp. 376-378.

2. Cf. Meritt, pp. 2-4, no.3. S. Markianos (1969, pp. 325-331) has solved the vexing problem of Lycurgus' periods in office during his twelve years of financial administration.

3. Bernardakis 1893, 842 F, p. 175.6-19.

friends who succeeded him in office, one learns that the office itself was probably concerned chiefly with the *merismos* (the allocation of funds to those agencies authorized by law to spend it) and probably concerned also with the disposal of the Surplus (*τα περιόντα*) either for distributions or for projects. It seems likely that the Administrator's authority placed him above the Military Treasurer and the Festival Board, but it was helpful to have in these positions men who would be sympathetic and cooperative. What other prerogatives the Administrator may have enjoyed one cannot say, for Aristotle does not even mention the office, but it is safe to assume that he had *eisodos* in the Council (with the right to make proposals) and that he sat *ex officio* on the several boards, both regular and special, which disbursed state funds.

Although the title was new, the idea of concentrating the administration of all public resources into the hands of a single individual was not. In the decade or so prior to and just after the Peace of Philocrates (346), the Athenians had allowed Euboulos of Probalinthos, a man who like Lycurgus enjoyed a special reputation for honesty and ability, to control the public finances by channelling the Surplus through the Festival Board, and not to squander them on distributions, but to reserve them for many useful projects of defence and improvement⁴. The only difference was that Euboulos had spent money to make Athens strong in the face of Macedonian aggression but apparently had tried to avoid using this strength in a showdown, whereas in Lycurgus those who thought that Philip must be stopped, now or never found a man who was Euboulos' equal in integrity and ability and, furthermore was willing to expend all his own energies and all the resources of the state in a decisive struggle against Macedon. But the mere fact that the state had resources for war, and that in the panic which followed the news of the defeat, the Athenians judged their city able to withstand a siege, shows that Lycurgus' predecessors had been active in repairing walls, building ships, and even in securing the water supply which, despite Demosthenes' sneers, was surely a *sine qua non* for a beleaguered city.

It is ironic that Lycurgus, the advocate of a military action (as distinct from mere preparedness), should so soon have been forced by the course of events to adopt the more passive policy of his predecessor, and that by pursuing it successfully he should have achieved his lasting fame, while Euboulos should have been held responsible for the defeat at Chaironea because of his ill-advised strategy of meeting the Macedonian menace only in Greece and because he allegedly squandered re-

4. Dilts 1997, III, 25, pp. 199.1-200.9; cf. Cawkwell 1963, pp. 47-67.

sources and corrupted the citizens with festival distributions while Philip's victory must be credited to his own military genius and to the strength of his new-style army, rather than blamed on the pacifists. Furthermore, the soundness of Euboulos' projects (specifically those which had been suspended with the outbreak of the war) receives the highest vindication from the fact that Lycurgus included in his more extensive programme, i.e. when he resumed the repair and modernization of the city's defences, the storing up weapons, the construction of triremes, and the work on the naval arsenal and shipsheds in Peiraeus and the Telesterion in Eleusis.

If Lycurgus achieved a more noteworthy success in increasing the state revenues, it is to be explained by the fact that he was operating in a period of enforced and uninterrupted peace, while the smaller financial recovery under Euboulos' administration was achieved in a period when peace, even after 346, was only relative and hard to maintain. At any rate it must be remembered that peace, with all its promotion of agriculture, industry and commerce, was the essential ingredient of financial recovery, no matter who was administering the Fiscus, and that the task of keeping peace it was as much of a concern for Lycurgus in the years after Chaeronea as it ever had been for Euboulos in the years before peace, was the basic element of Athens' recovery, which also received a significant boost from the "stimulus of hard knocks". Nor should one omit to mention the benefits which still accrued to Athens from the excellent harbour, docking facilities and market buildings which had been built in the preceding century with the tribute of empire and from the trading and banking customs which had been established in those happier days and still continued to swell the income of Athens' new tributes Fiscus. But a great share of the credit goes to Lycurgus himself for his skilful economic and political exploitation of the peace through exercising the powers of his administrative position and of his own personal prestige. For the growth of the annual revenue to an average of 1200 T. over the twelve-year period did not just happen; and the differences between Lycurgus' administration and that of Euboulos were not just quantitative, but qualitative.

The first goal in the programme of financial recovery was to conserve what revenue there was and to see that it did not evaporate through inefficiency and useless distributions. The Festival Board did not after Chaironea recover the important functions it had performed. At any rate the Festival Board was officially divested of its broad powers by the Law of Hegemon (probably in 336/5), which may have gone further and regularized all the Lycurgan changes in the financial administration, which till then had been on a *de facto* basis. The efficient, centralized administration, planning on a quadrennial basis, eliminated the losses due to the inexperience

of annually changing boards, and Lycurgus indictments against wrongdoers, written “with a pen dipped not in ink but in death”, put an end to graft^{5,6,7,8}.

The second goal would have been to stimulate the growth of the peace-time economy. Lycurgus got the ball rolling by borrowing in his own name, but on behalf of the state, the sum of 250T. One should note the startling implication that the stock of Lycurgus and friends was higher than that of Athens herself. To ensure a steady grain supply it was necessary to have a care for the happiness and well-being of foreign corn dealers, and so one finds Lycurgus moving decrees to grant *enktesis* to Egyptian and Cypriot merchants so that they might build temples to and worship their native gods in Athens. Note how closely the economic motives are related to his abiding interest in religion. The founding of a colony on the Adriatic some ten years later is in line with the other commercial goals; the decree authorizing the expedition is typically Lycurgan in tone and was moved by one of Lycurgus’ chief supporters, Kepisopon of Cholargos; the name of the founder, Miltiades of Lakiadai, is significant in that it allows one to suggest that Athens was trying to replace the lost territories in the Thracian Chersonesos which had been colonized in the sixth century by a like-named oikistes. Not surviving are the *poletai* lists which might have shown the dip and recovery in mining activity which is attested by the “new cuttings” and “restored confidence” to which Hypereides refers in his defence of Euxenippos⁹. The imposition of “tribute” on the mining magnates, which Hypereides mentions in the very next paragraph, may have been nothing more than a temporary change in the law which would require mining lessees to include their mineholdings in their assessment (*τίμημα*) for the surtax (*εισφορά*)¹⁰. Could it be that Lycurgus was struggling with that seemingly ageless problem - how to increase the tax without stifling the growth of economic activity? He could (and did) continue

5. Dilts 2002-2009, vol. I, III, 29, p. 30.3-11 with scholia (Dindorf, VIII, 133); cf. Dilts 2002-2009, vol. I, XIII, 30, p. 164.18-p. 165.2. Likewise D’s snide reference to *τας ἐπάλλξεις ας ἐκονιώμεν* tries to believe very worthwhile work on the walls.

6. Cf. French 1964, p. 175.

7. Cf. Ziegler 1927, *Pericles* XII, 5, p. 15.17, -7, p. 16.6.

8. Cf. Tod 1948, no. 189, pp. 250-252 and Pecirka 1966, pp. 59-61.

9. Hypereides (Jensen 1963, 36.54) indicates that there was considerable activity ca. 330, but the *poletai* lists that chance has preserved suggest rather that there was a drop in mine leases under Lycurgus after a sharp increase under Euboulos; Crosby 1950, pp. 189-312, esp. 190.

10. Cf. Thomsen 1964, pp. 243-245; the mines were state property and untaxable, but the lessee’s mills and workshops were private property and, although they were usually exempt, could have been taxed.

the special ten talents eisphora levied on resident aliens and paid annually between 347/6 and 323/2 to help with the construction of the naval arsenal and ship sheds¹¹, but he could not increase and extend such taxes indefinitely without running into trouble.

Recourse was had to a cleverer method which went beyond pure economic policy and involved other access in the overall programme, such as the revitalization of civic pride, patriotism and religious feeling. The method was to persuade a wealthy man to assume responsibility for a specific project. He would act as supervisor and “angel” for the project, and, when the funds provided by the state proved insufficient to finish the job in a fashion commensurate with the new standards of excellence, he would make up the difference from his own pocket and of course receive public recognition for his generosity (*epidosis* as distinct from *leitourgia*).

This plan can be seen in operation in the great rebuilding of the walls which got under way on the motion of Demosthenes at the end of 338/7¹² and continued at least into the next year¹³. The fortifications were divided into ten sections and each section was made the responsibility of a single tribe. The tribe in turn elected its own supervisor who received ten talents from the state and became responsible for the finances of the project. Demosthenes provided 100 *mnai*a of his own¹⁴, and we may safely assume that he was not the only member of Pandionis who contributed either money or services and that Pandionis was not the only tribe to conduct its business in this way. By exploiting the recent fear, playing upon patriotic feelings and introducing the spirit of competition, Lycurgus (who appropriated the money) and Demosthenes (who introduced the bill and set the patriotic example) were able to finish considerably more wall than would have been possible under a typical public works project.

Other public projects which were carried out partially at private expense include the Panathenaic stadium and the temple of Apollo Patroos in the Agora. In the first case Lycurgus persuaded a certain Deinias to donate the property, a steep and useless ravine south of the Ilissos river and west of the Ardettos hill, and got the job done in time for the celebration of the Panathenaia of 330 through the generosity

11. *IG I 2*, 505, pars I, p. 214.1-30.

12. Dilts 1997, III, 27, p. 200.1-31, p. 203.12.

13. *IG I 2*, 244, pars I, pp. 112-115 concerns the walls of Mounichia and Hetioneia. The date 337/6 is based historically on the known activity at this time and epigraphically on the “*litterai aetatis Lycurgae propriae*”. The date is accepted by Maier 1959, p. 40, but needlessly questioned by Cawkwell.

14. Dilts 1997, III, 17, p. 195.1-9.

of Eudemos of Plataia, who provided a thousand yoke of draft animals for the work of levelling the ravine and bringing in the stone for the retaining wall (*krepis*) around the race course and possibly for the semicircular southern end, or *theatron*¹⁵. And in the second case when word came from the Delphic god, that the altar, which was to stand in front of Lycurgus' new temple of Apollo Patroos, then a building in the Agora, had to be covered with gold, Neoptolemos of Melite promised to do it¹⁶.

We now know that this wealthy and public spirited individual, in addition to his other well-known public services, was mainly responsible for the reconstruction, in his home domain, of the temple of Artemis Aristoboule, which had been built by Themistokles after the battle of Salamis to commemorate his victory¹⁷. The renewal of this little shrine in the third quarter of the fourth century fitted with Lycurgus' aims - it was a matter of great national pride. The private contributions of men like Eudemos and Neoptolemos were obviously an important factor in the success of Lycurgus' financial administration, and they were also an expression of faith in Lycurgus' integrity and programme, and one assumes that he had more than money on his mind when he came forward himself to move the decrees in their honour. The list of private contributors could be greatly expanded if time permitted.

A series of laws regulating religious expenditures, the primary purpose of which was presumably to insure that the sacrifices and cult practices could be carried out according to ancestral custom, made for more efficient, long-range budgeting of the central fiscus. By earmarking specific festivals, it was also guaranteed that the funds which had previously been frittered away through lack of regulation, would be carefully administrated and used for public functions. Lycurgus' own law which dealt with regulations for the festivals, the fund from the sale of the victims' hides, and the making of suitable cult vessels for the processions is well known, but the law concerning the Lesser Panathenaia deserves mention at this point because of the important new fragment which tells how the festival was financed¹⁸. Athens had recently acquired the territory and harbour of Oropos, including the shrine of Am-

15. Tod 1948, no. 198, pp. 278-281. Further economies were affected by transferring surplus armaments from Philon's arsenal to the board in charge of the stadium; *IG II2*, 1627, pars II, p. 236.382-384.

16. Bernardakis 1893, 843 F, p. 178.5-17. For the temple see Thompson 1937, pp. 77-115; for an illustration and discussion of the altar, see esp. pp. 110-111; for the date of the temple, pp. 102-104.

17. Threpsiades-Vanderpool 1964, pp. 26-36.

18. Lewis 1959, pp. 239-247. This fragment is the upper part of *IG II2* 334, pars I, pp. 138-139, *IG F* 271, pp. 258-260. Schweigert 1938, p. 295, no. 20 is also concerned with the management of a major festival; the mention of musical contest makes the Greater Panathenaia a possibility.

phiarao, and the lands had been parcelled out among the ten tribes. But a certain area called *Nea* (New Land) was reserved for leasing, and the income (amounting to 47 mnai was specifically set then aside for the Lesser Panathenaia¹⁹. The mover of the law, Aristonikos of Marathon, was a supporter of the Lycurgan programme both now and later when he was executed along with the other antimacedonians after the Lamian war. His father Aristoteles had moved the so-called “Charter” of the Second Athenian League in 378/7.

One last financial reform is worthy of mention in this brief survey. Athens was one of the latest mints on the mainland to strike a regular bronze coinage, and it was Lycurgus who at this time led the city to adopt a mature monetary system (and thus to conserve silver) by issuing a fiduciary coinage. Contemporary with the first series of Athenian bronze is a series with Eleusinian types and legend which reflects Lycurgus’ personal interest in the mysteries, and they were struck to focus attention on Athens’ one great Panhellenic festival and particularly on the celebration of 335, the first during Lycurgus’ administration²⁰. Perhaps used as a “festival coinage” these little bronze tokens helped bring home again some of the silver Athens was spending abroad.

The conduct of the Athenian troops at Chaironea must have suggested that the typical hoplite was in need of “repair” as much as any wall. Toward this end, and at the level where the effort would be most effective, an annual outlay of some 40 talents²¹ was budgeted for the ephebic corps to pay the expense of the ephebes, their leaders, trainers and equipment. The spate of ephebic honour decrees and monuments belonging to the Lycurgan period (in contrast to the one decree definitely known have been passed in all the years prior to Chaironea²²), surely indicates a new approach to the existing practices, whatever they may have been, concerned with the training of the eighteen and nineteen year-old youths for military service and citizenship. In order that they might learn to stand firm in the battle line and be obedient to their officers, they were not only taught the skills of handling weapons and drilled in hoplite warfare, but were also subjected to a programme of intensive indoctrination in patriotism. They were introduced to the religious festi-

19. Cf. Robert 1960, pp. 189-203.

20. Shear 1933, p. 246.

21. The amount, suggested by Ferguson 1911, p. 10, is a likely approximation derived by multiplying the estimated annual enrolment of cadets and officials by the per capita allotments mentioned by Aristotle (Kenyon 1920, 42. 3, p. XLII.13-23).

22. In 361/0; cf. Mitsos 1965a, pp. 131-136.

vals, many of which served to remind them of Athens' glorious past. The taking of the ancestral oath was made over into an impressive ceremony. The ephebic tribes were modelled on the actual tribes, with elected officers called *taxiarchs* and *lochagoi*, not just in imitation of the regular army organization but as a preparation for that part of the civil life and responsibility which centred in the tribe. It is possible that those who had held cadet offices constituted a kind of reserve from which to draw experienced candidates for the annually elected or appointed tribal officers; and they met together and voted tribal decrees to honour their officers and others who had been helpful.

Although the ephebes seem to have spent most of their first year in Peiraeus and most of the second in the frontier forts, it is tempting to associate the contemporary refurbishing of the Theseion in the SW portion of the Agora with some intent to provide an appropriate ephebic centre near the administrative heart of the city. This suggestion is based not only on Theseus' reputation as founder of democracy and as the Athenian youth *par excellence* but also on the close association of the Theseion with the building complex now identified as the Library of the Gymnasium of Ptolemy - a known centre of ephebic training in later centuries²³. But perhaps one should wait for the archaeological dust to settle before one conjectures too much.

The Lyceion had been the traditional muster point and athletic field for at least two centuries and possibly already had a gymnasium of sorts, but the Lycurgan buildings, with their landscaping and trees, must have transformed the old drill field and *dromos* into a beautiful park²⁴, and it is no wonder that Aristotle (who returned to Athens in 335) chose, probably with Lycurgus' encouragement²⁵, to open the school there. Certainly Lycurgus himself took special pride in these buildings, for it was in front of the *palaistra* that he set up a stele recording all his official acts to be an example to the young men who trained there²⁶.

23. Cf. Thompson 1965, p. 177; Thompson 1966, pp. 40-48. The building has also been identified as Heliaria; cf. Wycherley 1957, pp. 145-146.

24. Travlos 1960, pp. 90-92. Cf. also Vanderpool 1953-1954.

25. The facilities of the Lykeion are the only real link between Aristotle and Lycurgus. The latter was merely interested in education and was not enough of a philosopher himself to have been caught up in rivalries between Plato and Isocrates (he studied with both, Bernardakis 1893, 841 B, p. 170.12-24) or between Xenokrates and Aristotle; although he was a friend and supporter of the former (Bernardakis 1893, 842 B, p. 173.10- 842 C, p. 174.7), it was Peripatetic Demokles who defended his son when they were accused after his death (Bernardakis 1893, 842 E, p. 174.17-p. 175.5).

26. Bernardakis 1893, 843 F, p. 178.5-17.

The efforts to renew political faith in the *polis* and to revive patriotism and civic pride did not stop with the training of the ephebes. Lycurgus took punitive action against their elders who were guilty, at least in his eyes, of unpatriotic conduct: he condemned Lysikles, one of the generals at Chaironea, for his part in the disaster, and Autolykos the Areiopagite for having so despaired of the city's ability to withstand siege that he had sent his family away into safety; his speech against Leokrates, a citizen who had fled the city after Chaironea and had returned after eight years, in a sermon of patriotism which preserves, no doubt- the sincere convictions of the speaker, but it is a bit frightening to learn that he failed only by a tie vote to secure conviction. On the brighter side of the ledger one finds that Lycurgus himself and his supporters were generous in proposing honours to those whose actions showed them to have been public benefactors. They began appropriately with those who had given their lives in Chaironea and whose ashes were buried in Kerameikos beneath an imposing monument of fifth-century type by the tomb of the heroes of the fifth-century disaster at Koroneia²⁷ -in a ceremony for which Demosthenes spoke the *epitaphios*²⁸. Thereafter the Athenians proudly offered the sanctuary and special privileges, even as they had done earlier in their struggle against Sparta, to those allies and friends who had become victims of a promacedonian reaction in their native states²⁹. They commonly voted honours not only to donors of large sums, but to public officers and priests who had carried out their jobs in honesty. Such public spirited recognition of patriotic actions was as beneficial to the bestowers as to the receivers.

One of the major problems faced by a conservative democratic leadership which hoped to revive public spirit and patriotism was to encourage broad participation in the government while avoiding the excesses of radical democracy. The people had to have some stake in the polity (other than the distributions and pay for attending courts and assemblies) if they were to become willing to support it and to make sacrifices for it. Aristotles' account of the Athenian policy during the Lycurgan period describes just such a broad based democracy;³⁰ and the many contrasts he draws between former and contemporary practices show that he knew of many

27. Bradeen 1964, pp. 55-58, n. 16. For the epigram see Tod 1948, no. 176, p. 223.

28. Dils 2002-2009, vol. I, XVII, 285, p. 306.4-289, p. 307.26. The preserved *Epitaphios* (Dils 2002-2009, vol. IV, LX, pp. 339-350) has been despised since antiquity, but its authenticity has been defended in modern times; cf. Lesky 1966, p. 605.

29. Cf. Tod 1948, no. 178, pp. 231-234.

30. Kenyon 1920, 42, p. XLI, 24-69, p. LXVIII.23.

changes which had taken place since the restoration of democracy in 403, some of which were surely Lycurgan. Without knowing why Aristotle failed to identify the reforms he mentions and failed even to mention still others, attention may be called to certain minor changes in governmental procedures, the purpose of which seems to have been to broaden participation -and hence to increase interest and to share honour and responsibility- in the operations of the government. The shift from expensive bronze dicastes tickets (*pinakia*) to cheap ones of boxwood, which took place ca. 330³¹, was probably a move to make it easier for citizens to participate in jury service.

The most common place of Assembly during the Lycurgan period was probably the theatre of Dionysus on the south slope of the Akropolis, and Lycurgus himself is generally given the credit for extending and building the stone auditorium, much of which remains in place³². The front row of thrones, if they are not Lycurgan, are at least faithful copies of fourth-century originals. The stone stage building doubled as a platform for orators, and Aischines, at least, must have felt at home. Behind and below the stage building appeared a stoa for the comfort of Assemblymen and theatre-goers alike. The theatre was also the scene of the impressive ceremony in which the epebes, at the end of their first year of training, passed in review and received their "sacred arms". It is difficult to think of a better example of the interlocking purpose of the several facets of the overall programme encouraging the citizens to participate in political, religious and cultural activities, providing an impressive spectacle which involved the youngest year class and furnishing gainful employment for the building trades.

But this was not the end of Lycurgus' plans to encourage the active participation of all the citizens in making public decisions. Archaeology has disclosed a grandiose scheme, begun late and never finished, to remodel and enlarge the Pnyx. The auditorium itself was extended to seat more people more comfortably; two large stoas were started on the terrace above the auditorium and faced it; they would have provided shelter from the sun and rain, and shops to sell food and drink; thus they would have been a great convenience to those who came in from some distance to attend the meetings. These stoas were the first of such great size to be started in Athens and may have expressed a competitive response to the great south stoa built in Korinth by Philip and Alexander for meetings of their League. The whole complex was centered on a large altar directly above and behind the speaker; platform

31. Dow 1963, pp. 653-687; cf. Kenyon 1920, 63.4, p. LXII.24-28. See also Kroll 1968.

32. Pickard-Cambridge 1946, pp. 134-174.

(bema), so that the meetings would be under the protection of the god³³.

A few years later it appeared that what Lycurgus had done or begun for the benefit of those who attended the Assembly he had also tried to do for the jurors who sat all day in the law courts. The building complex at the SW corner of the Agora was labelled Heliäia and the cloister-like building known as the Square Peristyle was associated with the law courts on the basis of the bronze ballots found amid the ruins of the Peristyle's predecessor on the same site. Both these structures had undergone enlargement and remodelling which was dated archaeologically to the second half of the fourth century and associated with the Lycurgan building programme. The Heliäia has been replaced by the Theseum and the Square Peristyle is being identified as the Leokorion, a shrine to the legendary daughters of Leos who gave their lives to save the city in a time of peril. Their sacrifice was a popular subject in Lycurgan Athens and was referred to at least twice in speeches³⁴. Their shrine was surely one of those holy places visited by the ephebes as they began their two-year tour of duty, and its refurbishing at this time is added to the programme to revive civic pride and patriotism.

Closely related to the programme of civic regeneration was a programme of religious reforms. It is hardly surprising that one of Plato's pupils should have believed that faith in the gods was basic to good citizenship or that, finding himself in a position of influence, he should have sought to bind men to their *polis* by making it a gain of their spiritual lives. Lycurgus' own deep religious involvement was inseparable from his devotion to the state and can be detected in his speeches, in his financial administration of specific cults, in his building programme and his personal participation. The material for discussion is exceedingly rich, but there is time to mention only the most important, that which is concerned with ancestral worship.

The most important cult, of course, was that of Athens Polias, whose priestess belonged always to the clan of Eteoboutadai, as did the hereditary priest of Poseidon-Erechtheus, which office was held by Lycurgus himself³⁵. Mention has already been made of the laws which regulated and earmarked funds for the Panathenaic festivals, so that they might be celebrated with time-honoured pomp and ceremony; and of the special commission elected to be in charge of making gold and silver processional vessels also saw to the restoration of the golden Nikai, and another board

33. Thompson-Scranton 1943, pp. 291-301.

34. Phokion, as reported in Diodorus (Vogel 1890, XVIII, 15.2, p. 340.18-24), and in Demosthenes, in his *Epitaphios* (Dilts 2002-2009, vol. I, LX, 29, p. 347.17-25).

35. Bernardakis 1893, 843 A, p. 175.19-843 C, p. 177.2 and 843 E, p. 177.13-843 F, p. 178.17.

made a recommendation concerning the restoration of a statue of Athina Nike which had been dedicated to commemorate naval victories ca. 425³⁶. Lycurgus himself was largely responsible for the construction of the Panathenaic stadium, which greatly increased the possibilities of spectator participation at contests. It was probably at this time that the small sanctuary and the altar, identified as belonging to Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratría, was built just south of the Royal Stoa in the Agora (emphasizing with cult worship the goddess' role as guardian of the purity of the citizenship)³⁷ and also that the newly cleared water-moat was designated Athena's own, thus placing the whole city under divine protection.

In a cave on the northwest slope of the Acropolis Pythian Apollo had seized Ion, the eponymous father of all Ionians, and hence the Pythian god was called Apollon Patroos by all the Athenians³⁸. His worship was re-emphasized by Lycurgus not only because he was counted an ancestor, but because his help was needed in deciding fine points in the religious reforms. His new temple, cult image and gilded altar in the Agora have already been mentioned and Lycurgus' special interest in the cult is attested by his going as one of the hieropoioi who led the Pythiastic procession to Delphi sometime after 330³⁹. It has been convincingly argued that the famous Akanthos Column in the Delphi Museum is an Athenian dedication of about the same time and that the three dancing maidens are daughters of Kekrops and Aglauros⁴⁰. Their roles in Athenian mythology and ritual are peculiarly appropriate both to Lycurgus' family interest in the cult of Erechtheus and to the Kreousa-Ion story. The emphasis on paternal Apollo, Poseidon-Erechtheus and other cult places associated with the old aristocracy on the north side of the Acropolis may have been something of a counterweight to that great building on the south side which was a monument to the ideals of Periclean democracy.

Another religious innovation of the time was the establishment of the cult of Demokratia. Perhaps since 403 the Athenians had annually celebrated the liberation of Athens and the restoration of democracy with sacrifices on the 12th of Boedromion⁴¹, but in 333/2 the Council of the Five Hundred, on leaving office, dedicated what must have been a cult image of Demokratia in the Agora -and in the

36. Cf. *IG U2*, 403, pars I, p. 168, which is probably Lycurgan.

37. Thompson 1937, pp. 104-107.

38. Dilts 2002-2009, vol. I, XVIII, 141, p. 260.21-p. 261.7.

39. *SIG3*, no. 296.

40. Bousquet 1964, pp. 655-675.

41. Deubner 1932, p. 39.

following two years the goddess received sacrificial offerings⁴². The deification of Demokratia was literally an expression of faith in a political ideal and at the same time a graphic illustration of the way in which Lycurgus thought that religious belief should be basic to the life in the *polis*. Although the cult was new, Demokratia herself was ancestral, since she had been introduced to Athens by Theseus.

Lycurgus's policies toward the sanctuaries of Eleusis and Oropos had more practical bent, which is not to say they were less sincere. The former was the centre of one of the oldest and most revered cults in all Greece, and the one Athenian Festival which attracted throngs of people from beyond the borders. The sanctuary was spruced up, and the walls were repaired⁴³ and work was pushed forward on Philon's portico on the west side of the Telesterion⁴⁴. These projects made the sanctuary more beautiful for the goddesses as well as for the visitors, and the latter were doubtless pleased by the addition of a horse race to the customary contests of the Festival⁴⁵. This ancestral custom of collecting first fruits for the goddesses was revived in time for the collection to take place for 329/8 and a tower was repaired to receive the offerings. This revival may have been partially a return to ancestral custom for its own sake, but it was also a religious reaction to the growing grain shortage and the income from the sale helped the expenses of the sanctuary during a very active year.

In the same year the Ploutonion, a small temple built in a cave to the right of the Sacred Way when one has entered the sanctuary, was given its finishing touches and marks a revival of the god's role not only in the enactment of the mysteries⁴⁶ but as a signal of agricultural wealth. At the Eleusinion in Athens Plouton was feasted as he reclined on a couch, by a committee of wealthy citizens chosen by the hierophant. Both the sacred feast and the renewal of the temple are probably to be connected with an oracular response to a question about the famine.

The cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos posed a problem not of restoration but of assimilation. Hypereides' defence of Euxenippos preserves an amusing picture of the complicated mess which resulted from Athenian efforts to integrate the land of Oropos by distributing parts of it among the tribes⁴⁷. Here it must suffice to point

42. *IG II2*, 1496, pars II, p. 97.131-132 and 140-141.

43. *IG II2*, 1672, pars II, p. 305.23-28.

44. *IG II2*, 1675, pars II, p. 319.

45. *IG II2*, 1672, pars II, p. 309.258-261.

46. Mylonas 1961, pp. 146-149.

47. Jensen 1963, 16, pp. 44-45

out that the god's reputation as an oracle was the basic cause of the trouble. The ancestral custom of collecting first fruits for the goddesses was revived in time for the collection to take place for 329/8 and a tower was repaired that could not afford to affront Amphiaraos by enquiring at Delphi about the ownership of the disputed territory⁴⁸, but recourse to divination by dream in Amphiaraos' own sanctuary only laid Euxenippos open to charges of impiety and bribery.

But in the affairs of the sanctuary itself the Athenians fared better. In 333/2 they crowned Pytheas of Alopeke for repairing the sacred spring and for furnishing it with a proper inlet and underground drains⁴⁹. In the following year they crowned the god for the care he had shown for the health and safety of the Athenians and others who had come to his shrine, and on the same day they honoured the noted antiquarian, Phanodemos of Thymaitidai, and those who had served that year as epimeletai who were to lead a sacred procession to Oropos and conduct a festival which included horse racing, stunt-riding and the usual athletic contests. Phanodemos himself served with Lycurgus and others on the board when four years later (329/8) this festival was actually celebrated⁵⁰. He had also legislated the sacrifices to be offered to Amphiaraos and to the other gods in the sanctuary⁵¹, and further had found funds, just as Lycurgus had done in other cases, to carry out the sacrifices. Unfortunately none of the extensive remains can be definitely labelled Lycurgan, in spite of the epigraphical evidence of building activity, and it must suffice to mention, as a measure of Athenian interest in the site, that at least one ephebic tribe spent enough time there to set up their class dedication in the sanctuary⁵², and that, sometime between 338 ca. 330, Meidias and Thrasyluchos of Anagyrous, dedicated statues there⁵³. The use of the demotic rather than the ethnic on these dedications shows that the subsequent erasure after 322 is eloquent testimony of the Oropian reaction to this latter-day Athenian imperialism. The Athenian occupation lasted fifteen years, but it was undoubtedly the most brilliant period in the history of the sanctuary thanks to Lycurgus' leadership.

Finally one comes to the most famous festival of all -that of Dionysos- and to what is, -for us at any rate- Lycurgus' most important revival. More important than

48. Cf. Hypereides' suggestion after the fact (Jensen 1963, 15, p. 44).

49. *SIG3*, no. 281.

50. *SIG3*, no. 298.

51. Cf. Rocha-Pereira 1973, I, 34.2, p. 81.6-34.5, p. 82.21 for a description of the cult practices and a list of the other gods.

52. Leonardos 1918-1920, pp. 73-100.

53. Mitsos 1965b.

the rebuilding of the theatre itself was Lycurgus' decision to preserve Athens' rich dramatic heritage by having definitive copies made of the works of three great tragedies and by requiring the actors to use these canonical texts⁵⁴. The Athenians were further reminded of their heritage by the bronze statue of Aischylos, Sophocles and Euripides which Lycurgus had set up in the theatre⁵⁵. He also put new life into the performances of comedy with a law which increased the number of actors eligible for the leading roles, while the institution of a choral competition the feast of Poseidon in Peiraeus must have stimulated an improvement in choral performances generally⁵⁶. The success of the policy of official encouragement may be measured by the number and magnificence of the choreagic monuments which were set up at this time and immediately afterwards, beginning with monument of Lysicrates (335/4) on the Street of the Tripods⁵⁷ and ending with those of Nikias and Thrasylos (320/19) in the sanctuary of Dionysos⁵⁸.

Next to his financial administration Lycurgus was most famous in antiquity for his building programme, and in modern times he has been considered the only Athenian worthy, from the point of view of the city with stately buildings, to be compared with Pericles. And yet, as we have seen, the programme did not exist merely for its own sake, as each project was undertaken for a specific purpose and was connected in some way with the defence of the city, its frontiers and harbour; the establishment of new cults and festivals or the revival of the old; the encouragement of attendance at public meetings and ceremonies; the training of the youth and so on.

The continual activity did, however, produce some general results. It created a need for all sorts of materials and services, and hence many jobs for the poorer classe; artisans and unskilled labourers, and it must have rectified the conditions to which Xenophon refers when he urges the restoration of temples, the walls and docks⁵⁹, and the sensible use of vacant areas within the city. The project on the Pnyx cleared away the slums which had encroached on that area by the mid-forties⁶⁰ and to some extent the programme removed the contrast of which Demosthenes had

54. Bernardakis 1893, 841 F, p. 172.10-22.

55. The famous Lateran Sophocles is considered a copy of the Lycurgan original. The statues of Aischylos and Euripides are discussed by Richter 1962, pp. 24-29. Lysippos' statue of Socrates which stood in the Pompeion was probably commissioned during the Lycurgan period.

56. Bernardakis 1893, 842 A, p. 172.24-p. 173.8.

57. *IG II2*, 3042, pars III, p. 46.

58. *IG II2*, 3055, pars III, p. 47 and 3056, pars III, p. 47 respectively.

59. Marchant 1925, VI. I, pp. 228-230.

60. Diltz 1997, I, 81, p. 42.1-82, p. 43.8.

earlier complained⁶¹ between the lavish splendour of private dwellings and the drabness of public. Under such an ambitious programme the Athenians must have felt that they were emulating their ancestors, of whom they were envious as well as proud competing with the Macedonian building of Corinth and Olympia, and simply catching up with other cities where stone theatres and large stadia had existed for a long time. Only if we stop to consider that Athens had completed no significant building since the Erechtheion and the temple of Athina Nike, can one duly appreciate the Lycurgan building programme; only by viewing the achievement of all the programmes combined can one appreciate the honour with which later ages, not just the next generation⁶² but well into Roman times, regarded the man who was mainly responsible.

In all this activity there is nothing to indicate that Athens was deliberately preparing to initiate a war of revenge against Macedon to recover her lost possessions. There is much, on the other hand, to suggest that under the strong and skillful guidance of Lycurgus she made the most of the unprecedented peace to recover her strength and pride and to renew those manifestations of vigorous public life which had in the past made Athens great, famous and admired. Military strength was only a part of the great tradition, and under Lycurgus' military preparedness was only a part of the overall programme, the other parts being pursued for their own worth. It was in part only incidental that all elements of his programme contributed toward military preparedness, in that they stimulated the patriotism and devotion to the state which made men again willing to make the personal sacrifices which were necessary if Athens was to hold on to what she had and resist further interference in her internal affairs.

In 323/2 the war started because of just such interference. As far as the Athenians were concerned their possession of Samos was an internal affair, and it had received Macedonian confirmation⁶³. Alexander's exiles decree was precisely the kind of thing they were prepared to resist if negotiations failed⁶⁴. They had been angered by the Harpalos affair which had shown their inability to grant sanctuary to a citizen and benefactor, and had blasted the political association, now benefiting from Lycurgus' steadying influence, which had been so effective in keeping the peace.

But the outbreak of war was by no means precipitous; they sought to negotiate

61. Dilts 2002-2009, vol. I, III, 29, p. 30.3-11 and XIII, 28, p. 164.7-30, p. 165.2.

62. *IG II2*, 457, pars I, p. 189-190 and *IG IP*, 3776, pars III, p. 179.

63. Cf. Vogel 1890, XVIII, 56.7, p. 400.14-20; Beloch 1967, p. 572.

64. Vogel 1890, XVIII, 8.6, p. 331.14-8.7, p. 332.1; Michel 1964, pp. 13-17.

and stalled for time while they looked about the allies who like themselves had grievances, and they watched with interest the deteriorating relations between Alexander and his officers, particularly Antipater. And as they inventoried the ships in Peiraeus, counted the money and arms of the Acropolis, and reviewed the year-classes which had matured since 338 and had been trained and indoctrinated more thoroughly than any classes before, it is no wonder that they felt confident of their own strength. The sudden death of Alexander only clinched the matter.

History has condemned the Hellenic war as a forlorn effort and taken Athens' humiliation as an excuse to characterize the Lycurgan reformation as an unsuccessful attempt to turn the clock back. But many an underdog has come out on top; and the Greek defeat at Krannon was not inevitable, but can be prescribed to specific errors in planning and strategy. The fact that Athens had once again stood at the head of a coalition of Greek states fighting against a foreign domination was far more important than the fact that they lost. The defeat at Krannon left no glorious tradition as had the victory at Marathon, but the subsequent characteristic readiness to strike a blow in the name of freedom, without carefully weighing the odds beforehand, and the tradition, even in the face of repeated devastations and penalties, of persistently supporting the weaker and therefore losing, side in resistance to imperial aggrandizement are not without a certain nobility. One need only recall the third century struggles of Athens against Antigonos Gonatas and Philip V; the city's support of Rome against Macedon, of Mithridates against Rome; its lucky choice of Brutus over Octavian and Antony over Octavian. For its resistance to the demands of the Byzantine emperor was punished by Viking mercenaries who left their runish marks upon the lion guarding the harbour⁶⁵; and modern parallels may be found in the Greek war of independence of 1821.

As for the overall programme, it cannot be discounted as ineffectual simply because of the military defeat or on the grounds that the reforms were not lasting. Although many changes were either wrought by later governments or imported from the Hellenistic east or Roman west, although many of the buildings were left unfinished or suffered alterations or destruction in later times, still the men of the Lycurgan period left a definite stamp both on Athens and on classical antiquity. It was they who first canonized not only the texts of the tragedians, but also the historical tradition of the preceding centuries, including such items as the ephebic oath, the oath of Plataia and the decrees of Miltiades and Themistokles, which modern schol-

65. The lion now guards the Customs House in Venice; cf. Arbman 1961, pl. 67.

ars find so difficult to reconcile with earlier documents. Their version of the latter are not without influence on the political theory of the Roman empire, where it passed into the western tradition⁶⁶.

Reference has already been made to the vitality of the *ephebeia*, and with it must be mentioned the philosophical schools which had equal vitality with semi-official encouragement and enjoyed an equally long run. One can not dismiss as a hopeless rearguard action Lycurgus' attempt to restore the democratic spirit and the worship of the ancestral gods, not if we consider that Athens longer than any other Greek city preserved her democratic forms, even under the late empire, and remained a bastion of paganism in an increasingly Christian world until finally her schools and her cults had to be destroyed by the imperial decree of Justinians.

Lycurgus was not only a builder, but restorer and in the best sense, a classicizer. He looked for what was good in Athens' past and sought to preserve it. For Athens he was the founder of the classical tradition, and if the tradition had not begun to crystallize under Lycurgus in the 330's and 320's, one may well ask when and under whom it would have had its start? One concludes the ready modern acceptance of Thoukydides' prophecy, concerning the fame which would accrue to Athens in later times because of her ruins, rests in good part on Lycurgan activity. But Lycurgus' values were not those of the materialistic historian; thanks to his efforts more was preserved than Thoukydides had imagined, and Athens is remembered for other reasons and her fame rests on foundations even more solid than those of her architectural wonders.

66. Cf. Olivier 1960, p. 164; Raubitschek 1964, p. 337.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreades 1933 = A. M. Andreades, *History of Greek Public Finance*, vol. I, (Cambridge-Massachusetts 1933).
- Arbman 1961 = H. Arbman, *The Vikings*, (London 1961).
- Bernardakis 1893 = G. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia*, vol. V, (Lipsiae 1893).
- Bradeen 1964 = D. W. Bradeen, "Athenian casualty lists", *Hesperia* 33 (1964), 16-62.
- Beloch 1967 = K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, Band III, (Berlin-Leipzig 1967, zweite Ausgabe).
- Bousquet 1964 = J. Bousquet, "Delphes et les Aglaurides d' Athenes", *BCH* 88/2 (1964), 655-675.
- Cawkwell 1963 = G. L. Cawkwell, "Eubulus", *JHS* 83 (1963), 47-67.
- Crosby 1950 = M. Crosby, "The Leases of the Laureion Mines", *Hesperia* 19 (1950), 189-312.
- Deubner 1961 = I. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, (Berlin 1932).
- Dilts 1997 = M. R. Dilts, *Aescinias Orationes*, (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), (Stuttgart-Lipsiae 1997).
- Dilts 2002-2009 = M. R. Dilts, *Demosthenis orationes*, vols. I-IV, Oxford Classical Texts (Oxford 2002-2009).
- Dow 1963 = S. Dow, "Dikasts' Bronze Pinakia", *BCH* 87/2 (1963), 653-687.
- Ferguson 1911 = W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens: an historical essay*, (London 1911).
- French 1964 = A. French, *The growth of the Athenian Economy*, (London 1964).
- IG II² = Inscriptiones Graecae vol. II: Inscriptiones aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora*, partes I-III, U. Koehler (ed.), (Berlin 1913-1935, editio minor).
- IG P = Inscriptiones Graecae vol I: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*, pars I, D. Lewis (ed.), (Berlin 1981, 3rd edition).
- Jensen 1963 = C. Jensen, *Hyperidis orationes sex cum ceterarum fragmentis*, (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), (Stuttgart 1963).
- Kenyon 1920 = F. G. Kenyon, *Aristotelis Atheniensium respublica*, (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis), (Oxonii 1920, reprint 1963).
- Kroll 1968 = J. H. Kroll, *The bronze allotment plates of 4th century BC Athens*, (Harvard diss. 1968).
- Leonardos 1918-1920 = V. Leonardos, «Ἀμφιαρείου ἐπιγραφαί», *AE* (1918-1920), 73-100.
- Lesky 1966 = A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, (London 1966).
- Lewis 1959 = D. M. Lewis, "Law on the Lesser Panathenaia", *Hesperia* 28 (1959), 239-247.
- Maier 1959 = F. G. Maier, *Griechische Mauerbaninschriften*, vol. II, (Heildeberg 1959).
- Marchant 1925 = E.C. Marchant, *Ξενοφώντος πρόροι*, in: *Xenophon Scripta minora*, The Loeb Classical Library, (London 1925, reprint 1962), 192-231.
- Markianos 1964 = S. S. Markianos, "A note on the Administration of Lycurgus", *GRBS* 10 (1964), 325-331.
- Meritt 1960 = B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions", *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 1-77.
- Mitchel 1964 = F. W. Mitchel, "A note on IG'IP 370", *Phoenix* 18 (1964), 13-17.
- Mitsos 1965a = M. T. Mitsos, «Ἐκ τοῦ Ἐπιγραφικοῦ Μουσείου (VII)», *AE* (1965), 131-138.
- Mitsos 1965b = M. T. Mitsos, «Χορηγική ἐπιγραφή ἐκ Βαρκίτζης», *AE* (1965), 163-167.
- Mylonas 1961 = G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, (Princeton 1961).
- Oliver 1960 = J. H. Oliver, *Demokratia, the Gods and the free world*, (Baltimore 1960).

- Pecirka 1966 = J. Pecirka, *The formula for the grant of Enktesis in Attic inscriptions*, (Praha 1966).
- Pickard-Cambridge 1946 = A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, (Oxford 1946).
- Raubitschek 1964 = A. E. Raubitschek, "Demokratia", *Akte des IV internationalen Kongresses für griechischen und lateinische Epigraphik (Wien, 17. Bis 22. September 1962, μνήμησ χάριν J. Keil*, (Vienna 1964), 332-337.
- Richter 1962 = G. M. A. Richter, *Greek Portraits: iconographical studies: a few suggestions*, vol. IV, (Bruxelles 1962).
- Robert 1960 = L. Robert, *Hellenica: recueil d'ipigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquitigreccques*, vol. XI-XII, (Paris 1960).
- Rocha-Pereira 1973 = M. H. Rocha-Pereira, *Pausaniae Graeciae description*, vol. I, libri I-IV, (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), (Leipzig 1973).
- Schweigert 1938 = E. Schweigert, "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis", *Hesperia* 7(1938), 264-310.
- Shear 1933 = J. P. Shear, "The coins of Athens", *Hesperia* 2 (1933), 231-278.
- Thompson 1937 = H. A. Thompson, "Building on the West side of the Agora", *Hesperia* 6 (1937), 1-226.
- Thompson 1966 = H. A. Thompson, "Activity in the Athenian Agora 1960-1965", *Hesperia* 35 (1966), 37-54.
- Thompson 1965 = H. A. Thompson, "The Sanctuary of Theseus in Athens", *AJA* 69 (1965), 177.
- Thompson-Scranton 1943 = H. A. Thompson-R. L. Scranton, "Stoas and city walls on the Pnyx", *Hesperia* 12 (1943), 269-383.
- Thomsen 1964 = R. Thomsen, *Eisphora: a study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens*, (Copenhagen 1964).
- Threpsiades-Vanderpool 1964 = J. Threpsiades-E. Vanderpool, "Themistokles' Sanctuary of Artemis Aristoboule", *ΑΔ* 19/A (1964), 26-36.
- Tod 1948 = M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical inscriptions, vol. II: from 403 to 323 B.C.*, (Oxford 1948).
- Travlos 1960 = J. Travlos, *Πολεοδομικη εξέλιξις τών Αθηνών άπο τών προϊστορικών χρόνων μέχρι τών άρχών του 19^{ου} αιώνα*, (Αθήνα 1960).
- Vanderpool 1953-1954 = E. Vanderpool, "The Museum and Garden of the Peripatetics", *AE* (1953-1954), 126-128.
- Vogel 1890 = Fr. Vogel, *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica*, vol. IV, (Stuttgart 1890, reprint 1964).
- Wycherley 1957 = R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora: results of excavations*, vol. III, (Princeton 1957).
- Ziegler 1927 = K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi Vitaeparallelae*, vol. I/2, (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), (Lipsiae 1927, reprint 1964).