

τῆς ψυχῆς verlangte, lag das Bild ja so nahe. So ist die Venusgestalt von der Kraft des lukrezischen Denkens und Anschauens ins Epikureische umgeformt, und insofern ist sie jetzt eine Gottheit, die, wenn überhaupt irgendeine, ein Jünger des Epikur preisen kann, — ohne sein Epikureertum aufzugeben. Venus wird zum Inbegriff des lukrezischen Denkens überhaupt. Und diesen Hymnus des Dichters soll nun der Philosoph Lukrez widerrufen haben? Er hätte seine eigene Philosophie widerrufen müssen, wenn er das Eingangsglied hätte paralisieren wollen. Der Epikureer Lukrez denkt und erlebt anders als Epikur. Der Hymnus auf diese so geschauten göttlichen Kraft und Gestalt hat seinen inneren Sinn am Eingang eines Werkes, dessen Verfasser T. Lucretius Carus heißt.

Göttingen

K. Deichgräber

---

## THE FIGHTING HELLENOTAMIAI

---

Sometimes it happens that two legal institutions — two different kinds of officials are erroneously intermingled and regarded as one by a sort of *contaminatio*. The German word is *verschmelzen*, but the process is known to all. Still you would not expect this kind of an error in the case of the Hellenotamiai who have been so closely studied ever since their inception as the ten treasurers of the Athenian Confederacy. Let us, however, test the Hellenotamiai for *verschmelzen*.

The Hellenotamiai are primarily known from two sets of records: the tribute lists and the records of hieratic military

---

*Placatumque nitet diffuso lumine caelum.* Dazu vgl. den homerischen Hymnus auf die Dioskuren 33, 14 αὐτίκα δ' ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων κατέπαυσαν ἀέλλας, | κύματα δ' ἐστόρεσαν λευκῆς ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι, dann Theokr. 22, 19 αἴψα δ' ἀπολήγουσ' ἀνεμοί, λιπαρὴ δὲ γαλήνη | ἄμ πέλαγος, νεφέλαι δὲ διέδραμον ἄλλυδις ἄλλαι. Die Verse des Lukrez führen aus, was in 2/3 über Venus' Herrschaft in den drei Bereichen Himmel, Meer und Erde gesagt ist. Erscheint Venus zuerst als die lebenspendende Göttin, so jetzt als die Göttin der γαλήνη. Zu I'8/9 vgl. III 23.

expense for the war. While this may be explained in a variety of ways, it is permissible, as the logicians say, "to draw the possibility". Now each kind of document lists, for the purpose of attaching responsibility, chairman, secretary, or the complete board, but at times we find an odd number (7, 8, 2 e t c.). Indeed, in one year 418/7, I hope to be able to show that there were 7 hellenotamiai collecting tribute and 3 fighting Peloponnesians — thus completing the full board of 10<sup>1</sup>). All this may be explained otherwise, but when one simple explanation, the division of administration, is sufficient . . . . .

Much more definite is the precise statement of Aristotle<sup>2</sup>) who reveals the oligarchic provision that the Hellenotamiai were to come from the 5 000. He then concludes with the statement that the Hellenotamiai who handle the tribute are not to consult with the Boule<sup>3</sup>). To Aristotle there are two kinds of Hellenotamiai: those who handle the tribute and those who do not. Only the latter participate in the deliberations of the Boule and he is amply substantiated by *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 63. No one should consider this distinction as a part rather than a modification of Aristotle's description of the constitution of the 5 000. Indeed, in *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 365 (and repeated in 366), we have the official names of the two kinds of Hellenotamiai: οἱ ἑλληνοταμίαι ἀπὸ στρατιᾶς and οἱ ἑλληνοταμίαι . . τοῦ συμμαχικοῦ φόρου<sup>4</sup>),

1) The mentioning of the full board of ten members in *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 220, 296 is as much a convention as the failure (*I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 191—200) to mention any at all. If *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 220 proves that there were ten hellenotamiai engaged in collecting the tribute then 191 proves that there were none. Boards of 7 and 3 are no convention and it may be that the records of 418/7 rarely or uniquely preserve the numerical distribution — while the officials may have exchanged duties.

2) XXX. 2.

3) *ibid.*

4) It is not impossible that the repetition denotes a difference between the funds and not the administrators, but this seems an insufficient explanation. The reference to *aparche* is not to be confused with the *aparche* which must pass through the hands of Athena's tamiai and is a much smaller sum. The tribute funds are separate from the army funds and this indicates the division of administration. But this separation is that of a part from the whole and the vote of the demos to expend the funds on the Acropolis did not apply to *aparche* which could be dedicated until protest. The financial hellenotamiai — not participating in the deliberations of the Boule — were not expected to spend money.



chonship of Kallias (406/5)<sup>7</sup>). Manifestly this is one of them.<sup>8</sup>). The Philippos of our document is the same tamias as that of II<sup>2</sup>, 1655 which consequently must also date in 406/5. This can be demonstrated in another way. The document mentions the ταμίαι τῆς Θεοῦ, a board no longer in existence in 405/4<sup>9</sup>). Consequently the latest possible date is 406/5. The document deals with works on the Erechtheum and so must date no earlier than 406/5 because all the earlier dates are taken up with other documents. *I. G.*<sup>2</sup>, I, 372, 373 in 409; 374 in 408; p. 183 in 407<sup>10</sup>). This leaves II<sup>2</sup>, 1654 for

7) I. 73. Andocides says that payments were due in the ninth prytany; the decree demands them by the end of the tenth. There is here no contradiction, but two points of procedure which I illustrate in a forthcoming number of *Hermes*. If payment is not made in the ninth prytany, very heavy penalty is imminent. But no one could ask that the debtor be deprived of citizenrights on the first day of the tenth prytany. The debtor had a prytany in which to make the payment that was regularly due in the ninth prytany. This piece of social legislation was not primarily directed for the advantage of accountants. The other point refers to the dating of documents in such overlapping periods as the Panathenaic and the Conciliar year might impose upon the Civil year. In a long financial history there is no proved example of the conscious insertion of a new archon's name or of any eponymous official in order to indicate the overlapping period which we and the ancients could detect only by incidental evidence. The distinction seems to be too academic to be Greek. Our modern difficulties are due merely to the very physical fact of fragmentary evidence; in antiquity it would have been an easy job.

8) I. 78. I speak of "supplementary reports" and „handfuls of gold" in order to embarrass the supplementary reporters whom I secretly despise.

9) I. 77.

10) This fragment (XXVI of *The Erechtheum*) clearly does not belong to any of the previously published records. This is proved by the character and content of the writing as well as the peculiar position it would have to occupy in the previous records. It is a record in the Ionic style; it belongs to the end of a record as the physical appearance and the contents of the stone indicate. Dinsmoor, *A. J. A.*, XXXVI (1932), 146 is very confident that the stone does not date in 408/7. I also agree with Broneer, *Hesp.*, II, 386 that the former's latest arrangement is not incapable of slight modification, but I do not see where the latter has found good reason for including this fragment with the accounts of 409/8, except that these, although written in good Attic, have an occasional Ionicism. I am also happy to acquire the support of Schweigert who is very clever and competent with this complicated material. Schweigert, *Hesp.*, VII (1938), 268 kindly notes that the dating of II<sup>2</sup> 1654 in 405/4 agrees with one of Dinsmoor's arrangements of the later Erechtheum accounts, but does not show that it disproves his latest arrangement. This dating of II<sup>2</sup> 1654 in 405

the first two prytanies of 405 when Aegospotami interrupted the work. Since the latter document is divided (Frgs. XXVII—XXVIII) into two parts, it admirably suits the year. And that's my story of the later Erechtheum documents.

Columbia University

Milton Giffler

## ZUR AMMONSOHNSCHAFT ALEXANDERS

Um den vielerörterten Zug Alexanders zur Oase Siwa<sup>1)</sup>, der durch U. Wilckens<sup>2)</sup> stark beachteten Aufsatz in den Berl. Sitzb. 1928 lange in den Mittelpunkt der Diskussionen gezogen war<sup>3)</sup>, ist es wieder ruhiger geworden<sup>3a)</sup>; das hängt

excludes II<sup>2</sup> 1655 from that date and does not permit (thanks to a new fragment) under any circumstances the dating of the former document many years away from the early records. The same men are working.

Since II<sup>2</sup> 1655 (406/5) mentions the treasurers of Athena and Andocides I. 77 (405/4) mentions the board (of Athena and the other gods) that took over the latter's duties. I suggest that the united board entered upon its duties for the first time in 405/4. The amalgamation may have been caused by the fire of 406/5 (Xen. *Hell.* I. 6, 1; *I. G.*, XII, 1977; II<sup>2</sup>, 1654). Dem. XXIV, 133 ff. also refers to the same event (Dörpfeld). Granted the fact, Demosthenes' reproach of the unamalgamated board is significant. My date for Καλλι and his culprits seems confirmed by *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 305, 7. The decrease of property in the care of the treasurers of the other gods at the end of the Peloponnesian War is a less sufficient explanation for the liquidation of the board than the burning of their only treasury, the Opisthodomos.

<sup>1)</sup> Arr. III 3—4; Strab. XVII 1, 43 p. 813 f. = Jac., *F. Gr.* H. 124, 14 (II p. 645 = Kallisthenes); Diod. XVII 49—51; Curt. IV 7, 5—32; Just. XI 11; Plut., Alex. 26 f. Vgl. Strab. VII fr. 1a; Eustath., *Comm.* in Dionys. *Perieg.* 211 (G. G. M. II p. 253 f.).

<sup>2)</sup> „Alexanders Zug in die Oase Siwa“, Berl. Sitzb. 1928, S. 576—603; vgl. ebda. 1930, 159—176; 1938, 299—302.

<sup>3)</sup> Die Hauptliteratur bei E. Mederer, *Die Alexanderlegenden* b. d. ältesten Alexanderhistorikern (= Würzburger Stud. z. Altertumswissensch. VIII, 1936) S. 37 f. Dazu noch G. Radet, *Mélanges Bidez* (= *Ann. de l'Inst. de philol. et d'hist. orient.* t. II, 1934), 779 ff., und im Rahmen der Gesamtdarstellungen: W. W. Tarn, *Cambr. Anc. Hist.* VI (1933), 377 f., 398 f.; R. Cohen in *Hist. Anc.* II (= *histoire grecque*) IV, 1 (Alexandre et le démembrement de son empire; 1938) [mir leider unzugänglich]. Die betr. Stelle in dem populären Buche von F. A. Wright, *Alexander the Great* (1934), 117 f. ist nicht scharf genug, um diskutieren zu können.

<sup>3a)</sup> Mein Manuskript war schon abgeschlossen, als mir Wilckens' Aufsatz in den Sitzb. 1938 durch die Güte des Herrn Verfassers zugeing.