

**THE**  
**CLASSICAL MUSEUM,**

**A JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, AND OF  
ANCIENT HISTORY AND  
LITERATURE.**

---

**VOLUME THE FIRST.**

---

**LONDON:**  
**JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.**

**M.DCCC.XLIV.**

THE  
CLASSICAL MUSEUM.

---

XII.

REMARKS ON THE DOCUMENTS IN THE *DE CORONA*  
OF DEMOSTHENES.

[NOTE.—The following discussion was drawn up, in ignorance that several dissertations on the subject had already appeared in Germany, to which the present writer has not had access. Although it is much to be desired that the question should be further reviewed by one who has considered all that has been urged on both sides, this appears not to be a sufficient reason for suppressing a train of argument, which, however incomplete, rests on its own basis.]

IN the celebrated oration of Demosthenes which concludes, for us, his public career, we find a singularly large number of documents which appear at first sight very valuable. In all the other orations we are generally tantalized by naked words such as *Ψήφισμα*, *Νόμος*, *Μάρτυρες*, *Ἐπιστολή*, &c. ; and such, indeed, is the case towards the *end* of this speech likewise. At first, twenty-seven times in succession the records are present, and then seven times their places are vacant. It is useless to speculate on the causes of their sudden disappearance after so regular an appearance: yet we may seem justified in inferring, that it is not by any care of Demosthenes personally, that these twenty-seven have been preserved. For it is reasonable to believe that he could have secured copies of the last seven with equal ease: and we find nothing in their *subject* that would allow us to suppose that its inferior importance occasioned the omission of the documents. If he had himself embodied them in his speech, there is no reason why they should have been lost, more than any substantive part of the speech itself. The non-appearance of the last seven has, therefore, some effect in lowering the *external* evidence of the extant twenty-seven, as denoting that they have been inserted by a later hand.

If, nevertheless, the *internal* evidence were every way satisfactory, it would be credible that after the decease of Demosthenes one of his literary admirers endeavoured to complete his oration, by searching for the genuine decrees and letters in the public offices at Athens; and although we might still wonder why the search which had been twenty-seven times together successful, should then uniformly meet with a failure, which no internal grounds could have led us to anticipate; still the strangeness of the phenomenon would probably be insufficient to make us suspect the documents as spurious. But although the mere negative evidence of consistency might thus suffice to establish them, they have no external evidence of positive weight and capable of resisting objections founded on their contents. If we find them to be erroneous as to dates or facts, we must not try to save their credit by re-modelling our chronology and history, by tampering with their text, or by putting forced senses on the words of the two orators. Moreover, it will be conceded that they form in some sense a *whole* within themselves; insomuch that whatever should clearly demonstrate the spuriousness of one would, forthwith, cast a certain doubt upon the others: and if a large proportion of them were proved spurious, the fact would throw prejudice so strong on the rest, that no mere negative merit could save them from a common verdict: especially if those which we had failed of directly disproving, appeared to be screened from detection by mere emptiness or by remoteness from the sphere of our knowledge; while to forge them would have been an easy task to any grammarian.

Strong suspicion was long since directed against most of them, when it was observed that the eponymous archons affixed to them never (except in one solitary case) agreed with the names found in other lists. In several notes which are published in the current editions, Palmer and Taylor complain of this incongruity; the former sometimes in a very decisive tone. The phenomenon itself is so marked, that, but for the extreme unwillingness of the excellent old commentators to *lose* any portion of a classic work by allowing its spuriousness, a more cutting criticism might have been expected. Various hypotheses were set up concerning these pseudonymous archons, but none of them satisfactory. It has been imagined that they were *ἐπίστράται*, or some other presidents, whose names, *pro hac vice*, were attached to the decrees, instead of that of the ordinary *ἐπίστυπος*; and laborious theories have been erected and overthrown in endeavouring to establish one or other of these

views. But it is an obvious and decisive reply, that if the Athenians thus tampered with the word ἀρχων, all utility of the name of the chief archon in ascertaining dates, is lost, and in fact he is no longer ἐπώνυμος at all: and that if such liberties were really taken, we should find the difficulty to recur elsewhere in genuine decrees; but we do not. Another theory, that the names belonged to archons who were substituted for the ἐπώνυμος upon his dying during his year of office, is equally untenable. No one can imagine so many chief archons together, and only just at this critical time, to have died during office, some of them in the very first month; moreover, as Corsini observed, we find two and even three pseudo-archons in the very same year. The argument also from the analogy of the Roman republic seems to be valid; viz. that even if an archon (as a consul) did die in office, his name would nevertheless be attached to the whole year, for the very object of avoiding chronological confusion. All such assertions as that the names belong to *other* officers than the chief archon, are gratuitous guesses; and it has been truly observed, that we might as well interpret *Cæsare et Bibulo consulibus*, to mean, *Cæsare et Bibulo prætoribus*, in order to get rid of an anachronism; as pretend that ἀρχων meant ἐπιστάτης or πρόεδρος.

It appears to me that this single fact, the non-agreement of the names of the archons, is sufficient *prima facie* evidence to throw the burden of proof most heavily on him who should allege the authenticity of these decrees. If there had been but one or two cases of the kind, this might have been imputed to corruption of the text; or possibly the received lists of archons might have been believed faulty. But here we have fourteen Attic records, yielding ten or eleven different names, one only of which is a true chief archon:—this cannot be corruption of the text:—and the solitary true name is that of Chærondas, which was so notorious by its association with the fatal battle of Chæronea, that every rhetorical composer would be likely to remember it<sup>1</sup>, though few had lists of archons at hand to refer to. It will hereafter be shown that the only decree in which this name certainly appears, refers to an event which undoubtedly did not take place in his year. In

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, in his notices of Demosthenes, says, that the bill of Æschines against Ctesiphon was filed Χαίρωνδος ἀρχωντος, μικρόν ἐπώνυμ τῶν Χαίρωνικῶν. This is too obviously false, not

to have been remarked on by everybody: but it is a singular proof, how easily a writer most ignorant of chronology, and of all *other* archons, would stumble on the name of Chærondas.

another decree which, I believe, did happen while he was in office, the common editions read 'Ἐπὶ Χαυράνδου Ἠγήμωνος, (*De Coron.* 253) where both names can scarcely be correct. It looks as if Χαυράνδου had been added by a later hand.

It may be useful here to present in a tabular form those decrees, which we can by their contents refer to a known date, with the true and false archons' names annexed. (The reasons for some of the dates will be given below.)

B. C.		TRUE ARCHON.	FALSE ARCHON.
346	Decree of Demosthenes concerning the oaths (235).	Themistocles.	Mnesiphilus.
	Decree of Callisthenes in panic (238). Epistle from Philip, expostulating.	Archias.	
344 (latter half.)	Decree of Eubulus about the detained vessels (249). Resolution of Senate. [Βοῦδρόμιον]. Cool reply of Philip.	Lyciscus.	Neocles.
340	Reform of the Trierarchy (261).	Theo-	Polycles.
339	Spring Pylæa. Decree reproving the Amphissians (279).	phrastus.	Mnesitheides.
338 (former half.)	Spring Pylæa. Invitation to Philip (279). Letter of Philip to the Peloponnesian allies. Two Athenian decrees (282, 283). Decree of Demosthenes for alliance with Thebes and war with Philip (289).	Lysimachides.	Mnesitheides?
			Heropythes.
			Nausicles.
337	Decree of Aristonicus to crown Demosthenes (253). Similar decree of Ctesiphon (266). Bill of Æschines against Ctesiphon (243).	Charondas.	Charondas Hegemon.
		Phrynichus.	Euthycles.
		.....	Charondas.

But since many learned men do not regard the objection drawn from the false names in so serious a light as I view it, it appears desirable to go more fully into the question; and, examining the details of the documents one by one, to consider whether they can support themselves as genuine.

From the four controversial speeches left us by the two great orators, we gain, in spite of their inconsistencies, a pretty clear view of the transactions of the year 346 B. C. The first embassy, of Ten, returned from Philip in the beginning of Elaphebolion: the peace and alliance were decreed by the Athenians *on the 19th of that month*. The people placed the management of the business

in the hands of the senate; and, when the ambassadors delayed, Demosthenes, being that year a senator, passed a decree of the senate *on the 3rd of Munychion*, ordering them to sail immediately, and follow Philip wherever he might be, in order to gain a ratification of the peace. (See *Æsch. F. L. 271*, *Demos. F. L. 359*). This is the celebrated embassy *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρκους*, for malversation in which Demosthenes accused *Æschines*, B. C. 343.— We have now to examine the decree presented to us in the *De Coron. 235*, as the actual *βουλῆς ψήφισμα* by which the ambassadors were so peremptorily ordered to depart.

A glance at the document shows that the date is hopelessly erroneous. It is the last day of Hecatombæon, instead of the 3rd of Munychion. Even if we did not know the true day so distinctly on *Æschines's* information, we should be certain that the alleged date is false; for in Hecatombæon, Demosthenes was no longer a senator at all; and, in fact, the embassy actually returned as early as Skiroph. 13th (*Demosth. F. L. 359*). Looking on the case as desperate, Corsini cuts the knot by altering the text of this decree: which may spare us the need of farther words on the subject.

Again: the decree is wrong as to the names of the ambassadors. It gives us five names, Eubulus, *Æschines*, Cephisophon, Democrates, and Cleon; and deceived by this, and forgetting for a moment the incontrovertible proof on the other side, the learned author of the article *ÆSCHINES*, in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.*, has stated (p. 37) that Demosthenes was not a member of this second embassy. That he *was*, appears by entire pages of the two orators; and there is a passage in *Æschines (F. L. 273)*, which appears to me to imply that the same ten persons were re-elected for the second embassy. He says: "I must take up from the beginning our journey in quest of the oaths, and our embassy. Whereas on the former occasion, there were so many as ten ambassadors, besides an eleventh sent along with us by the allies, not one of them would eat at the same table with him (Demosthenes), nor, where it could be helped, stop at the same inn; seeing that he, in the former embassy, had plotted against them all." Thus, on the second embassy, they shunned him, in revenge for his conduct to them in or after the first. That the same ambassadors should have been reappointed was natural, since likewise on the third embassy, ("to the Amphictyons"), this was done, as *Æschines* was just before saying: *προσαναγκάζοντος τοῦ δήμου μηδὲν ἴππον πρεσβεῖν ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἰρεθέντας ἅπαντας*. That

is, though at first Demosthenes had absolutely refused to go on the third embassy, and Æschines had taken an oath of ill-health, by reason of which two other persons, Stephanus (?) and Aphobetus (?)<sup>2</sup>, were substituted for them; yet all were finally compelled to go. This justifies us in interpreting literally the words of Æschines, above translated, to mean, that all the ten ambassadors (besides Aglaocreon of Tenedos, who was the eleventh,) were on the second as well as on the first embassy. The names of the Ten were Philocrates, Phrynon, Aristodemus, Ctesiphon, Æschines, Demosthenes, Iatrocles, Nausicles, Dercyllus, and Cimon. Thus the decree under examination is wrong in four names out of the five, besides giving five instead of ten. It could not help being right in one, namely, that of Æschines: but it deserves remark, that from the oration *De Corona*, (from which *alone* I believe the rhetorical author to have fabricated the decree), no other name could have been discovered. That Demosthenes was on the second embassy, appears clearly enough in his attack on Æschines, thirteen years earlier, but in the *De Corona* he studiously keeps it out of sight.

The decree before us has then a false archon, a false date, and false names of the ambassadors. It is rarely that we can expect to get more decisive marks of spuriousness than these three points combined. Yet, perhaps, in the present case still more can be adduced, as cumulative disproof. If, however, the reader should give less weight to the following, it must not be allowed to injure the force of what has been already said.

In the first place, then, it appears nearly certain, that the real decree contained the name of the general (*i. e.* admiral) Proxenus, who was ordered to conduct the ambassadors straight into the presence of Philip. For we read in Demosthenes (*F. L.* 389), γράφω ψήφισμα βουλευῶν, . . . ἀπίενα τοὺς πρέσβεις τὴν ταχίστην, τὸν δὲ στρατηγὸν Πρόξενον κομίζεω αὐτοὺς, &c. . . . , γράψας, ὅσπερ νῦν λέγω, τοῖς ῥήμασιν οὕτως ἀντίκρυσ. The last clause which I quote appears to justify the belief that Proxenus was named in the real decree: but he is not in that which here lies before us.

Other words seem to be quoted by Demosthenes from this decree, in *F. L.* 430, viz.: Ἀθηναίους καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίων συμμάχοις εἶναι

<sup>2</sup> Æsch. *F. L.* 289, we find Stephanus among the ambassadors on the third occasion; and by Dem. *F. L.* 379, it appears

that one of Æschines's brothers was his substitute.

τὴν εἰρήνην, and, τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὀρκοῦν τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, and, τοὺς πρέσβεις οὐδαμοῦ μόνους ἐντυγχάνειν Φιλίππῳ, none of which are found in the suspected decree. It is true, that the first, or even the two first quotations might be referred to the original decree of Elapheb. 19th, but the third quotation exhibits too strong a jealousy of the ambassadors to be ascribed to any other hand than that of Demosthenes. Unless he has forged it entirely, it must surely be part of the βουλῆς ψήφισμα, penned by him on the 3rd of Munychion.

Less stress can be laid upon the words quoted by Æschines, (*F. L.* 275), πράττειν δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις καὶ ἄλλ' ὃ τι ἂν δύνωνται ἀγαθόν. In fact, the internal evidence is here the other way, and may convince us that these words come from the decree of Elapheb. 19th, in which the influence of Demosthenes was by no means exclusive or even predominant.

In regard to the form of the decree under examination, I desire correction if I am wrong, but I cannot help suspecting that there is a defect. On this occasion, the *people* had conferred full powers on the *senate*, (*Demosth. F. L.* 389; *cf. Andoc. Myst.* 8,) so that the βουλῆς ψήφισμα was a final authority. Nevertheless, the formula here used is precisely the same as in the reverse case of Ctesiphon's decree (*De Coron.* 266), where the consent of the senate had *first* been obtained, for introducing a measure to the people with its sanction. In both, it is barely said δεδῶχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, but no one would be able to find out from the former decree that the senate had previously obtained full powers from the people, any more than from the latter that Ctesiphon had previously secured the approbation of the senate. In fact, the very same form is employed also in the decree of Aristonicus, (*De Coron.* 253), which does not appear to have been passed with the same formalities as either of the others. Are we to suppose that the Athenians did not carefully mark in the decrees themselves the process by which they received the public sanction? I should have expected this senatorial edict of Demosthenes to have run thus: Ἐπειδὴ περὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν τὴν ἀποληψομένην τοὺς ὄρκους παρὰ Φιλίππου ὁ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησε τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοκράτορα· δεδῶχθαι τῇ βουλῇ ἀπέναι τοὺς πρέσβεις τὴν ταχίστην, &c. ....

There is another obscure point in the decree before us, *viz.* the mention of the εἰρήνη and the πρώτη ἐκκλησία. The speeches of the antagonist orators abound with allusions to the *two* ἐκλήσεις which were held on the 18th and 19th of Elaphebolion, but their

contradictions are very embarrassing. I believe, however, that on the 18th the resolution of the allies for *peace* was read to the people, and discussed, but nothing was done that day. On the 19th, a vote was carried for both *peace* and *alliance* with Philip, provided that "all the allies of Athens" were included. On the 25th, Philocrates qualified this by the clause, "such of the allies as have representatives now sitting in the congress." (See *Æsch. c. Ctes.* 391—393, and *Demosth. F. L.* 353, 354, &c.) That not only *εἰρήνη* with Philip, but also *συμμαχία*, was voted, is admitted by Demosthenes; but he names it with reluctance, except when charging it on Philocrates, being aware that the guilt of it was laid upon himself; as, most bitterly, by *Æschines* (l. c.) Since he generally calls it *εἰρήνη*, a mere reader of the *De Corona* would suppose it was nothing more; but as we know it was *συμμαχία*, would not this have been expressed in the decree? The *εἰρήνη* was discussed and approved, but it was not formally passed in the *προτέρα ἐκκλησία*; what then are we to understand by the *εἰρήνη ἢ ἐπιχειροποιηθεῖσα τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ*?—We might farther ask, How is it that the clause is here found, "including the allies of each party," for this might appear to take no cognizance of the qualifying words introduced by Philocrates. The reply, I believe, is sufficient, that the only party excluded by that clause, was *Kersobleptes*, (*Æsch.* l. c.); and before the date of this decree, the Athenians had learned that his kingdom was irrecoverably lost (*Æsch. F. L.* 271).

But I must pass to the next document, the decree of *Callisthenes* (238); which is there stated to have been enacted "when *Mnesiphilus* was archon, on the 21st of *Mæmacterion*." The name of the archon being the same as in the former, and the interval of time only several months, we cannot doubt that the fabricator intended *Mnesiphilus* to be one of the *annual* archons; which he is not. Concerning the date, the question is less clear. *Corsini* has confidently rested on a statement of *Demosthenes*, which perhaps cannot be trusted, since the orator had a case to make out by exaggerating the rapidity of the events. The second Embassy had returned on *Skiroph.* 13th, and made its report to the people on the 16th. On the same day *Philocrates* passed a decree of alliance "with Philip and his heirs for ever," with a distinct threat of hostility against the *Phocians*. On the 23rd the *Phocians* submitted to Philip. On the 27th *Dercyllus* brought

the news to the Piræus (Demosth. *F. L.* 356 and 359). *Afterwards*, (and the present question is, *How long afterwards?*) the Athenians were seized with panic, and collected persons and property into the city, and even celebrated the feast of Hercules within their walls (368). Demosthenes is anxious to shew that this was an *immediate* result of the Athenian decree on the 16th; and for the same reason he habitually speaks of the "ruin" of the Phocians as taking place on the 23rd, the day of their *surrender*. In p. 389 (*F. L.*) he has the following important passage: "When, after five or six days, the Phocians were ruined,.... and Dercyllus came back from Chalcis, and reported to you, while you were met in assembly at Piræus, that 'the Phocians are ruined;' and you, on hearing it, were, with good reason, partakers in their grief, and panic-struck for yourselves too; you voted to bring in the women and children from the fields, to repair the fortresses, to fortify Piræus, and to celebrate the feast of Hercules within the city."

It cannot be questioned, that the obvious meaning of the above, is, that this panic was occasioned by the tidings which Dercyllus brought; and, in fact, that the decree (which must have been this very decree of Callisthenes, see Demosth. *F. L.* 368), was passed on the same 27th of Skirophorion. So Corsini understood it; and if so, then clearly the date Mæmacterion 21st, is a mark of spuriousness in the document which we are examining. Nevertheless, I am disposed here to charge Demosthenes with misrepresentation, and to believe that the panic did not take place until Philip had begun to raze the Phocian cities to the ground, the measures for which cannot have been taken in a day, nor is it likely that he would instantaneously disclose his intentions. In the *De Corona* (237), Demosthenes shows himself equally desirous as here, of insisting on the shortness of the interval, (*εὐθύς, οὐκ εἰς μακρόν,*) yet he there seems to admit that the actual razing of the cities to the ground preceded the Athenian panic. "What happened after this; instantly, and not at a distant time? That the miserable Phocians were ruined, and *their cities razed*, while you, remaining inactive and believing the word of this fellow, *a little afterwards* had to collect your property from the fields, &c." I do not think then that we can entirely adopt Corsini's inference, that the feast of Hercules was at the end of Skirophorion, or that the decree of Callisthenes was passed on the 27th. On the other hand, it is intrinsically incredible that Philip should wait until the middle of Mæmacterion, that is to say, nearly five months after the sur-

render of the Phocian army, before proceeding to the decided and severe measures which threw the Athenians into alarm. No more words are needed, to show that this is undoubtedly a false date: yet I may add, that as, *after* his campaign in Phocis was ended, Philip celebrated the Pythian games (*De Pace* 62, III. Philip, 119), those who hold with Mr. Clinton that these games could not fall later than the beginning of autumn, have therein an independent ground for rejecting the date Mæmact. 21st.

It would farther appear that the composer of the decree before us did not know very accurately what the contents of it ought to have been. Demosthenes had just implied, that it commanded the people *σκεναγωγεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν*: but he did not here add, what is twice stated in the *Fals. Leg.* (368 and 379), "to bring in the women and children from the fields." Instead of this, the decree before us forbids any one (male adult, as well as females and children) to be in the country during the night, with the sole exception of the guards on duty. Such a decree appears impossible to be executed. It might indeed have been *passed*, during a frenzy of alarm; but if so, I think Demosthenes would have commented on it in the *F. L.*, as aggravating the case against Æschines, instead of softening it down into a more reasonable edict. Again, the natural, if not the necessary, inference from his words in *F. L.* 368, is that the order to celebrate the feast of Hercules within the walls, *was a part of Callisthenes's decree*. Now this could not be found out from the *De Corona*, and accordingly it is omitted in the document there inserted. If the passage of the *F. L.*, to which I refer, be examined, it will be seen that the orator is contrasting the glorious events which gave rise to the decree of Diotimus, with the melancholy ones which caused that of Callisthenes; after which, he orders each decree to be read out *for the sake of verifying his statement*. This appears to me to imply that all the lamentable things which (says he) ἐψηφίσθη, were contained in the ψήφισμα of Callisthenes. Decidedly to the same effect is the passage from p. 379, already quoted. If so, this is another very strong proof that we have not before us the authentic decree.

---

The epistle from Philip which follows, is moral rather than historical, yet it contains one point which may seem historically questionable. He says: "In short, you appear to me to be doing something rather extreme, in agreeing to the peace, and yet, not

at all the less drawing out your forces against me," ἀντιπαρεξέγοντες. It is dangerous to reason from negative evidence; yet such a fact, as that the Athenian armies marched out, after the destruction of the Phocian towns, to cope single-handed with the Thebans, the Thessalians and Philip, appears not more incredible, than the omission of it everywhere else, if true. Possibly, however, it may be replied, that if they had collected an army round Athens itself for defensive purposes, Philip may have exaggerated this on purpose.

The records to be next discussed, refer to a topic which has no acknowledged date: it is, the detention of the Athenian merchant-vessels by Philip. We first get a rough approximation to the time, from the remark of Demosthenes (249): "It was he who broke the peace by seizing our vessels; and not the city, Æschines." Now, we know that in B.C. 342, Diopieithes assaulted the dominions of Philip in the Chersonese and on the coast of Thrace; and Demosthenes justified him: we must then place this detention of the vessels *earlier* than B.C. 342. In the oration *περὶ Χερσονήσου* Demosthenes does not, indeed, definitely mention the affair, but he has words which will include it, and may even seem to allude to it (p. 91 Reiske, p. 110 aliorum): φαίνεται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ Φίλιππος, πρὶν Διοπιέθην ἐκπλεύσαι, . . . πεποιημένοι τὸν πόλεμον, πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀδίκως εἰληφῶς ὑπερ ὧν ψηφίσμαθ' ἡμέτερα ἐγκαλοῦντα κύρια ταυτί.— We might believe that while uttering the word ταυτί, the orator displayed the very same ψηφίσματα as he afterwards caused to be recited at this part of the *De Coroná*. At any rate, as the pervading argument of the *περὶ Χερσ.* is, the positive assertion that Philip had *already* broken the peace, and was in actual war with Athens, and as this seizure of the vessels must have been, according to that speech, only the first act of a series of hostilities, we seem justified in placing the aggression at least as early as B.C. 343.

A farther examination of the orator's words shows, if I do not mistake, that it happened either in the beginning of that year, or even as far back as the year preceding. For he tells us (250), that the first decree was moved by Eubulus, a second by Aristophon, a third by Hegesippus, a fourth by Aristophon again, *a fifth by Philocrates*, a sixth by Cephisophon, and others by others. Such a series of decrees implies a succession of messages backwards and forwards to the scene of action; perhaps replies from

Philip in the intervals; and several months at least may be allowed between the original seizure and the decree of Philocrates. Yet Philocrates was capitally impeached by Hyperides, and went into voluntary exile in the year 343, *before* the celebrated accusation of Æschines by Demosthenes. It is true, there may seem to be some difficulty as to the later fortunes of Philocrates. Namely, in this same speech (*De Cor.* 310), Demosthenes mentions *the slanders of Philocrates* as dangerous to him after the battle of Chæronea; which at first made me infer that Philocrates had obtained forgiveness and returned to Athens. Æschines, however, in his attack on Ctesiphon (395), speaks of him as still in exile; *φύγας ἀπ' εἰσαγγελίας γυγνῆνται*. I think we must believe that Philocrates, although banished, was still dangerous to Demosthenes by his voice or pen, with which he could pretend to reveal scandalous secrets, owing to his former intimacy with him.

If we could trust the date *Boëdromion*, which is affixed to both these decrees, they must have been passed in the autumn of B. C. 344. At any rate, I think we are justified in saying, that the event which occasioned them was between midsummer 344 and midsummer 343; that is, it fell under the archon *Lyciscus*, as I have expressed in the table.

It cannot be doubted that the Eubulus who drew up the first decree was the celebrated statesman of that name; for Demosthenes would not otherwise have used the bare name without qualification; moreover, he is endeavouring to show that the first opposition to Philip began, *not from him, but from his opponents*; of whom Eubulus was the most eminent. Whether this Eubulus was *son of Mnesitheus*, as the decree says, I am not able to find; but that he was *Ἀναφλύστιος* is generally received as certain. I at first thought that it was a clear error in the present decree to call him by any other cognomen; but upon searching for the proof that he was of Anaphlystus, I was unable to find any other than the first decree already examined (235), which I have been rejecting as spurious. Will any one then say, that possibly the well-known Eubulus was not really *Ἀναφλύστιος*, but as our present decree says, *Κύπριος*? or that he was of the parish Anaphlystus, but derived from Cyprus? The objection to this is, that Cyprus is not an Attic parish at all, and that even supposing him to have been derived from the island Cyprus, such an epithet was out of place; where the name of the parish was certainly needed. For this reason, several critics have conjecturally altered the word

to *Κυθήριος*; but such a proceeding presupposes that the composer wrote with full knowledge, or with a list of the Attic parishes at his side.

It is to be remarked, as a peculiarity in this decree, that it has the date *Boëdromion* only, and not the *day* of the month.

---

The act of the senate, in pursuance of the decree of the people, needs no particular remark: I proceed to Philip's letter. Every careful reader, I suppose, is surprised by the comments on the letter which Demosthenes makes; for they are not merely sophistical, but so unplausible and stupid as to be unworthy of him. His argument is this (249, 250, 252): "It is Philip that first broke the peace, and not the city; and when he did so, the first persons to complain were Eubulus and his followers, not I; and, in fact, Philip himself blames *others* and not me (*ἐτέροις ἐγκαλῶν*) as the cause of the war. Read his letter.....There! he has not put down the name of Demosthenes, nor brought any charge at all against me. Why did he not mention *my* doings, when he was finding fault with everybody else (*τοῖς ἄλλοις*)?" Now what is the fact? that the present letter does not refer by name to any Athenian statesman at all, nor complain pointedly of any one; but has merely the vague words, *ὑπὸ τινῶν ἀρχόντων, καὶ ἐτέρων, ἰδιωτῶν μὲν ὄντων, ἐκ παντὸς δὲ τρόπου βουλόμενοι . . . τὸν πόλεμον ἀναλαβεῖν*: words which are so far from excluding Demosthenes, that it is hard to say to whom they might more naturally be applied. This alone gives me a strong indisposition to believe that the letter before us is the real one which Demosthenes ordered the clerk to recite.

It is also rather inconsistent for Philip to begin by imputing fraud to the Athenians: "You are great simpletons, *if you think I do not see* that these ships were sent, &c.," and then, in so few lines, to acquit them of the guilt, and lay it on crafty individuals, and statesmen whom they ought to punish. But perhaps it will be said, that consistency is not to be expected.

A far more serious ground of suspicion, and one which (in connection with the other objections) convinces me that the letter is a forgery, is found in the allusions to Selymbria. In his speech for the Rhodians (p. 198 Reiske, p. 225 of others), in the year 351, Demosthenes counts this city as an integrant part of the Byzantine confederacy; and especially as it lies *between* Perinthus and Byzantium, it is on other grounds impossible that Philip could have

blockaded it, without being involved *ipso facto* in a war with those cities. Yet it is certain that at the date of this affair, *i. e.* not later than B. C. 343, he was still ostensibly at peace with Byzantium. The speech *περὶ Χερσονήσου*, while labouring to set forth the encroachments of Philip, as well as his positive breaches of the peace with Athens,—makes no allusion to any blockade of Selymbria. It describes hostilities with Byzantium as impending merely, (p. 93 Reiske, p. 112 others), and the Byzantines themselves as inactive: *ἐὰν περιμείνας τοὺς ἐτησίας ἐπὶ Βυζάντιον ἔλθων πολιορκῆ, οἴεσθε τοὺς Βυζαντίους . . . οὐτε παρακαλέσειν ὑμᾶς, οὐτε βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἀξιώσειν*; Such supineness on the part of the Byzantines would seem incredible, if Selymbria had already been attacked; and if even the Athenians were so alive to pity a town which was not theirs, as to send in corn for their relief. In the 3rd Philippic, also which was spoken rather later in the same year, Demosthenes merely says of Philip (p. 120 Reiske, p. 138 of others), *καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ Βυζαντίους πορεύεται, συμμάχους ὄντας*; but still there is no allusion to Selymbria, nor to any deeds of actual hostility already commenced.

In short, neither from any of the extant remains of the orators, nor from Diodorus, nor from Justin, nor from any other source, as far as I am aware, does it appear that Philip ever established a blockade of Selymbria at all, much less that it became the first and direct occasion of hostility with the Athenians. In the two orations concerning Malversation in the Embassy, which, it appears, must have been composed after the seizure of the vessels, it is not surprising that no allusion to this act of hostility is found: for Demosthenes was not likely to go out of his way to inveigh against Philip in a matter which would probably be looked on as a result rather of his own policy than of his rival's. Nevertheless, if Philip had involved himself in so serious a matter as a war with Selymbria, *that*, I think, might have been expected to come out somewhere in so long and desultory a speech. My suspicion that there is no authority whatever for the whole story except this letter of Philip's, and the comment on it by Ulpian, is confirmed, by observing that these two are the only authorities to which Mr. Clinton appeals (*F. H.* in Tables): while, under the intrinsic improbability of the alleged facts, we need not be surprised that there has been controversy concerning their date.

Whether the commentary is really from Ulpian of Cæsarea, or has been ascribed to him without any grounds, need not concern us here, since he lived as late as the times of Constantine the

Great. It is more important to insist, that this scholiast, whoever he was, knew no more of the affair of Selymbria than he learnt from the letter before us. In fact, he even retains many of its very words, under a more historical form. All that his comment can prove, is, that the letter was not forged later than A. D. 300, and was then received as genuine.

The reform of the Trierarchy by Demosthenes (261) must next engage us; the date of which is pretty well fixed by the orator's statement, πάντα τὸν πόλεμον τῶν ἀποστῶλων γιγνομένων κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν ἐμὸν, &c. (262). As we have no reason to regard this as a rhetorical boast, we may suppose the law to have been carried in the year 340, early enough to allow of fleets being built or duly equipped by help of its enactments.

When we examine the document set before us, it is strange to find that it does not profess to be what we expect, viz., the Act of Reform itself, but the record of a failure to convict Demosthenes of illegality for passing it. It does not detail *what* was the change, so as to shew the advantage gained by the state and by the poor, as the orator desires: it only alludes to the fact of a change, and states that Patrocles had to pay "the 500 drachmas" for losing his suit against Demosthenes. Is it possible that the composer was deceived by the phrase, λέγε μοι τὸ ψήφισμα καθ' ὅτι εἰσῆλθον τὴν γραφήν; and interpreted it, "Read the decree about my having been impeached," instead of, "the decree which gave occasion to my impeachment"? As for "the 500 drachmas," in the other passages to which we are directed, I find that it was 1000 drachmas. Is this also a mistake?

After this, the orator directs two κατάλογοι to be read, one according to the old law, and another according to his reformed system. We naturally expect a schedule, or rather (in an English sense) a *catalogue*, which shall tell *how many* Athenian citizens had to keep one or more trireme, *how many* half a trireme, *how many* one third, &c. &c.; nor does it appear to me that in this connection, the word κατάλογος can have any other meaning. On the contrary, we are, instead, presented with two decrees,

<sup>3</sup> There is something peculiar in the process indicated. Demosthenes εἰσήνεγκε τὸν νόμον εἰς τὸ τριηραρχικόν, (—what is this? "Laid a copy of it before the admiralty"?—) and then, the senate and people sanctioned it by vote.

—Such specifications, even when, as here, not very intelligible, are rather in favour of the genuineness of the record. [Bœckh, *Ec. of Ath.* b. iv. note 387, corrects εἰσήνεγκε νόμον τριηραρχικόν in the decree.—ED.]

or fragments of decrees, which do not tell us *the actual results* of the reform at all. In fact, it would seem that what is here called τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ νόμου κατάλογον, would more properly be called a clause of the law itself. It may be imagined, that the fabricator had felt that he ought to tell the reader somewhere what the arrangements were under the new law, and unluckily brought them into the κατάλογος, because he had left them out under the ψήφισμα.

I come next to the Amphictyonic decrees (279), and the Attic date affixed to them. Here is at once a startling difficulty, and even absurdity. The two decrees are obviously intended to be separated by a year of time; each being at the *spring* Pylæa, and the state of affairs widely different in the two. In the former, the Amphissians are mildly rebuked, in the latter, Philip is called in as general against them. Nevertheless, only one date is given for both these decrees: Ἀρχῶν Μνησιθείδης, μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα. It was hardly by accident that Demosthenes asked, λέγε δὴ τοὺς χρόνους (*plural*), ἐν οἷς ταῦτ' ἐγένετο. At least, if the δόγματα really recited by the clerk, were passed (as is probable) at different times, two different dates would be needed. If, on the contrary, χρόνους is to be understood vaguely to mean "the period," including weeks or months, there is some impropriety in so definite a date as Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα. Once more, by what link was this Attic date attached to the Delphian decrees? was the decree countersigned by the πυλάγοραι, and was a copy thus attested deposited in the records at Athens? This is left obscure; but perhaps is not to be complained of. On the other hand, is it not strange that the Delphian decree had no date of its own to mark the year? For if these δόγματα are genuine, the Delphian priesthood was not annual; indeed, it is on other grounds improbable that it should have been so: hence, the formula ἐπὶ ἱέρειω Κλεωγόρου does not distinguish the year at all. Mr. Clinton has remarked (*F. H.* Vol. II. p. 357), that, at least at a later time, the Delphian decrees were for this very reason dated, not by the name of the priest, but by that of the archon.

Another suspicious circumstance, is, that the second decree styles Cottyphus *the Arcadian*; whereas, we know by Æsch. *c. Ctes.* (413, *in fine*), that he was a *Pharsalian*. A grammarian, who did not remember this, might have been tempted to make him an Arcadian, from observing that he was a general,

and knowing that great numbers of Arcadian mercenaries had in these times been employed in Phocis. That it was not at all natural for the Amphictyons to send away to Philip their president and general, as sole ambassador, I would not say confidently; but it strikes me as neither usual nor probable.

---

The letter of Philip to the Peloponnesian allies (280), which follows, contains, in the opinion of a very competent judge, Mr. Clinton, one error which cannot be cleared up; viz. its statement that the Macedonian month Lous agreed with the Athenian Boëdromion. It is needless here to extract the demonstration which he has offered, that the coincidence of the two months was impossible. Though I am sensible of the great delicacy of such inquiries, it does look to me as if Mr. Clinton had proved his point. I will only add, that in other parts of his work, he affords us the means of accounting for a fabricator being seduced into this mistake. Namely, after the Julian Calendar was adopted at Cæsarea, their Lous was made equivalent to the Roman September; moreover, in Greece generally, the Attic Boëdromion was used for September. Hence a superficial person might look on Lous and Boëdromion as identical.

---

The two decrees (282, 283) which bear the name of Heropythes are still more manifestly spurious. Bishop Thirlwall has already commented on the fact, that they represent the Athenians and Philip to have entered into a new treaty of peace (τοὺς ἄρκους καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην...τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὑπαρχούσας αὐτῷ συνθήκας) since the war of Byzantium; which, says Bishop Thirlwall (*Gr. Hist.* Vol. VI. p. 60) is not credible, although attested by Diodorus. In his judgment this alone is a strong ground for rejecting these decrees. This, however, is but a part of the refutation. The contents of the decrees themselves are incredibly humiliating to Athens, when she had so lately triumphed over Philip at Byzantium, or, at least, believed herself to have triumphed. The former of them, dated Elapheb. 26th, states that "Philip has already taken certain πόλεις τῶν ἀστυγαιτόνων, and intends to break the oaths;" and, therefore, they "send ambassadors to beg for time to reflect, and for a truce until Thargelion." The next is dated the last day of Munychion, and says: "Since Philip is aiming to set us at variance with the Thebans, and has proposed to march a force to the very borders

of Attica, therefore"...they send an embassy "to entreat and exhort him to make the truce, in order that the people may take such measures as the case may admit (*ἐνδεχομένως*): for even now, the people has determined not to sally forth, in anything short of an extreme case (*ἐν οὐδένι τῶν μετρίων*)."<sup>1</sup> This appears to me, I say, incredibly abject; it is also anachronistic. The speech of Demosthenes obviously implies that the two decrees quoted were passed before the seizure of Elatea, the effects of which on Athens are told immediately afterwards. Yet it was not possible that Philip could take *πᾶσις τῶν ἀστυγεϊόνων* before he passed through Pylæ, and no sooner had he passed through than (Demosthenes tells us) he instantly seized Elatea. Nor can the strength of this be evaded, by saying that the orator exaggerated Philip's promptitude; for it is incredible that so able a general should have left Elatea behind him, and first attacked certain cities, *ἀστυγεϊότες* to the Athenians. We might indeed justly contend that this term can mean nothing but Bœotian towns on the Attic border; but waiving that, it cannot be doubted that the first act, by which Philip showed that he was come on an errand different from that for which he had been invited, was, his occupation of Elatea. The extraordinary panic which seized the Athenians on hearing of this, entirely refutes the notion that they can, six weeks or more previously, have passed a decree, complaining that "he is prepared to come with an army on to the very borders of Attica."

Again, the comments of Demosthenes on the documents really recited to the assembly, are not such as could have been suggested by those here set before us. He introduces them with the words *Ἐν οἷς δὲ ἦτε ἤδη τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τούτων τῶν ψηφισμάτων ἀκούσαστες εἴσασθε*: by which we are warranted in expecting decrees of mutual hostility passed by Athens against Thebes, and by Thebes against Athens. After they have been read, he adds, *οὕτω διαβείς τὰς πόλεις πρὸς ἀλλήλας ὁ Φίλιππος, &c. &c.*: which is quite consistent. The real decrees must have exhibited Philip's success in infusing enmity between Athens and Thebes; and we were thence to learn how great a service Demosthenes performed in healing the breach. Yet, in fact, there is nothing in *our* documents to show that Philip had had any success at all in that matter; we barely learn that Philip "is intending" (or "aiming"? *ἐπιβάλλεται*) "to set the Thebans at variance" with Athens; at the mere idea of which the Athenians are grievously alarmed: moreover, in his letter to the Thebans, Philip praises them for their prudence in sacrificing the Athenian

interests to their own; which can imply in them only selfishness, not enmity to Athens. His letter is called, *Rep'y to the Thebans*; but we have no Theban decree to which it could be a reply.

There is another way by which we may refute, in a combined view, the whole series of documents which belong to the Amphissian war. Assuming them to be sound, a *reductio ad absurdum* is readily obtained. The decrees inscribed with the name of Heropythes, represent Philip as warring south of Pylæ during Munychion, and even Elaphebolion of B. C. 338. Let this be granted. Prior to this he directed his Peloponnesian allies to meet him by Boëdromion. If this is sound, his order cannot have been issued later than Metageitnion in B. C. 339. Consequently his invitation came from the Amphictyons before that month. It is dated *ἐαρινῆς πολαιάς*; which must then have been in the spring of 339. Hence the preceding *spring* Pylæ, viz. of 340, was that at which the first decree was issued, gently reproving the Amphissians, in consequence of Æschines's harangue to the Amphictyonic council. But Æschines himself distinctly tells us that Theophrastus was archon when he was elected *πυλαγόρας* (c. *Ctes.* 413); and we know that Theophrastus did not enter office until the midsummer of 340. Which is absurd.

To cut his way out of this maze, Boeckh alters *ἐαρινῆς* in the second Amphictyonic decree, into *ὀπωρινῆς*. Against such arbitrary changes, in documents destitute of external or any strong evidence, I wholly protest; but let that pass for the present. He next has to suppose three Amphictyonic assemblies in the time of six or seven months; viz. one at Delphi in the spring of 339, in which Æschines first attacked the Amphissians; one in *Metageitnion* the same year, which month he thinks may be called *ὀπώρα*; and one between the two, viz. that at Pylæ, named by Æschines, c. *Ctes.* 413. This is, then, supposed by him to have been an *irregular* assembly, though neither orator implies it. He has next to crush up Philip's Scythian expedition into an incredibly short time. During the second assembly of the Amphictyons (at Pylæ), Æschines tells us that "Philip was far and far away in Scythia:" the third assembly was "*πολλῷ χρόνῳ ὕστερον*, when Philip was already come back." Great force must be used to reconcile this with Mr. Boeckh's scheme. But if with Corsini and Clinton we change *Βοηδρομιῶνος* into *Ἐκατομβαιῶνος* in Philip's letter, to avoid another objection, this will render Boeckh's alteration of *ἐαρινῆς* into *ὀπωρινῆς*

useless, and indeed mischievous to his theory: for granting that Metageitnion might be called *ὑπέρα*, Skirophorion certainly could not. Thus the two corrections are incompatible. Other objections urged by Mr. Clinton (in p. 356, Vol. II. *Fast. Hell.*), appear to me also of weight; and I feel no question that he rightly interprets *τῆς ἐπιούσας Πυλαίων* (*Dem. Cor. 277, in fine*) to mean "the Pylæa which was subsequent to Cottyphus's autumnal expedition." But Mr. Clinton does not appear to have remarked, that all the arguments against *his* view are based on these documents, and must entangle his system, as well as every other, until they are shaken off entirely.

---

The decree of Demosthenes consequent on the seizure of Elatea is here dated, "16th Skirophorion, under the archon Neocles;" (though those of Elaphebolion and Munychion were under Heropythes!) No decree in the whole oration is so like the vapid forgery of a rhetorician as this. Lengthy as it is, it does not yield us a single definite fact about Philip's hostilities, about which it wastes many vague words. Could any thing so verbose have proceeded from Demosthenes, and at such a time? or, was it according to his taste, however congenial to Isocrates, and even to Æschines, to lay stress on a mythical tale about the sons of Hercules? Considering also how much took place between the seizure of Elatea and the battle of Chæronea, (which was Metageitnion 7th,) it may be suspected that the date, Skirophorion 16th, is too late. Not that I lay any stress on the *μάχη χειμερινή*, which, I make no doubt, was a battle fought during a furious storm—perhaps of summer hail.

We may further ask, whether it is credible that the Athenians, before ascertaining the temper of the Thebans, should have decreed not only *συμμαχία* with them, but even *ἐπιγαμία*? For Ionians to become mingled as one people with Æolians, was to a Greek mind equivalent to a sacrifice of nationality. Those who had lost their own country already, might gladly become incorporated with another nation; but so liberal a bestowal of *ἐπιγαμία* as this decree supposes, does not look to me like reality.

---

Next in time, I have placed the decree of Aristonicus for the crowning of Demosthenes; because the orator distinctly tells us that that was the second time of his being crowned (253): the first must consequently have been that which was moved by Demomeles (302) in honour of the successes obtained a little before the battle

of Chæronea. This decree of Demomeles was impeached after the battle, but the accuser, Diondas, did not get a fifth part of the votes (302, 310). I conjecture that that emboldened Aristonicus to propose a new crown to Demosthenes for a part of his administration which had hitherto passed unhonoured, viz. his Eubœan policy of the year 340.

The 25th of Gamelion, which we find in the record, may be a true date, if the view now given is correct. Aristonicus may have crowned Demosthenes in Febr. B.C. 337, while Chærondas was archon. Except the strange double name of "Chærondas Hegemon," this decree is the most unexceptionable in the whole speech; but it is at the same time the easiest to forge: for as we are told that Aristonicus wrote "the same syllables" as Ctesiphon, and the whole of Ctesiphon's decree may be picked up from the two orations, there was no difficulty at all. Negatively, however, we may ask, why does it say vaguely *τινας τῶν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ πόλεων*, when it would be more natural for one who knew what he meant, to specify Oreus and Eretria, and the ejection of Philistides and Clearchus?

---

Ctesiphon's decree follows in order of time (267); and nearly the same remarks apply to it as to the preceding. The month assigned to it is plausible enough,—Pyaneption 22nd, or autumn of the year 337. We know distinctly from Æsch. c. *Ctes.* 376, that Demosthenes was appointed *τειχοποιός* by his tribe, in an *ἀγορὰ τῶν φυλῶν* held on the 2nd and 3rd of Skirophorion, when Chærondas was archon, i. e. about a week before the summer solstice of B.C. 337. The month which barely remained to Chærondas was scarcely enough for finishing the work and crowning Demosthenes. Moreover, if he had been set over the theatrical fund during that year, Ctesiphon would surely have waited a few days in order to remove that objection to his decree. I believe therefore that it was in the following Attic year, B.C. 337-6, that Demosthenes was theatrical treasurer, and in the same, as we know, the *προβούλευμα* for crowning him must have been obtained by Ctesiphon.

It has however surprised me, that this decree throws no light on the language used immediately before by Demosthenes. He says, *λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ψήφισμα ἔδον τὸ γραφέν μοι· οἷς γὰρ οὐκ ἐγράψατο τοῦ προβουλεύματος*, &c. This may seem to mean that the *προβούλευμα* was incorporated in the *ψήφισμα*. Indeed, following the usual explanation, that Ctesiphon first petitioned the senate to

allow him to bring in a bill before the people, in their name and authority, ought not his *ψήφισμα* to carry that on the face of it? Is the concise phrase *δέδοχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ* a sufficient notification to the *δῆμος* that the consent of the *βουλή* has already been obtained? I should have expected a formula more like that in page 265, *ἔειπε Καλλίας Φρεάργιος, πρυτανέων λεγόντων βουλῆς γνῶμη*, if at least the text there is sound, and if we may translate it:—  
 “A bill was brought in by Callias, the prytanes *reading it aloud*, in accordance with a vote of the senate.” Some act on the part of the officers of the senate would seem needed, in order to guarantee the bill to the people as that which the senate had approved. Nevertheless, I write this, much more in hope of being instructed better, than from feeling that I have any understanding of these matters.

---

The last of these decrees for which we can get a sufficient date, is the bill of impeachment against Ctesiphon by Æschines. We know at least that it cannot have been written before the offence was committed by Ctesiphon, and before Demosthenes was elected a *τειχοποιός* by his tribe. This at once convicts the decree before us as anachronistic. It is dated Elaphebolion 6th, in the year of Chærondas; yet we have seen from Æschines that the office of *τειχοποιία* was not conferred until the 3rd of Skirophorion in that year. Such is the ill luck of the fabricator of these decrees, when he ventures to deal with a real, instead of a fictitious archon.

---

Several documents still remain. Two of them are found in p. 265, and represent Nausicles to have been crowned when *Demonicus* was archon, (a false name,) for advancing money to 2000 troops in Imbros, and not exacting it of the treasury:—also Charidemus and Diotimus, (under what archon is not stated,) for similar generosity.

The orator has just named four persons whom the Athenians had honoured. “First Nausicles,” says he, “has often received crowns for the generosity he has shewn in his office of general: next Diotimus, for his present of the shields, was crowned; and again Charidemus: afterwards Neoptolemus here has been honoured for the surplus payments which he made in various offices of trust.” Then he adds, “To prove that I speak truth, read aloud

the decrees which were made for these men." Hereupon follow, not four decrees, (which might have seemed the least to be expected, since Nausicles had been *often* crowned,) but two only; and the latter combines Diotimus and Charidemus in a single vote. The words are not without obscurity: Ἐπειδὴ Χαρίδημος ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλιτῶν ἀποσταλεῖς εἰς Σαλαμίνα, καὶ Διότιμος, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἰππέων, ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ ποτάμου μάχῃ, &c. . . . The plural verbs with which the decree closes, show that the expression ἀποσταλεῖς εἰς Σαλαμίνα is to be repeated with the second clause. *Both* generals were sent to Salamis, one over the horse, one over the heavy-armed foot; and when the shields of certain troops were captured by surprise during "the battle on the river," they unitedly sustained the expence of replacing them. On the contrary, the words of Demosthenes strongly impress me with the belief that it was on two different occasions that these generals were crowned; otherwise the word *πάλιν* seems unnatural: *ὅτι τὰς ἀσπίδας Διότιμος ἔδωκε, καὶ πάλιν Χαρίδημος*. Again, it is a strange coincidence that the Athenians should have fought a battle in Salamis called *ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ποτάμου μάχη*, when this name was likewise given to a battle fought against Philip, in the campaign which preceded Chæronea. The battle so called by Demosthenes (p. 300) must surely have been in Phocis or Bœotia, not in Salamis: moreover, that the affair for which Charidemus was crowned, was very recent, appears from the perfect tense, *Ναυσικλῆς ἐστεφάνωται*. If there had been two well-known battles lately fought on rivers, the latter would have probably gained some distinctive title. But we have further to ask, against whom was this Salaminian battle fought? and where else is it named? or is it possible so to interpret ἀποσταλεῖς εἰς Σαλαμίνα as to evade the conclusion that the battle was fought in Salamis?

---

The decrees of the Byzantines and Chersonesites are the more difficult to bring to a severe test, from our little knowledge of their customs; and if they stood alone, I should probably receive them as genuine. At first, indeed, I regarded it as a favourable symptom in the former, that it made no mention of the Selymbrians; but here the orator himself gave the clue, by naming only the Byzantines and Perinthians. A peculiarity in the decree, is the opening Ἐπὶ ἱερομνάμονος: for we might naturally have doubted whether the Hieromnemon was an annual officer. All objection, however, appears to be overruled by the similar phrase in Polyb. iv. 52. A

more important difficulty strikes me in the orator's phrase, λέγει τοὺς τῶν Βυζαντιῶν στεφάνους, καὶ τοὺς τῶν Περινθίων. The repetition of τοὺς implies that the Perinthians sent στεφάνοι separately from the Byzantines. Yet the decree not only joins the two cities in the act, but uses the strong expression τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Βυζαντιῶν καὶ Περινθίων, as if they were but a single people<sup>4</sup>. It has also been remarked to me by a judicious friend, that the splendid gifts named in both these decrees are more like the liberality of a rhetorician, than the practical life of Greek cities. The Byzantines and Perinthians give to the Athenians "the rights of *intermarriage, of citizenship, of possessing land or houses, &c. &c.*, and *exemption from all λειτούργια* for such of them as choose to dwell among them:" this last particular elevates them *above* citizens. Besides, three statues *sixteen cubits high* are to be erected, &c. &c. As for the towns of the Chersonese, considering that they were Ionian, and indeed colonies from Athens, we might have less wondered if they had been ready to confer *ἐπιγαμία, πολιτεία, &c.* . . . They, on the contrary, bestow on the senate and people of Athens "a golden crown of the value of *sixty talents*:"—(ἀπὸ ταλάντων ἐξήκοντα, *from a fund of sixty talents; i. e.* not to exceed that sum?)—and build an altar to "Gratitude and the People of Athens." Bishop Thirlwall (*Hist. Greece*, Vol. vi. p. 50, note 3) has remarked on a discrepancy between this latter decree and the words of Justin, ix. 1, 7; where we read, "Ne unius urbis [Byzantii] oppugnatione tantus exercitus teneretur, [Philippus] profectus cum fortissimis, multas Chersonensium urbes expugnat." But nothing, I think, can be hence deduced to the discredit of the decree before us; for its expression, that Athens has "restored their native soil" (ἀποδοὺς τὰς πατρίδας) is quite appropriate, if Justin be correct; and that Philip was at this time expelled, is declared by Demosthenes immediately after:—οὐκοῦν οὐ μόνον τὸ Χερρόνησον σῶσαι, &c. . .

I have now noticed all the documents in this speech, except that in p. 268, headed Νόμος, and those in 272, 273, called Μάρτυρες. There is nothing in them which could not be invented by any one out of the speech itself, names being added at pleasure for the

<sup>4</sup> If the whole confederacy of Byzantium was so united as to regard itself as a single people, why are the two names of Byzantium and Perinthus put forward

as representing the entire league? Was Selymbria, which lay between them, not part of the same people?

witnesses. To us, indeed, it might appear that the former affidavit, or rather the fragment of it which alone is quoted, is highly unsatisfactory, for we read, *Μαρτυροῦσιν ὑπὲρ πάντων οἷδε*, &c. without any statement what the *πάντα* meant<sup>6</sup>. The second affidavit is also disfigured by the name of a pseudo-archon *Nicias*; when the event was probably about the year 341. The *Nóμος* set before us is not quite consistent with the more probable statement in the speech of *Æschines*; but this may naturally have arisen from the arts of the rival orator.

---

Thus far, I have studiously refrained from making any remarks upon the *phraseology* of these documents, because I regard that side of the argument as far more difficult and treacherous. Many of the scholiasts and grammarians possessed a full and delicate acquaintance with the language which we shall never attain; and those of them who tried their skill at affecting the style of old decrees, or of letters from Philip, (however they may blunder as to chronology,) are more likely to deceive us by their excellent imitation of the antique manner, than to be detected by us through their failure. The same phenomenon would be remarked, if an Englishman at all versed in our antiquities were now to fabricate letters with the names of Henry VIII and Wolsey:—how hard would it be for a stranger, in a distant age, to say, by the mere idiom, This *cannot* be authentic! It is by error of fact, not by faults of style, that the foreigner would detect the fraud.

Nevertheless, I avow that there are peculiarities of phraseology in these documents which more or less startle me. They occur indeed oftener in the letters imputed to Philip, than in the so-called Attic decrees; and if the latter were *quite* free from such phenomena, I might regard their presence in Philip's letter as an evidence on the side of the authenticity of the latter. I mean, that the phrases which appear like the idiom of Polybius or Diodorus, might have existed already in the diplomatic Greek of Philip's day, though not yet visible in the genuine Attic writers and speakers. As the case stands, however, it rather appears to me that the composer has exerted himself more, and more successfully, to imitate

---

<sup>6</sup> Yet I am biassed in favour of this affidavit, by its very moderate tone, which is so much less to his rival's discredit

than Demosthenes's comment would imply.

the stiff and formal style of the decrees, than the epistolary idiom of an accomplished man like Philip; and in attaining for the latter more freedom, has unawares admitted a larger infusion of recent phrases. To put the evidence, such as it is, in the clearest light, I will remark upon the Athenian documents separately, first.

### I. ATHENIAN DOCUMENTS.

Strange titles of office at Athens seem in several cases to occur in these decrees. First I will name *ναύαρχος*, although a difficulty hangs over the word. It is notoriously the proper term in the Lacedæmonian navy, but the Athenians closely adhere to the title *στρατηγός*. Frequently as the *στρατηγοί* are mentioned by these orators, it seems hardly credible that the word *ναύαρχος* should not once slip out, if that term had been the properly descriptive one in the Athenian public documents. That Philip (p. 251) should employ the title concerning an Athenian sea-captain, is less wonderful, not to say that Laomedon was captain over *merchant* vessels only (*πλοία*), perhaps corn-ships. But even in the decree of Demosthenes (p. 289) it is ordered that the *ναύαρχος* should sail *ἐπὶ τὸς Πυλών*, to attack, it seems, Philip's sea-coast, or intercept convoys of provisions. At Arginusæ, indeed, (Xen. *Hell.* i. 6, 29) besides eight *στρατηγοί*, there were three *ναύαρχοι*: these, however, had but one ship each, and I conjecture (in the dearth of certain knowledge) that they were *permanent* and experienced sea-captains; since such persons would be essential as *πάρεδροι* to the admirals. One passage, nevertheless, in the same author, makes the question perplexing. Xen. *Hell.* v. 1, 5: *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . ἀντιπληροῦσι ναῦς τρισκαίδεκα, καὶ αἰρούνται Ἐβρομον ναύαρχον ἐπ' αὐτάς*. Is it too bold a conjecture, that Xenophon, living abroad, and habituated to the titles of Lacedæmonian and Corinthian officers, has here slipped into an un-Attic phraseology? At least I cannot find a similar instance in early writers.

In the decree of Callisthenes, moreover, we find the titles *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων στρατηγός*, and *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως* (paymaster of the forces?) in agreement to which there recur in the decrees of p. 265, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως κεχειροτονημένος*, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλιτῶν*, and *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱππέων*. I should be glad to know if there is any other proof that such a distribution of functions and such appellations, existed at that time. I observe that Bœckh (*Pub. Econ. Athens*, book II. ch. vii.)

when quoting these titles, refers to the decrees before us as his sole and sufficient proof.

Page 238, μηδεμία παρεύρεσι, "on no pretence." Who would not have expected μηδεμία προφάσει or τέχνη? Παρευρίσκειν is found in Herodotus, and Diodorus, the Ionism blending (as frequently) with the later common dialect. I cannot find παρεύρεσι again.

Page 261, in the former κατάλογος, we read: τοὺς τριηράρχας καλεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ τριηρῇ συνεκκαίδεκα ἐκ τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόχοις συντελειῶν. By the embarrassment of the commentators concerning these λόχοι, and their apparent inability to produce any similar use of the word in Attic finance, I presume that it has no parallel extant. I do not get any light upon it from Bœckh (book II. ch. xxii. p. 278 of Eng. Tr. 2nd ed.).

In the next κατάλογος we read ἕως τριῶν πλοίων καὶ ὑπηρητικοῦ, where F. A. Wolf (*Proleg. to In Lept.*) interprets it "three *triremes* and a boat." He is no doubt correct; but I do not remember πλοῖον in the Attic classics with this sense. It is a generally received doctrine that ναῦς is the generic term for ships of war, πλοῖον for ships of burden.

Page 265. The first decree, under Demonicus, uses the expression, ἕκτη μετ' εἰκάδα instead of πέμπτη ἀπίοντος. Has this any parallel in early documents? Perhaps it is from my own inadvertence that I am led to ask the question; for I perceive that in several highly respectable books of reference the two modes of expression are stated to be wholly indifferent.—The second decree uses τοὺς νεανίσκους for "the soldiers;" which savors of later idiom. The Index for Demosthenes does not contain the word; in Æschines it bears its primitive sense.

Page 266. In the decree of Ctesiphon we read τοῖς ἐκ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν θεωρικοῖς. I believe there is no authority for such a masculine as οἱ θεωρικοί. Τὰ θεωρικά is common, but τὰ ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν θεωρικά is new; and I have difficulty in thinking it quite right. Will the words bear the sense: "Demosthenes gave a hundred minas to the *theatrical fund of EACH tribe?*" (or rather, *ten to each, a hundred to all.*) Bœckh probably does not so interpret it, or he would have used the passage to confirm the opinion which he expresses (*Pub. Ec. Ath.* II. vii. p. 183, Eng. Tr.): "The number of these treasurers is nowhere mentioned, but there were most probably ten, one from each tribe," &c.

In each of the decrees (p. 282, 283) named after the archon Heropythes, the verb ἐπιβάλλεται is used in an Ionic, or recent sense, for *intends*, or *aims*.

In the last decree of Demosthenes, we find *προάγει* in the intransitive meaning of *increases*: *ἐνθυμηθῆναι διότι* for *ἐνθυμηθῆναι ὅτι*: and *ἀντιβαινειν* in a rather suspicious poetical sense for *ἐναντιωθῆναι*, or *ἀντιστῆναι*.

## II. OTHER DOCUMENTS.

More striking certainly are the peculiarities in the other documents, which are *not* strictly Attic. In Philip's Letter, p. 239, we have *τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ὁλοῖς*, for, *in short*: *οὐδὲν προτερήσετε*, for, *you will gain no advantage*, where *οὐδὲν πλέον ἔχετε* might have been expected: and *ἔξω τοῦ ἐφθακέναι* for *πλὴν τ. ε.*

In his second Letter, p. 251, we find *οἱ πρεσβευταί* in the plural. The singular *πρεσβευτής* was already the legitimate term: but it can hardly be by accident that the historians and orators so uniformly make the plural *οἱ πρέσβεις*<sup>6</sup>. Here also is *καθόλου*, for *denique*: but this does not sound to me so decidedly recent as *τοῖς ὁλοῖς*.

In the decree of the Chersonesites, the phrase *ἐξελόμενος ἐκ τῆς Φιλίππου*, is explained by the ellipsis of *χειρός*. What is to be said of this? Is it an orientalism? In the same decree the word *παραίτιος* must apparently be explained as equivalent to *αἴτιος*, otherwise it is but a poor compliment to the Athenians. This use of the word is familiar to Polybius, but I do not remember it earlier.

In the second Amphictyonic decree, *ἀξιώ ἵνα βοηθήσῃ* for *ἀξιώ αὐτὸν βοηθεῖν* sounds to me like a more recent idiom; and much more does *καὶ διότι αἰρούνται αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν*, if it means *ἀγγέλλειν διότι*, for *ἀγγέλλειν ὅτι*. But perhaps *ὅπως μὴ*— is to be looked on as in apposition to *καὶ διότι*, and the latter is to be rendered, “and because—”

In Philip's reply to the Athenians (p. 283), *αἵρεσιν* is used for *προαίρεσιν*, *intentions*, *line of policy*, *πρεσβευταί* for *πρέσβεις*, and *παραπέμφαντες* (*having discarded*) for *ἀπελάσαντες*. In his letter also to the Thebans, we may remark on the verb *συγκατατίθειμαι*, *I assent*, as bearing the stamp of a more recent phraseology. We find also *πυνθάνομαι διότι* for *πυνθάνομαι ὅτι*: *προσφέρεσθαι φιλοτιμίαν* for *παρέχεσθαι φιλοτιμίαν* or *προσφέρεσθαι φιλοτίμως*. *Ἵμων κατεγίνωσκον ἐπὶ τῷ μέλλειν* appears a stiff expression for “*I blamed you for being about, &c.*” At the end, *πρόθεσις* for *προαίρεσις*, a determination, is usual with

<sup>6</sup> Since writing the above, I find the following in the *Lexicon Xenophon-teum*: “*Πρεσβευτής, legatus... Pluralis damnatur a Thomá: ἀμαρτάνει ὁ λέγων*

*ἐπὶ πληθυντικοῦ πρεσβευταὶ καὶ πρεσβευτάς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν δοκίμων εἶπε τοῦτο. Sed non item a Polluce 8, 137.”*

Polybius; perhaps not earlier. The adjective *συγκάταινος* is very rare; an Athenian would, I think, have said *συνέπαινος*, and altogether the Ionic<sup>7</sup> and the later style has often a preference for compounds of *κατά*, which are less used in Attic.

It has occurred to me as rather questionable, whether the Amphictyons would have published a decree against the Amphiſſians in Attic Greek; and equally, whether Philip would write to his Peloponnesian allies in that dialect. To the former objection it might be replied, that perhaps the Athenian *πυλαγόρας* habitually sent to Athens authenticated copies of the decrees, translated into the Attic; and that the quotation is from the public record at Athens. The latter objection also, in the opinion of a literary friend, may be overruled.

---

Sensible as I am of the delicacy of these inquiries, and of the danger of resting on negative arguments, I shall be glad of correction on these points from any competent scholar. On the whole, however, the dialect of these documents appears to me somewhat to corroborate, and at least not to weaken, the evidence of their spuriousness, which rests on another line of reasoning.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.

---

[Prof. Droysen published in 1839 a dissertation, *Ueber die Aechtheit der Urkunden in Demosthenes Rede vom Kranz*, in which he contested the genuineness of these documents. This dissertation (which contains an account of all that had been previously written in Germany on the subject) first appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft*, and was afterwards reprinted separately, (Berlin, 1839. 1 vol. 12mo, pp. 205). The genuineness of the documents has been since defended by Prof. Voemel, who published in 1841, at Frankfort, a programme of the gymnasium, entitled *Die Echtheit der Urkunden in des Demosthenes Rede vom Kranze vertheidigt gegen den Herrn Prof. Droysen*, 4to, which has been followed by a second part in 1842. The latter dissertation is not yet finished; when complete, it is likely to be reprinted in the *Rheinisches Museum*.—EDITOR.]

---

<sup>7</sup> We should distinguish between the old poetical Ionic, and the new Ionic developed in prose. The latter often,

more rarely the former, found its way at a latter period into the *κοινή διάλεκτος*.