

Javier Verdejo-Manchado* – Borja Antela-Bernárdez*

IG II² 1623, 276–285. Athens *versus* Pirates: between Recovery, Need and Patriotism

<https://doi.org/10.1515/klio-2020-0302>

Summary: Scholars have usually understood the epigraphical evidence for an Athenian naval mission led by Diotimos as an example of the treaties in the framework of the Corinthian League and Athens' role as guarantor of security on the seas. Nevertheless, a close look at the main characters involved in the inscription and the mission of Diotimos, as well as to the historical context and the rise of the Macedonian hegemony, seems to allow a new interpretation of the evidence, in order to shed some light on the nature of Diotimos' mission.

Keywords: Diotimos, Lycurgus, Athenian Navy, Corinthian League, Alexander the Great

The inscription catalogued as IG II² 1623 contains the inventory of Athenian ships recorded by the inspectors of the dockyards (ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων), corresponding to the year 334/333 BC (ἐπὶ Κτησικλέους ἄρχοντος). Between lines 276 and 285, it reports the use of two ships (Νεμεάς and Δύναμις, mentioned in the preceding lines, 245 and 260, respectively) from the previous year, 335/334 BC (Εὐαινέτου ἄρχοντος), in a military operation promoted by the orators Lycurgus of Boutadai and Aristonicus of Marathon and carried out under the command of General Diotimos of Euonimon. As the inscription says, the purpose of the expedition was the protection against pirates. The text of the inscription, which poses no reading problems, says:

τριήρεις αἶδε (sc. Νεμεάς καὶ Δύναμις) ἐξέπλ/ευσαν μετὰ στρατηγ(οῦ) / Διοτίμου ἐπὶ τὴν / φυλακὴν τῶν λεισ/τῶν κατὰ ψήφισμα / δήμου, ὃ εἶπεν Λυκ/οὔργος Βουτά(δας) καὶ Ἀ/ ριστόνικος Μαραθῶ, / ταχυναυτοῦσαι ἐπὶ / Εὐαινέτου ἄρχοντος.

“These ships (sc. Nemea and Dynamis) went to sea under the command of General Diotimos as protection against pirates by decree of the people proposed by Lycurgus of Boutadai and Aristonicus of Marathon, due to their speed, in the archonship of Evenetus (335/4 BC).”

*Kontakt: Javier Verdejo-Manchado, E-Mail: verdejojavier@uniovi.es;

Borja Antela-Bernárdez, E-Mail: borja.antela@uab.cat

The supervision of a naval expedition by Diotimos, the son of Diopeithes, also appears in Plutarch (Mor. 844a),¹ with an epigraphic parallel in IG II² 414a² (= IG II³ 336). According to the honours, the orator Lycurgus vowed for Diotimos in 334/333 BC, probably because he had brought the expedition against pirates launched one year earlier to successful fruition.³

Traditionally, the text of the inscription and its honorific correlate have been summarily related to the situation of the general context of Athens in the second half of the 4th century BC, that is, the outcome of the maritime instability caused by Athens' weakness.⁴ In this sense, considering the starting date, 335/334 BC, and its mission to counter pirates, it has even been associated with the bilateral treaties that Athens reached with Alexander the Great over the renewal of the League of Corinth in 336 BC,⁵ with the understanding that Athens' cleansing of the seas had been part of the preparations organised by Alexander and the Macedonians prior to the start of their invasion of Asia in 334 BC.⁶ However, these interpretations almost exclusively take the mission of the campaign into account, the importance of which, furthermore, seems to have eclipsed the other information we have on it, such as its agents or the socio-political context in which it was undertaken to the extent that they are hardly considered or are consid-

1 Roisman – Worthington – Waterfield 2015, 59.

2 Schweigert 1940, 335–343; cf. Lambert 2004, 108 = 2012, 43, n. 79, who expresses doubts concerning the reconstruction of the inscription and its parallel in the literary sources.

3 E.g., Schweigert 1940, 341; Davies 1971, 164; Burke 2010, 399, no. 24.

4 Durrbach 1890, 73–75; Schweigert 1940, 341 (cf. Pritchett 1991, 88, 337 f.; Develin 2003, 373; De Souza 1999, 41; Burke 2010, 399, no. 24); Garnsey 1988, 154–164; Rhodes – Osborne 2003, 525; Gabrielsen 2007, 301, 306, n. 60. Durrbach also links this mission to the pirates' capture of Eresus, an event dated sometime during the reign of Alexander the Great (cf. IG XII, 2526). Rhodes – Osborne 2003, 525 dated the campaign erroneously to 334/333 BC (ἐπὶ Κτησικλέους ἄρχοντος) and linked it to Athens' struggle to erase Etruscan piracy (cf. *infra*). Thus, albeit in a less specific way, Gabrielsen (1994, 157–206; 2007, 259–272) considers the goal of this campaign to be guaranteeing the security of merchant ships (cf. *infra*). We cannot agree with Serrat 2013, 328 f., who assigns a mercenary purpose to this campaign. According to Serrat, Athens rented its own troops as a way to strengthen its finances as it had many other times during the first half of the 4th century BC. Nevertheless, Serrat does not seem to take the details we know about this campaign into account, including dates, participants etc., so his theory seems unfeasible, vid. *infra*. On the other hand, we find it quite surprising that this campaign has not been noted by Ormerod 1924, who does not even mention it.

5 In fact, as far as we know, only Lambert 2012, 43 no. 79 has expressed doubts about the identification of the mission of Diotimos in the context of Macedonian rule and the international regulation over the *poleis* held by the League of Corinth.

6 Regarding the League of Corinth, vid. Hammond – Griffith 1979, 639; Bosworth 1988, 187–196 for an overview of the problematics and main issues regarding the League of Corinth. Also, see Antela-Bernárdez 2011 with full bibliography.

ered only independently. The purpose of this article is to analyse all the information we have on the campaign in order to place it within its most immediate context,⁷ offering a plausible and coherent explanation of the reasons leading it to be conducted, beyond the generality ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῶν λειστῶν mentioned in the inscription. Finally, bearing all of this information in mind, we shall strive to provide a satisfactory justification of this generality, which we do not view as coincidental.

A brief glance at the Athenian prosopography serves to reveal that the three agents who appear in the inscription, Diotimos of Euonimon, the general in command of the campaign, and the orators who spearheaded it, Lycurgus of Boutadai and Aristonicus of Marathon, are all very prominent figures in Athenian society of the time, with clearly defined patriotic, anti-Macedonian political leanings.⁸ Yet there is also certain information on their lives that leads us to the conjecture of a close political cooperation among them.

Diotimos of Euonimon⁹ had a brilliant political career, including posts as trierarch and general which he occupied several times throughout his life. His patriot and anti-Macedonian political positioning is easily deductible from Demosthenes' mentions of Diotimos,¹⁰ whom we know to be an Athenian general in 338 BC.¹¹ Diotimos also donated, along with Charidemus, a series of shields after the battle of Chaeronea,¹² which must have earned them numerous honours

7 For an overview of 4th-century BC Athens, Ferguson 1911, 1–14; Mossé 1973; Habicht 1997; and the recent, although popular, Scott 2010. On the other hand, for the age of Alexander in Athens, Mitchel 1965; Schwenk 1985; Faraguna 1992; Landucci Gationi 1994 and 1995; Antela-Bernárdez 2005.

8 Faraguna 2011, 68–70 presents a very interesting reflexion that sums up the reality of Lykourgan Athens as being under the control of a compact elite.

9 PA 4384 (Davies 1971, 163–165); PAA 365865.

10 Despite his support for Meidias against Demosthenes, our sources linked Diotimos with the Athenian political collective that opposed Macedonian hegemony, cf. Dem. 18.70.75.

11 IG II² 1628, 396–397; 1629, 915–916; 1631, 2–11. Likewise, Bosworth 1980, 94 f.

12 Dem. 18.114, 116; cf. Kroll 1977, 146, no. 169. On the reasons for this donation, Friend 2009, 81: “The donation of shields made by the *strategoi* Diotimos and Charidemus immediately after Chaeronea should be seen as an attempt to reequip those citizens who had lost their shields in the battle rather than an effort to furnish hoplite arms for the *thetes* who had never possessed them (Dem. 18.114, 116). The gifting of the shields was one of the emergency measures undertaken in the aftermath of Chaeronea, when the Athenians manned the city walls with every adult male capable of bearing arms in the expectation of a Macedonian assault on Athens.” Likewise, no. 74, “While Sekunda [Sekunda 1992, 345 f.] recognizes that these shields were issued in the crisis after Chaeronea, he does not take into account that a minority of the 5,000 Athenian hoplites who were not killed at Chaeronea would have returned to Athens with their panoply intact: (1) The 2,000 citizens captured on the battlefield would have been despoiled of their arms (cf. Vaughn 1991, 46 f.). (2) Many of the remainders who fled to Athens would have thrown away

and recognition of importance¹³ that may even be regarded as exceptional, as Low has suggested.¹⁴ Indeed, Pseudo-Plutarch's "Life of Demosthenes" explicitly mentions this bond of political alliance between Demosthenes and Diotimos, both prominent members of the group of Athenian politicians against Philip. In our sources, Diotimos is often associated with other prominent figures from this faction, such as Demosthenes and Lycurgus himself,¹⁵ as a quite active participant.

On the other hand, we know that Diopieithes of Sounion, who probably had family ties with Diotimos,¹⁶ had also most likely been an active Athenian soldier in the opposition against Philip of Macedonia. In fact, his responsibility in the struggle against Macedonia after the Peace of Philocrates (345 BC) is particularly important for our analysis, when he is mentioned in the story of a series of naval operations in Chersonesus and Thrace in 341 BC.¹⁷ Likewise, in his speech "On the Crown", Demosthenes mentioned Diopieithes as a member of the group of politicians opposed to Macedonia.¹⁸

It is likely that Diotimos' political position was determined by his economic activity. Diotimos possessed a vast fortune mainly based on the exploitation of the mines of Laureion. His father Diopieithes of Euonimon appeared back in

their shields and other items in order to save themselves (cf. Archil. Fr. 5 West; Hdt. 5.95.1). The interpolated decree in Demosthenes, if genuine, explicitly says that Charidemus supplied the shieldless *neaniskoi* who had been disarmed (18.116; cf. Kroll 1977, 146 no. 16). Demosthenes' equipping of citizens who lacked arms (καθώπλισε τοὺς πολίτας τῶν ἄλλειπόντων) may also refer to those Athenians who fought in the battle and who had lost their arms afterwards ([Plut.] Mor. 851A), though all that can be deduced from Demochares' decree (since the events depicted are not in chronological order) is that Demosthenes made the gift at some point in 338/7–337/6." On Charidemus, Landucci Gattioni 1994, esp. 44–50.

13 Dem. 18.114 and 116.

14 Low 2011, 81. Low assures that honorific decrees were very unusual for Athenian generals, a fact that also confirms that the honours Diotimos received, according to Plutarch (v. *supra*), because of the expedition we are analysing here, are actually very unusual. Nevertheless, Liddel 2016, no. 21 has stressed the existence of other exceptions similar to that of Diotimos' honorific decree: SEG XXVIII 45 and the information we have on the honours to Conon, Chabrias and Timotheus (Dem. 20.69–70; Paus. 1.3.2–3; Nep. Timoth. 2.3; Chabr. 1.2–3), but these few examples seem to us very exceptional indeed.

15 Plut. Mor. 844f, where Diotimos is mentioned with Hyperides, Nausicles, Polyuctus and Demosthenes (v. *infra*, n. 38).

16 Brun 2005a, 146, who equates Diopieithes of Sunion with the Diopieithes I of Davies 1971, 163, father of Diotimos.

17 Dem. 8.26; 12.3–5; cf. Ormerod 1924, 118; Sealey 1993, 163, 167, 181; Ryder 2000, 77–79; Worthington 2014, 76f.

18 Dem. 18.70 and 75.

367/366 BC as the owner of a plot of land and a workshop near the mines,¹⁹ both of which were used to process the material extracted.²⁰ Diotimos, in turn, appears throughout his lifetime as the owner of two workshops, one in Laurion and the other in Anaphystos, as well as a plot of land, part of which he must have inherited from his father. Furthermore, he also appears as the recorder and lessor of the mining concessions.²¹ Based on the information we have, we can deduce that Diotimos' investment in the mining operation must have been considerable, since it encompassed all phases of the process: extraction, washing and processing, and this investment was only affordable if he held a large fortune.²²

However, the Macedonian rule resulting from Chaeronea was a huge threat to Diotimos' business and many other Athenian fortunes earned from mining operations,²³ and therefore it was a threat to their social and political standing as well. Philip's and Alexander's campaigns gave rise to the sudden entry of precious metals into Greece.²⁴ This led not only to a decline of the value of silver but to this precious metal being largely transformed into coin. Philip, and to an even greater extent so Alexander, created a monetary system adapted to their own projects and the new situation, so in trade relations within the Greek world, Macedonian coinage quickly replaced Athenian coins, which until then had been the leader in all markets.²⁵ These changes were quite harmful to Laurion's prosperity. Furthermore, even though silver had been devalued because of the increase in the stock of precious metals,²⁶ the production costs in Attica had not dropped, so the mine became less profitable. And since there was a surplus of silver in trade, the outflow of silver from Laurion was restricted.

Despite the fact that mining activity in Laurion was much lower in the 4th century BC than it had been in the previous century, silver mining was still a major asset in the Athenian economy.²⁷ Around the time of the inscription, mining in Laurion experienced a surge,²⁸ precisely at a time when one of the promoters of

19 Crosby – Young 1941, 2, ll. 53, 54, 55 and 78.

20 Ardaillon 1897, 21–58; Hopper 1953, 200–210.

21 For a detailed exposition of the details about Diotimos' links to the mining activities at Laurion, Lauffer 1957, 289–292; cf. Hopper 1953, 243.

22 Bissa 2008, 263–273.

23 Lauffer 1957, 291 f. (vid. *contra*, Strauss 1984, 418–427); Faraguna 1992, 238 and no. 111.

24 Milns 1996, 763 f.

25 Cf. Bellinger 1963, 2, 60. Likewise, for a review before Bellinger's, vid. Ardaillon 1897, 159–161; Cary 1932, 139–142; Crosby 1950, 190.

26 Loomis 1998, 240–250.

27 Ardaillon 1897, 18; Crosby 1950, 190; Hooper 1953, 248–254.

28 E.g., Ardaillon 1897, 158.

the campaign, Lycurgus of Boutadai, held the role of administrator of the Treasury of Athens.²⁹

Indeed, the mining operation in Laurion must have played an important role in the economic recovery of Athens' finances during Lycurgus' era.³⁰ There is no information that allows us to make a detailed reconstruction of all the measures adopted to reactivate the economy, but bearing in mind the pernicious effect of Macedonian policy on mining in Laurion, the measures must have at least partly consisted of restrictions on the entry of precious metals fostered by the new dominant power into Athens, as well as hurdles to hinder the implementation and dissemination of the new monetary system. Diotimos must have been one of the major beneficiaries of the administration's new policy, and he, in turn, must have participated actively in the recovery through a loan to the public treasury, something which was common among the holders of vast fortunes during that time, as mentioned by Lycurgus' honorific decree in the year 307/306 BC (Plut. Mor. 852b).

The third agent who appears in the inscription as the second promoter of the campaign, Aristonicus of Marathon, is perhaps the less known character for us. However, the information available is sufficient to ascertain his political profile.³¹ A collaborator of Lycurgus, he soon appears associated with other contemporary figures from the anti-Macedonian party, such as Demosthenes. We should probably identify him as the Athenian of the same name mentioned by the 4th-century BC playwright Alexis (frs. 130–131 Kassel-Austin),³² who refers to the post of νομοθέτης he held, probably at a time of shortage in Athens.³³ But what interests us the most in this study – for the moment – is that Alexis mentions his vast fortune, which even further cements his association with Lycurgus and the economic recovery, in the same way that it does with Diotimos.

Therefore, based on this web of economic interests that were reciprocally beneficial for both Athens and their fortunes, it is easy to see a close partnership

29 Despite this character's prime role in Athenian history, the bibliography is quite short. For some basic works, see Durrbach 1890, esp. 1–114; Conomis 1961, 72–152; Colin 1928, 189–200; Renehan 1970; Salamone 1976; Humphreys 1985; Merker 1986; Oikonomides 1986; Mossé 1989; Brun 2005b.

30 Ardaillon 1897, 158; Hopper 1953, 252; Faraguna 1992, 289–322 and 2003, 121; cf. Burke 2010, 396 for a reconsideration of his importance.

31 PA 2028; PAA 174070.

32 Lewis 1959, 241; Arnott 1996, 363–365.

33 On the grain supply problems in Athens during the Classical Age, cf. the classic work by Germet 1909, and also Mck Camp 1982; Garnsey 1988, 150–164 and 2004. Likewise, cf. Whitby 1998, 102–128; Braund 2007. On the grain shortage in Greece during Alexander's campaigns, Milns 1996; Antela-Bernárdez forthcoming.

between the three agents who appear in the inscription, beyond just their political affinity.³⁴ In short, this relationship leads us to suspect the concurrence of all three in the promotion and development of the campaign in the way we shall outline below.

In view of this information, it is already possible to reject the hypothesis that the mission against pirates led by Diotimos may have been motivated more specifically by a previous action within the framework of the bilateral treaties between Macedonia and Athens which regulated its adhesion to the League of Corinth. It is difficult to accept that a mission so closely associated with Macedonian politics, especially with the preparations for Alexander's Asian campaign, could have been proposed by figures who were so openly anti-Macedonian like Lycurgus and Aristonicus, and left in the hands of someone like Diotimos, who shared the same political stance. Likewise, it seems difficult to accept that Lycurgus would have promoted a tribute to Diotimos (Plut. Mor. 844a, IG II² 414a [= IG II³ 339]) in relation to a mission that would benefit Macedonian politics, if indeed its aim was to cleanse the seas for Macedonian profit and to ensure the safety of the campaign against Asia being planned by Philip and carried out by Alexander.

On the other hand, if the political and economic background of the agents participating in the campaign is revealing in terms of interpreting the inscription, so is the date when it happened: 335/334 BC (ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετου ἄρχοντος). Without a doubt, this was an extraordinarily significant time for Greece in general and Athens in particular. Indeed, it was a time of great social and political upheaval. Philip had recently been assassinated (336 BC) and Alexander's foray in the territory on the Thracian border³⁵ led to a spate of rumours of his death, which sparked the flame of rebellion among the Greeks. Athens' satisfaction with Philip's death was no secret,³⁶ and liberation from the Macedonia yoke seemed closer than ever. However, these hopes were soon dashed when Alexander razed Thebes in 335 BC, putting a sudden end to any questioning of his power.³⁷ At that time, before the Athenians' petition for peace, Alexander had demanded that they turn

³⁴ Although Davies thinks Lycurgus could not have been sufficiently wealthy to perform liturgies, Plut. Mor. 842a–b suggests his wealth (the authors owe this observation to J. Roisman).

³⁵ Antela-Bernárdez 2016a, esp. 113–117 for the case of Thrace-Ilyria, with bibliography.

³⁶ Before the death of Philip, the Athenians voted for a decree accepting the possible extradition of anyone who would assassinate Philip and ask for refuge in Athens (Plut. Dem. 22.2; cf. Aeschin. 3.160). Nevertheless, as soon as Philip was assassinated by Pausanias, they voted on a crown for the killer, and sacrifices were made to celebrate the good news (Plut. Dem. 22.3; Aeschin. 3.77). On the inconsistency of Athenian behaviour, vid. Sealey 1993, 202.

³⁷ Diod. 17.8–15; Plut. Alex. 11.6–12.2; Arr. An. 1.7–1.9; Just. 11.3.6. Likewise, Antela-Bernárdez 2012, esp. 82–90 and 2015.

over a group of important figures in Athenian politics, including Lycurgus and Diotimos, whom he accused of being the instigators of the uprising.³⁸

Considering that Thebes was destroyed in October 335,³⁹ it is theoretically impossible to know whether Diotimos' expedition took place before or after the uprising. Indeed, the archons of Athens took their posts in summer at the start of the month of *Hekatombaion* (July), so the expedition may have taken place in either 335 or 334 BC. However, given that two of the agents in the campaign were summoned by Alexander the Great after the destruction of Thebes, it is difficult to imagine that the Athenians not only did not turn those persons over but also approved the initiative of another of those involved, Lycurgus, to send a mission to cleanse the seas under the mandate of another person involved, namely Diotimos.⁴⁰ It is more logical to assume that the campaign happened prior to the destruction of Thebes and the end of the uprising.

Furthermore, it is difficult to grasp the way this expedition would have been arranged if it had happened after the uprising in Thebes was put down. If this was promoted by this time, Diotimos' mission would be the only proof confirming the existence of military actions outside the regulatory capacity of the League of Corinth,⁴¹ something which does not seem feasible. We know that back in 343/342 BC, Philip had showed his intention to join Athens in the military operations against the pirates; this operation had a twofold purpose – as the Athenians were keenly aware at the time – of both eliminating the threat of piracy and controlling Athens' naval movements.⁴² It is obvious that the political situation

38 Arr. An.1.10; cf. Suda α 2704. Plut. Dem. 23.4, in a confusing list, mentions five names but not Diotimos, although it is possible that his presence on the list may have been erased by some other erroneous names, cf. Sealey 1993, 204. If we believe Plut. Mor. 852b (cf. Plut. Mor. 852c; IG II² 457 and 3227, fr. b, 16–17), there were also references to this fact in Lycurgus' honorific decree, although only the name of the orator is mentioned.

39 E.g., Bury 2015, 848; Gabriel 2015, 87. Actually, it is commonly accepted that the destruction of Thebes is likely to have happened during autumn: for example, Whibley 1921, 109. Bellinger 1963, 97 goes further and adds a specific date for the siege of Thebes: 8 to 12 October, 335 BC (cf. Plut. Cam. 19.6, during the Mysteries in Athens).

40 It is not possible to argue that Lycurgus might have imposed his own opinion over the decision of the Athenian people. As has been amply shown (Ober 1989, 293–328; Harding 1995, 105–125; Burke 2010, 394), after the death of Pericles, the Athenian people dominated the city's political decisions, especially on matters of foreign affairs. Therefore, the orator's role was to talk and act following the lines which the people considered to be beneficial and profitable for their interests.

41 Indeed, apart from this inscription, scarce data exist about Athens running other naval operations in the years following Chaeronea, cf. Durrbach 1890, 72. On other Athenian naval missions, vid. [Dem.] 17.20 (dated to 332).

42 Dem. 7.14–15. In fact, the use of piratical practices by both Athens and Philip before Chaeronea are known by Dem. 18.145; 19.145.

at that time was very different to the time of the decree on Diotimos, and that Athens was still able to question and reject the proposals coming from Macedonia. However, after Chaeronea, any naval military action of this kind had to be led by the League of Corinth,⁴³ as happened years later with Amphoterus' campaign in the Aegean in 332 BC (Arr. An. 2.20.5 and Curt. 4.8.15).⁴⁴ However, the arrangement of the expedition is perfectly understood in the context of the situation prior to 335 BC, before the destruction of Thebes and after Philip's death, when the power of his son Alexander was being questioned; in short when there were the necessary conditions to start a campaign as an individual initiative, without the support or approval of Macedonia.

Now that the identities of the agents participating in the campaign have been established, along with their possible personal relationships, their association with Athens' economic recovery and the exact date of the campaign, we are poised to attempt to ascertain their motivation by providing specifics, if possible, on that indeterminate phrase "protection against pirates".

As is known, during the period when Lycurgus was at the helm of Athens' finances, there was a considerable increase in the city's revenues, which, according to the sources (Plut. Mor. 841b, 842f and 852b) reached very high levels.⁴⁵ One of the most important cornerstones in the restoration of Athens' finances and the increase in its revenues, even more than the exploitation of the mines, was the restructuring and stimulation of maritime trade to and from Piraeus,⁴⁶ making it the main trading hub in the Aegean. The measures adopted⁴⁷ necessitated the indispensable prerequisite of the protection of the seas. To this end, according to modern estimates,⁴⁸ Athens had around 60 vessels plying the seas⁴⁹

43 As Durrbach 1890, 70 says, it is quite telling that the campaign led by Diotimos was the only Athenian naval operation with a military command registered during the years after Chaeronea. This fact is a main argument in the explanation we have been defending for dating it, and it eliminates the possibility that the naval operation would have happened at a different time.

44 On Amphoterus' mission, Arr. An. 2.20.5; Curt. 4.3.11; cf. Hauben 1972 and 1976; Bosworth 1975; Heckel 2006, 107 f., no. 231.

45 E.g., Mitchel 1965 and 1970.

46 E.g., Burke 1985 and 2010, 395–401; Bosworth 1988, 206 f.; Faraguna 1992, 119–124; 2003, 120 f. and 2011, 67 f.; Oliver 2011; Roisman – Worthington – Waterfield 2015, 203.

47 Burke 2010, 396–398, with discussion.

48 Burke 2010, 398, with bibliography.

49 The Athenian naval force was truly superior. If we accept the numbers given by Dem. 14.13, in 354 BC the fleet had 300 triremes, and in 330/329 BC it reached more than 400 (IG IP 1627, 266–269, 275–278). Nevertheless, the fleet could not operate as a wholly mobilised navy because of the unaffordable expense. Likewise, at that time, the rule of Philip of Macedon would have surely forbidden it. For a discussion of the Athenian naval force based on epigraphy, Ashton 1977; Gabrielsen 1994, 126–131; Burke 2010, 398 f.

sailing in small squadrons as a constant defence against possible attackers, protecting the trade and circulation of goods to and from Piraeus. The campaign we are studying seems to have been part of the same administrative programme and therefore had the same purpose, namely to protect the seas. However, the above mentioned tasks were ordinary monitoring and protection which required no specific decrees to be approved, much less the oversight of a general like Diotimos. Thus, it seems that there should have been some exceptional situation that required both the approval of the Assembly and the participation of Diotimos in the decreed campaign. Was this situation the protection against pirates (ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῶν λειστῶν) as the inscription says?

Piracy in Greece is consubstantial with its history. There is information on its existence since the very early years, as well as on the attempts to combat it, with greater or lesser success.⁵⁰ Indeed, far from being an occasional, specific problem, it extends over space and time and was more or less widespread. Its development involved a large number of people of varied provenances acting independently and with different settlements. Therefore, its total elimination could only have happened if the pirates' bases were eradicated, which required not only a huge investment and a great deal of manpower but also the participation of different cities exerting, on the points in their territory affected by piracy, the pressure required and preventing pirates from finding refuge there.⁵¹

In theory, the economic boom which Athens' finances were experiencing could have financed an expedition of this kind, especially bearing in mind that piracy was only aggravated during times of war. However, the true effectiveness of a mission like the one led by Diotimos is questionable, and it would probably have been minimal since it was an individual initiative with such a small contingent: two ships, as we seem to be able to glean from the information provided by the inscription. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that in this year, 335 BC, after the news of the swift movements of Alexander the Great's troops, the Athenians voted to retract their troops and put the walls in a state of defence.⁵² In this situation, the Athenian people would have been unable to approve an expedition of this kind, which would have tied up troops whom they could not spare.

Therefore, it is quite likely that a much more specific, modest, although important, purpose was concealed under the generic name of "protection against pirates", while if we accept Plutarch's testimony as referring to the same campaign, it ended in less than one year. Furthermore, considering the fact that refer-

⁵⁰ On the record of the actions against the pirates directed by the different Greek states from the 5th to 2nd centuries BC, *vid.* De Souza 1995, 189–192.

⁵¹ Cf. De Souza 1995, 189–191, with discussion.

⁵² Sealey 1993, 202.

ence is made to the speed of the ships (ταχυνουτοῦσαι), it must have been a quick and very specific intervention at a specific location in the Mediterranean.

The dates on the inscription lead us to consider the grain shortage which had been besieging Athens since Chaeronea⁵³ and was aggravated during Alexander's campaign precisely before the destruction of Thebes, in 335 BC,⁵⁴ when the expedition was undertaken. Indeed, in Athens the supply, escort and protection of the grain transport was a prerogative of the State (Arist. Ath. 43.4; Dem. 18.301, IG II² 212, 13–15), and at times a military operation was decreed to ensure the supply (Dem. 50.6, cf. IG II² 1628, 37–42).

In theory, all of this concurs with the campaign recorded in this inscription in the sense that it could have been aimed at combatting the attackers on a given maritime route. In fact, the unease concerning the grain supply that Lycurgus expressed after Chaeronea in his “Against Leocrates” is well known.⁵⁵ And during his time as the νομοθέτης, Aristonicus also showed a great deal of concern over the availability and distribution of food in Athens, according to the comedian Alexis (see *supra*).⁵⁶ However, it is clear that these observations cannot be viewed as arguments in favour but instead, if viewed as a whole, they are somewhat parallel. In our opinion, the most important information is the presence of Diotimos as the general at the helm of the campaign. Indeed, among the numerous honorific decrees dedicated to merchants during this period, there is one particularly relevant to our case at hand, IG II² 408 (= IG II³ 339): an inscription which should be dated to around 335 BC, according to Tracy.⁵⁷ The text on the inscription contains the honours decreed to two grain suppliers, Memnon and Callias. But it also mentions Diotimos' intervention as a general (1.9) in one specific supply run which brought wheat and barley from Sicily (1.12). And precisely here, on the route through the Tyrrhenian Sea, is where piracy must have increased substantially during that time, judging by the references in the lost speeches of Dinarchus, “The Tyrrhenian Speech” (Τυρρηνικός, 12, p. 91–92 Conomis) and Hyperides, “On Defence against the Tyrrhenians” (i.e., pirates) (περὶ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν τυρρηνικῶν, 56 Jensen). This increase in piracy must have lain at the root of the need for a military intervention.⁵⁸

⁵³ Antela-Bernárdez 2016b and 2017.

⁵⁴ See Dem. 34.38–9. For example, Hopper 1953, 250; Garnsey 1988, 154; Tracy 1995, 33 f. For the epigraphical evidence, cf. Moreno 2007, 169–208.

⁵⁵ Antela-Bernárdez 2016b, 77–80.

⁵⁶ Arnott 1996, 365 suggests that he probably occupied his post during a time of shortage, which Arnott links – without arguments – to the crisis in around 320 BC, but the truth is that there are other possible dates and contexts which can be related to this campaign.

⁵⁷ Tracy 1995, 34. For a discussion, cf. Lambert 2007, 113 f. = 2012, 156.

⁵⁸ Cf. Rhodes – Osborne 2003, 525; Gabrielsen 1994, 157–206 and 2007, 259–272.

In view of this information, it is extremely likely that the two inscriptions, IG II² 1623, 276–85 and II² 408, refer to the same event, the campaign led by Diotimos, whose specific purpose was therefore to protect the Sicilian grain supply from Tyrrhenian pirates. Indeed, the inscription we are studying has a clear parallel form another inventory of ships from the ἐπιμελητῶν τῶν νεωρίων, dated to the years 326/325 BC (IG II² 1628, 37–42). This inventory references the use of the quadriremes mentioned in a military operation under the command of General Thrasybulus, whose purpose was to ensure the grain transport. The similarity between the two inscriptions is clear:

[τετρήρεις τ]άσδε ἔδομεν / [κατὰ ψήφισ]μα δήμου, ὃ Πο/[λύευκτος Κ]υδαντίδης εἶπε, / [μετὰ στρατ]ηγού Θρασυβού/[λου Ἐρχιέω]ς ἐπὶ τὴν / [παραπομπή]ν τ[οῦ] σίτου

“We grant these quadriremes via the decree of the people proposed by Polyuctos Cinantides under the command of General Thrasybulus Erchieus to escort grain.”

The wording of both is similar; they only differ in the mention of the aim of the expedition. Therefore, while Diotimos’ campaign had, as pointed out, a specific objective, we should wonder why the inscription refers to such a generic mission, yet one that is also as important as “protection against pirates”. In our viewpoint, this lack of determinacy is no coincidence but instead clearly intentional. In fact, at his death, Diotimos left some naval debts (IG II² 1629, 539–541 and 622–629). This fact reveals that part of his fortune was clearly linked to the silver mines at Laurion, but other parts of his fortune came from trade or merchant investments, or other kinds of naval activities, as his positions in the fleet and naval experience seems to stress.⁵⁹

As is known, one of the most frequent arguments that Athenian orators wielded against Macedonia was the exaltation of Athens’ glorious past as the standard of Hellenism.⁶⁰ In this sense, we should recall that piracy and its eradication had indeed already been one of the most important purposes and justifications of the ancient Attic-Delian League.⁶¹ Furthermore, as the legacy of those times, Athens still believed that the protection of the seas was its own prerogative (Dem. 58.53–56), as recognised by Philip himself (Dem. 7.14–15). During the 4th century BC, particularly owing to Athens’ precarious economic situation, signs of its inability to stem the problems occasionally caused by pirates had been already shown, such as the seizure of the island of Halonnesus in 343 BC (Dem. 7). However, the situation in 335 BC prior to the destruction of Thebes was, as seen,

⁵⁹ IG II² 1629, 539–541, 622–629, cf. Lambert 2012, 158.

⁶⁰ Allen 2000, 10 f.; Antela-Bernárdez 2016b.

⁶¹ Ormerod 1924, 108–110; Meiggs 1972, 153; Hornblower 2011, 246; cf. De Souza 1995, 189.

totally different. In this situation, two patriotic politicians, namely Lycurgus and Aristonicus, goaded by the chance and taking advantage of the need to ensure the city's grain supply, were able to promote a military campaign. This was the first one since Chaeronea, which, judging from how it is reported in epigraphy, must have been presented and glorified as the start of a struggle against the pirates. However, this goal was much more ambitious and far from reality, but one that contained a clear message of the restoration of Athens' past naval power, in line with what was happening in other spheres of society, namely the economy and politics.

In this sense, the fact that Diotimos of Euonimon led the expedition must not have been coincidental; instead, he must have been chosen with the utmost care. Diotimos, as mentioned above, was a close collaborator of the State, a renowned politician who already had experience with the navy as a trierarch, and was furthermore a renowned general who had commanded a part of the Athenian fleet at such a decisive juncture in Athens' history in particular and Greece's history in general as in 338 BC. Therefore, his reputation preceded him and made him the perfect candidate to command the mission.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to express their gratitude to L. Sancho and mostly to J. Roisman, for the comments and suggestions to the manuscript. The errors and mistakes are, nevertheless, our fault.

Bibliography

- Allen 2000: D. Allen, Changing the Authoritative Voice. Lycurgus' "Against Leocrates", *ClAnt* 19, 2000, 5–33.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2005: B. Antela-Bernárdez, *Alexandre e Atenas. Historia de Grecia 338–323 a.C.*, Santiago de Compostela 2005.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2011: B. Antela-Bernárdez, El día después de Queronea: La Liga de Corinto y el Imperio Macedonio sobre Grecia, in: E. Muñiz – J. M. Cortés Copete – R. Gordillo Hervás (eds.), *Grecia ante los imperios*, Seville 2011, 187–195.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2012: B. Antela-Bernárdez, Alejandro Magno, *poliorcetes*, in: J. Vidal – B. Antela-Bernárdez (eds.), *Fortificaciones y guerra de asedio en las guerras de la Antigüedad*, Zaragoza 2012, 77–134.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2015: B. Antela-Bernárdez, Furious Wrath. Alexander's Destruction of Thebes and Perdiccas' False Retreat, in: G. Lee – H. Whittaker – G. Wrightson (eds.), *Ancient Warfare. Introducing Current Research I*, Cambridge 2015, 94–106.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2016a: B. Antela-Bernárdez, Tracia, Sogdiana, India. Políticas de frontera en el imperio de Alejandro, in: F. J. Gómez Espelosín – B. Antela-Bernárdez (eds.), *El imperio de Alejandro. Aspectos geográficos e historiográficos*, Alcalá de Henares 2016, 111–149.

- Antela-Bernárdez 2016b: B. Antela-Bernárdez, Leócrates contra Atenas. Memoria del conflicto y carestía en Atenas entre 338 y 330 a.C., *Aevum* 90, 2016, 71–82.
- Antela-Bernárdez forthcoming: B. Antela-Bernárdez, *The Hungry Years. Athenian Grain and the Impact of Alexander's Conquest over Greece*, forthcoming.
- Ardaillon 1897: E. Ardaillon, *Les mines du Laurion dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1897.
- Arnott 1996: W. G. Arnott, *Alexis. The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996.
- Ashton 1977: N. G. Ashton, *The Naumachia near Amorgos in 322 B.C.*, *ABSA* 72, 1977, 1–11.
- Bellinger 1963: R. A. Bellinger, *Essays on the Coinage of Alexander the Great*, New York 1963.
- Bissa 2008: E.M.A. Bissa, *Investment Patterns in the Laurion Mining Industry in the Fourth Century BCE*, *Historia* 57, 2008, 263–273.
- Bosworth 1975: A. B. Bosworth, *The Mission of Amphoterus and the Outbreak of Agis' War*, *Phoenix* 29, 1975, 27–43.
- Bosworth 1980: A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander, I: Commentary on Books I–III*, Oxford 1980.
- Bosworth 1988 [1993]: A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 1988 [1993].
- Braund 2007: D. Braund, *Black Sea Grain for Athens? From Herodotus to Demosthenes*, in: V. Gabrielsen – J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity. Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, Copenhagen 2007, 39–68.
- Brun 2005a: P. Brun, *Impérialisme et démocratie à Athènes. Inscriptions de l'époque classique*, Paris 2005.
- Brun 2005b: P. Brun, *Lycurgue d'Athènes. Un législateur?*, in: P. Sineux (ed.), *Le Législateur et la loi dans l'Antiquité. Hommage à Françoise Ruzé*, Caen 2005, 187–199.
- Burke 1985: E. M. Burke, *Lycurgan Finances*, *GRBS* 26, 1985, 251–264.
- Burke 2010: E. M. Burke, *Finances and the Operation of the Athenian Democracy in the 'Lycurgan Era'*, *AJPh* 131, 2010, 393–423.
- Bury 2015: J. B. Bury, *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 2015⁴.
- Cary 1932: M. Cary, *Sources of Silver for the Greek World*, in: *Mélanges Gustave Glotz I*, Paris 1932, 133–142.
- Colin 1928: G. Colin, *Note sur l'administration financière de l'orateur Lycurgue*, *REA* 30, 1928, 189–200.
- Conomis 1961: N. C. Conomis, *Notes on the Fragments of Lycurgus*, *KLIO* 39, 1961, 72–152.
- Crosby – Young 1941: M. Crosby – J. Young, *Greek Inscriptions, Hesperia* 10, 1941, 442–468.
- Crosby 1950: M. Crosby, *The Leases of the Laureion Mines*, *Hesperia* 19, 1950, 189–312.
- Davies 1971: J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
- De Souza 1995: P. De Souza, *Greek Piracy*, in: A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World*, London, 1995, 179–198.
- De Souza 1999: P. De Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 1999.
- Develin 2003: R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 BC*, Cambridge 2003.
- Durrbach 1890: F. Durrbach, *L'orateur Lycurgue*, Paris 1890.
- Faraguna 1992: M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro. Problemi politici, economici, finanziari*, Rome 1992.
- Faraguna 2003: M. Faraguna, *Alexander and the Greeks*, in: J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden 2003, 99–130.
- Faraguna 2011: M. Faraguna, *Lykourgan Athens*, in: V. Azoulay – P. Ismard (eds.), *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, Paris 2011, 175–190.
- Ferguson 1911: M. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens. An Historical Essay*, Chicago 1911.

- Friend 2009: J. L. Friend, *The Athenian Ephebeia in the Lycurgan Period: 334/3–322/1 BC*, Diss. Austin 2009.
- Gabriel 2015: R. A. Gabriel, *The Madness of Alexander the Great and the Myth of Military Genius*, Barnsley 2015.
- Gabrielsen 1994: V. Gabrielsen, *Financing the Athenian Fleet. Public Taxation and Social Relations*, Baltimore – London 1994.
- Gabrielsen 2007: V. Gabrielsen, *Trade and Tribute. Byzantium and the Black Sea Straits*, in: V. Gabrielsen – J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity. Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, Aarhus – Lancaster 2007, 287–324.
- Garnsey 1988: P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World. Responses to Risk and Crisis*, Cambridge 1988.
- Garnsey 2004: P. Garnsey, *Grain for Athens*, in: *Cities, Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity. Essays in Social and Economic History* by Peter Garnsey, Cambridge 2004, 183–200.
- Gernet 1909: L. Gernet, *L'approvisionnement d'Athènes en blé au V^e et au IV^e siècle*, Paris 1909.
- Habicht 1997: C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Anthony*, London 1997.
- Hammond – Griffith 1979: N.G.L. Hammond – G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II*, Oxford 1979.
- Harding 1995: P. Harding, *Athenian Foreign Policy in the Fourth Century*, *Klio* 77, 1995, 105–125.
- Hauben 1972: H. Hauben, *The Command Structure in Alexander's Mediterranean Fleets*, *AncSoc* 3, 1972, 55–65.
- Hauben 1976: H. Hauben, *The Expansion of Macedonian Sea-Power under Alexander the Great*, *AncSoc* 7, 1976, 82–87.
- Heckel 2006: W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London 2006.
- Hopper 1953: R. J. Hopper, *The Attic Silver Mines in the Fourth Century B.C.*, *ABSA* 48, 1953, 200–254.
- Hornblower 2011: S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479–323 B.C.*, London 2011⁴.
- Humphreys 1985: S. Humphreys, *Lycurgus of Butadae. An Athenian Aristocrat*, in: J. W. Eadie – J. Ober (eds.), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian. Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, Lanham 1985, 199–252.
- Kroll 1977: J. H. Kroll, *Some Athenian Armor Tokens*, *Hesperia* 46, 1977, 141–146.
- Lambert 2004: S. D. Lambert, *Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1, I: Decrees Honouring Athenians*, *ZPE* 150, 2004, 85–120.
- Lambert 2007: S. D. Lambert, *Athenian State Laws and Decrees, 352/1–322/1, III: Decrees Honouring Foreigners, B. Other Awards*, *ZPE* 159, 2007, 101–154.
- Lambert 2012: S. D. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1 BC: Epigraphical Essays*, Leiden – Boston 2012.
- Landucci Gationi 1994: F. Landucci Gationi, *I mercenari nella politica ateniese nell'età di Alessandro, I: Soldati e ufficiali mercenari ateniesi al servizio della Persia*, *AncSoc* 25, 1994, 33–61.
- Landucci Gationi 1995: F. Landucci Gationi, *I mercenari nella politica ateniese dell'età di Alessandro, II: Il ritorno in patria dei mercenari*, *AncSoc* 33, 1995, 59–91.
- Lauffer 1957: S. Lauffer, *Prosopographische Bemerkungen zu den attischen Grubenpachtlisten*, *Historia* 6, 1957, 287–305.
- Lewis 1959: D. M. Lewis, *Law on the Lesser Panathenaia*, *Hesperia* 28, 1959, 239–247.
- Liddel 2016: P. Liddel, *Honorific Decrees of Fourth-Century Athens. Trends, Perceptions, Controversies*, in: C. Tiersch (ed.), *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 2016, 335–357.

- Loomis 1998: W. T. Loomis, Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens, Ann Arbor 1998.
- Low 2011: P. A. Low, Athenian Foreign Policy and the Quest for Stability, in: G. Herman (ed.), *Stability and Crisis in the Athenian Democracy*, Stuttgart 2011, 67–86.
- McK Camp 1982: J. McK Camp, Drought and Famine in the 4th Century B.C., *Hesperia Suppl.* 20, 1982, 9–17.
- Meiggs 1972: R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972.
- Merker 1986: I. L. Merker, Habron the Son of Lykourgos of Boutadai, *AncW* 14, 1986, 41–50.
- Milns 1996: R. D. Milns, The Effect of Alexander's Campaign on Food Prices, *Ancient Macedonia* 7, 1996, 763–769.
- Mitchel 1965: F. W. Mitchel, Athens in the Age of Alexander, *G&R* 12, 1965, 189–204.
- Mitchel 1970: F. W. Mitchel, Lykourgan Athens: 338–322. *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple*, Cincinnati 1970.
- Moreno 2007: A. Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy. The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*, Oxford 2007.
- Mossé 1973: C. Mossé, Athens in Decline: 404–86 BC, transl. by J. Stewart, London 1973.
- Mossé 1989: C. Mossé, Lycurgue l'Athenien. Home du passé ou précurseur de l'avenir?, *QS* 30, 1989, 25–36.
- Ober 1989: J. Ober, Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People, Princeton 1989.
- Oikonomides, 1986: A. N. Oikonomides, The Epigraphical Tradition of the Decree of Stratokles Honoring "Post Mortem" the Orator Lykourgos, *AncW* 14, 1986, 51–54.
- Oliver 2011: G. Oliver, Before "Lykourgan Athens". The Origin of Change, in: V. Azoulay – P. Ismard (eds.), *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, Paris 2011, 119–131.
- Ormerod 1997 [1924]: V.H.A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World. An Essay in Mediterranean History*, London – Liverpool 1997 [1924].
- Pritchett 1991: W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War V*, Berkeley 1991.
- Renehan 1970: R. F. Renehan, The Platonism of Lycurgus, *GRBS* 11, 1970, 219–231.
- Rhodes – Osborne 2003: P. J. Rhodes – R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford 2003.
- Roisman – Worthington – Waterfield 2015: J. Roisman – I. Worthington – R. Waterfield, *Lives of the Attic Orators. Texts from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius, and the Suda*, Oxford 2015.
- Ryder 2000: T.T.B. Ryder, Demosthenes and Philip II, in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Demosthenes. Statesman and Orator*, London – New York 2000, 45–89.
- Salamone 1976: S. Salamone, L'impegno etico e la morale di Licurgo, *A&R* 21, 1976, 41–52.
- Schweigert 1940: E. Schweigert, Greek Inscriptions, *Hesperia* 9, 1940, 309–357.
- Schwenk 1985: C. J. Schwenk, Athens in the Age of Alexander. The Dated Laws and Decrees of 'the Lykourgan Era' 338–322 B.C., Chicago 1985.
- Scott 2010: M. Scott, *From Democrats to Kings. The Downfall of Athens to the Epic Rise of Alexander the Great*, London 2010.
- Sealey 1993: R. Sealey, *Demosthenes and His Time. A Study in Defeat*, New York – Oxford 1993.
- Sekunda 1992: N. Sekunda, Athenian Demography and Military Strength 338–322 B.C., *ABSA* 87, 1992, 311–355.
- Serrat 2013: J. Serrat, Government and Warfare, in: H. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, Malden 317–331.

- Strauss 1984: B. S. Strauss, Philip II of Macedon, Athens, and Silver Mining, *Hermes* 112, 1984, 418–427.
- Tracy 1995: S. V. Tracy, Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C., Berkeley – London 1995.
- Vaughn 1991: P. Vaughn, The Identification and Retrieval of Hoplite Battle-Dead, in: V. D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London 1991, 38–62.
- Wankel 1986: H. Wankel, Die athenischen Strategen der Schlacht bei Chaironeia, *ZPE* 55, 1986, 45–53.
- Whibley 1921: L. Whibley, *A Companion to Greek Studies*, Cambridge 1921.
- Whitby 1998: M. Whitby, The Grain Trade of Athens in the Fourth Century BC, in: H. Parkins – C. Smith (eds.), *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*, London 1998, 99–124.
- Worthington 2014: I. Worthington, *By the Spear. Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*, Oxford 2014.