

Theorika in Fifth-Century Athens

David Kawalko Roselli

THE INTRODUCTION of the Theoric Fund is correctly dated to the middle of the fourth century.¹ Rhodes has argued that the institution of the Theoric Fund was created by Diophantus and Eubulus “probably soon after 355,” and Ruschenbusch, elaborating Beloch’s brief discussion in 1922, also argued for a fourth-century date.² However, as I will argue here, a reconsideration of the evidence of Plutarch and Philochorus in light of Athenian public finance suggests that

¹ For discussion of the *theorikon* see A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford 1957) 33–35; J. J. Buchanan, *Theorika. A Study of Monetary Distributions to the Athenian Citizenry* (Locust Valley 1962); N. Valmin, “Diobelia und Theorikon,” *OpAth* 6 (1963) 171–206; M. H. Hansen, “The Theoric Fund and the *Graphe Paranomon* against Apollodorus,” *GRBS* 17 (1974) 235–246; E. Ruschenbusch, “Die Einführung des Theorikon,” *ZPE* 36 (1979) 303–308; A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1988) 265–268; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*² (Oxford 1993) 514–516; M. Faraguna, *Atene nell’età di Alessandro* (Rome 1994) 187–189; E. M. Harris, “Demosthenes and the Theoric Fund,” in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History* (Norman/London 1994) 57–76 (repr. E. M. Harris, *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens* [Cambridge 2006] 121–139); E. Csapo and W. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor 1995) 287–289; A. Sommerstein, “The Theatre Audience, the *Demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus,” in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford 1997) 63–79, at 66–71; P. Wilson, “Leading the Tragic *Khoros*: Tragic Prestige in the Democratic City,” in Pelling, 81–108, at 97–100; G. Lentini, “Una nota sulla glossa *theorika* di Arpocrazione,” *AnnPisa* SER. IV 5 (2000) 247–250; E. Csapo, “The Men Who Built the Theatres: *Theatropolai*, *Theatronai*, and *Arkhitektones*,” in P. Wilson (ed.), *Greek Theatre and Festivals* (Oxford 2007) 87–115.

² Rhodes, *Commentary* 514; Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 307–308; Beloch, *Gr.Gesch.* III.1 (1922) 343. Cf. Beloch, *Die attische Politik seit Perikles* (Leipzig 1884) 178, and *Gr.Gesch.* II.1 (1914) 157, for his earlier attribution of the *theorikon* to Pericles.

distributions of public funds approved by the *demos* for attendance at festivals (θεωρικά) existed as ad hoc payments in the fifth century, but these were not part of the Theoric Fund that came into existence later in the fourth century. While Old Comedy does not explicitly refer to τὸ θεωρικόν or θεωρικά, its references to the economics of the theater (e.g. entrance costs, theater-leasing) can nonetheless contribute to our understanding of the distributions of state funds for attending festivals in the fifth century and help to sort out some of the confusing and contradictory information on other distributions of state funds (e.g. δωβελία) preserved in ancient sources.

1. Plutarch's *Pericles* and Fifth-Century Athenian Finance

There is explicit evidence attributing *theorika* to Pericles. Plutarch's *Pericles* (9.1) contests Thucydides' "aristocratic" presentation of Pericles by noting that others claim that "the *demos* was led on by him into cleruchies, *theorika*, and distributions of public pay" (ὑπ' ἐκείνου φασὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐπὶ κληρουχίας καὶ θεωρικὰ καὶ μισθῶν διανομὰς προαχθῆναι). As a result the *demos* became extravagant and wanton. Plutarch (9.2–3) goes on to describe how in his competition with Cimon for the favor of the *demos* Pericles "turned to the distribution of state funds" (τρέπεται πρὸς τὴν τῶν δημοσίων διανομήν); soon thereafter he "bribed the multitude wholesale with *theorika*, pay for service in jury courts, other payments, and choregic performances" (θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις συνδεκάσας τὸ πλῆθος).

Plutarch is most clear on the attribution of the *theorika* to Pericles. However, the numerous accounts of Pericles' distributions of state funds (e.g. *Ath. Pol.* 27.4, *Pl. Grg.* 515E) have led some to suggest that the attribution of *theorika* to Pericles is the result of confusion with the *dikastikon*.³ Plutarch is not, however,

³ See Buchanan, *Theorika* 29–34; Rhodes, *Commentary* 514; Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 308. L. Kallet, "Accounting for Culture in Fifth-Century Athens," in D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1998) 44–58, 357–364, at 358 n.26, states that "Evidence connecting the *theorikon* with Perikles ... is not sound"; cf. Faraguna, *Atene* 189. For discussion of Plutarch's text see P. A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill 1989) 110–118.

the only source to associate Pericles with *theorika*: the scholiast to Aeschines (3.24) and Ulpian (on Dem. 1.1) likewise attribute *theorika* to Pericles. The common source for this attribution may have been Philochorus or Theopompus.⁴ Although some scholars have accepted this testimony and wrongly attributed a Theoric Fund to Pericles, in the face of these late sources Rhodes emphasizes the apparent fact that there is “no contemporary evidence to support a fifth-century date.”⁵ However, the question of the introduction of *theorika* necessitates a consideration of more than the explicit references in our sources. A brief reassessment of public expenditure and the economic practices of the theater can, I argue below, provide contemporaneous confirmation of fifth-century *theorika*: Plutarch’s evidence appears to be supported by fifth-century sources.

A key distinction needs to be made between theoric distributions and the Theoric Fund. This Fund is commonly attributed to Eubulus, but the evidence only states that Eubulus (and Diophantus) made distributions from it (schol. Aeschin. 3.24, Harp. s.vv. θεωρικά, Εὐβουλος), or that he was closely associated with its substantial growth (Aeschin. 3.25). The fourth-century Theoric Fund was permanent and received a regular allotment in the *merismos*; it also received any surplus revenue that previously was allotted to the Military Fund ([Dem.] 59.4–

⁴ See Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 103, for references.

⁵ Rhodes, *Commentary* 514, cf. 492. S. Goldhill, “The Audience of Athenian Tragedy,” in P. Easterling (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge 1997) 54–68, at 66–67, states that “There was a fund called the Theoric Fund, established by the city probably under Pericles, which made payments to the citizens to enable them to attend the theatre”; N. Croally, “Tragedy’s Teaching,” in J. Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Malden 2005) 55–70, at 63: “The evidence concerning the Theoric Fund is not good ... but it seems likely that all citizens received some form of subsidy during the fifth century.” See further Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals* 266–267; N. Spineto, *Dionysos a teatro: il contesto festivo del dramma greco* (Rome 2005) 272. Rhodes, *Commentary* 514, favors a date in the “350’s and 340’s” for the creation of the *theorikon* and suggests that “the references to Pericles will be a careless extension of the fact that he instituted the first state payments to civilians”; see also W. T. Loomis, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens* (Ann Arbor 1998) 225–226. Faraguna, *Atene* 189, considers the discrepancy among the sources as “insanabile.”

5). The *theorikon* may have first been managed by one official but later appears to have been managed by a board (οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν: *Ath. Pol.* 43.1, 47.2; Aeschin. 3.25).⁶ The passage from Aeschines further suggests that those controlling the Theoric Fund—because of the citizens’ trust in Eubulus—controlled other financial officers and oversaw a wide array of state projects. According to these sources Eubulus appears to have enlarged the scope of the Theoric Fund and the authority of its manager(s); he also channeled surplus funds into the fund and made distributions from it.⁷

A permanently funded Theoric Fund was not possible in the fifth century, for there was no annual allotment in the *merismos* in Athenian public finance at that time. All payments of state funds were made from a central state fund until ca. 411, and expenditures were individually authorized by the Assembly.⁸ Herodotus’ discussion about the use of the funds from the silver mines in Laurium in 483/2 suggests that surplus money was held in the “public funds” (7.144.1 ἐν τῷ κοινῷ; cf. *Ath. Pol.* 22, Plut. *Them.* 4). If not for the intervention of Themistocles, whose motion prevailed at a timely moment (γνώμη ἐς καιρὸν ἠρίστευσε) and who thus convinced (ἀνέγνωσε) the Athenians to use the money to build ships, they would have distributed these surplus public funds to each citizen at a rate of ten drachmas each.⁹ Herodotus’ language indicates that a public debate was envisioned as taking place concerning the fate of

⁶ For discussion of οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν see P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 235–240; Rhodes, *Commentary* 514–516.

⁷ For discussion of Eubulus see Buchanan, *Theorika* 53–60; G. Cawkwell, “Eubulus,” *JHS* 83 (1963) 47–67; E. M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian Politics* (Oxford 1995) 38–42.

⁸ Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 99, 102–103. See M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford 1991) 262–263, for references to allotment amounts in the *merismos*.

⁹ The so-called Papyrus Decree with its fragmentary commentary on Dem. 22 may contain a reference to the “public treasury” (τὸ δημόσιον) from which payments were made (perhaps) on the basis of Pericles’ motion, but there are too many uncertainties in the text; see A. Blamire, “Athenian Finance, 454–404 B.C.,” *Hesperia* 70 (2001) 99–126, at 100; L. J. Samons II, *Empire of the Owl. Athenian Imperial Finance* (Stuttgart 2000) 139.

the newly generated surplus from the silver mines. Later in the fifth century funds for the military expeditions to Samos (*IG I³ 363* [M./L. 55]) and Corcyra (*IG I³ 364* [M./L. 61]) were contingent upon their approval in the Assembly (cf. *IG I³ 52.A.3–4*).

Public finance was organized quite differently later in the Classical period. In the fourth century the various ἀρχαί were allotted funds in the *merismos* (e.g. *IG II² 29* [Rhodes/Osborne, *GHI* 19]), and additional expenses beyond the amount allotted in the *merismos* required a law passed by the *nomothetai* (*IG II² 222.41–52*).¹⁰ The *stratiotic* fund also received an allocation;¹¹ while the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν was free to make payments for expeditions directly (e.g. *IG II² 207.b.11*, 1492.118–124; cf. *Ath.Pol.* 48.2), the accounts of the ἀρχαί would have been examined by *logistai* ([Dem.] 49.12, Aeschin. 3.13–15, *Ath.Pol.* 48.1–3).¹²

In the fifth century state payments were made on an ad hoc basis and paid out by *kolakretai*, known as the “stewards of public funds” (schol. *Ar. Av.* 1541 τὸν κωλακρέτην· τὸν ταμίαν τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων). These treasury officials (i.e. “paymasters”), who were appointed to serve for only one prytany (e.g. *IG I³ 36.8–10*), were in charge of Athens’ domestic expenses (in contrast with the city’s imperial funds controlled by the *hellenotamiai*) and made payments voted by the *ekklesia*.¹³ The *kolakretai* were responsible for dispensing a wide range of state funds: dikasts’ pay (*Ar. Av.* 1542, *Vesp.* 695, 724; schol. *Ar. Av.* 1541; Hesych. and *Suda* s.v. κωλακρέται), *theoroi* (schol. *Ar. Av.* 1541 = Androt. *FGrHist* 324 F 36), fees for heralds and stonecutters (*IG I³ 71.50–51*, 25–26 [M./L. 69]), the salary for the priestess of Athena Nike (*IG I³ 36.4–11* [M./L. 71]), and

¹⁰ Hansen, *Athenian Democracy* 263.

¹¹ Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 105.

¹² *Logistai*: Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 111. Hansen, *Athenian Democracy* 157–158, notes that in the fourth century the “surviving number of decrees regulating state finances is surprisingly small” on account of the *merismos* settling the budget for ἀρχαί.

¹³ On the *hellenotamiai* see Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 102; Samons, *Empire* 70–82, 240–245.

payment for a statue of Athena Promachos (*IG* I³ 435).¹⁴ According to Androtion (F 36) the *kolakretai* are to “make expenditures for any other matter that is necessary” (καὶ εἰς ἄλλο ὃ τι ἂν δέη ἀναλώσαι).¹⁵

Although the existence of a fifth-century Theoric Fund is not possible given the structure of Athenian public finance, ad hoc payments approved by the Assembly when deemed necessary appear to have been routine. Whereas Pericles could thus not have created a “Theoric Fund,” the language of Plutarch’s text nonetheless suggests a different arrangement for distributions of public funds. According to Plutarch “the *demos* was led on” by Pericles to cleruchies, *theorika*, and public pay for civic service; he “bribed the multitude wholesale with *theorika*, pay for service in jury courts, other payments, and choregic performances” (9.1–3). Plutarch describes Pericles as having the support of the *demos* to distribute public funds (much like Themistocles’ successful intervention with the Athenians in 483/2), and it is precisely this arrangement that we find in fifth-century Athenian finance.¹⁶ In addition to payment for the courts, the payment of state funds for *bouleutai*, overseas officials, and various magistracies is further attested in the fifth century.¹⁷ Plutarch’s description of the distribution of public funds to attend festivals (*theorika*) is consistent with contemporary evidence for the *dikastikon* and other payments passed by the *ekklesia* in the fifth century.

¹⁴ For additional domestic financial payments made by the *kolakretai* see *ATL* III 360–362; Blamire, *Hesperia* 70 (2001) 106–107; J. Oehler, “Κολακρέται,” *RE* 11 (1921) 1068; Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 102 n.5; Samons, *Empire* 57 n.141. For a brief overview of the sources of income paid out by the *kolakretai* see Blamire 106.

¹⁵ See P. Harding, *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford 1994) 134–138, for discussion of this fragment (his translation).

¹⁶ Plutarch’s reference to choregic performances likely alludes to Pericles’ own expenditures on choral performances. We know that he served as *choregos* for the production that included Aeschylus’ *Persians* in 472 (*IG* II² 2318.10); for similar usage for choregic performances see also Plut. *Nic.* 3. For discussion of the *choregia* and its political significance see P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia* (Cambridge 2000).

¹⁷ E.g. *Ath. Pol.* 24.3, *Old Oligarch* 1.3, *Thuc.* 8.69.4; see further Loomis, *Wages* 9–22, for evidence of state pay for public officials.

2. Philochorus and *Theorikon*

An excerpt from Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 33) preserved by Harpocration (s.v. θεωρικά) provides tantalizing information concerning the history of the *theorikon*, but its significance for fifth-century distributions of public funds has been neglected:

θεωρικὰ ἦν τινὰ ἐν κοινῷ χρήματα ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς πόλεως προσόδων συναγόμενα. ταῦτα δὲ πρότερον μὲν εἰς τὰς τοῦ πολέμου χρείας ἐφυλάττετο καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο στρατιωτικά, ὕστερον δὲ κατετίθετο εἰς τε τὰς δημοσίας κατασκευὰς καὶ διανομὰς τῶν πολιτῶν, ὧν πρῶτος ἦρξατο Ἀγύρριος ὁ δημαγωγός. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν τῇ γ' τῆς Ἀτθίδος φησὶ “τὸ δὲ θεωρικὸν ἦν τὸ πρῶτον νομισθὲν δραχμὴ τῆς θέας, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦνομα ἔλαβε καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.” Φιλίνος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Σοφοκλέους καὶ Εὐριπίδου εἰκονας περὶ Εὐβούλου λέγων φησὶ “ἐκλήθη δὲ θεωρικὸν ὅτι τῶν Διονυσίων ὑπογύων ὄντων διένειμεν εἰς θυσίαν, ἵνα πάντες ἐορτάζωσι καὶ τῆς θεωρίας μηδεὶς τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπολείπηται δι' ἀσθένειαν τῶν ιδίων. ἄλλοτε μέντοι ἄλλως ὠρίσθη τὸ διδόμενον εἰς τε τὰς θέας καὶ εἰς τὰς θυσίας καὶ ἐορτάς, ὡς ἔστι δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ α' Φιλίππων Δημοσθένους.”

Theorika were public funds collected from the revenue of the city. Earlier these funds were kept for the needs of war and called *stratōtika*, but later they were made available for public works and distributions, which Agyrrhius the demagogue was the first to start. Philochorus says in the third book of *Atthis* that *theorika* were first considered the drachma for the spectacle [or seat], from which it took its name and so on. In his speech *Against the Statues of Sophocles and Euripides*, Philinus says of Eubulus that it was called *theorikon* because when the Dionysia was approaching, Eubulus distributed it for the sacrifice, so that all could take part in the celebrations and none of the citizens would be deprived of the spectacles on account of poverty. Elsewhere however it is otherwise defined as what is given out for spectacles [or seats] and sacrifices and public holidays, as is clear from Demosthenes' *First Philippic*.¹⁸

The excerpt from Philochorus contributes some crucial evidence that can further corroborate Plutarch's discussion of *theorika*. Philinus' testimony is also notable for its description of Eubulus' motive for distributing the funds, but it falls notably

¹⁸ Translation (slightly modified) from Csapo/Slater, *Context* 293–294.

short of attributing the fund(s) to him.

Harpocration's entry appears to preserve the detail that Agyrrhius was the originator of the *theorikon*, but this is unlikely.¹⁹ References to an increase in the amount of the *theorikon* (Hesych. Δ 2351, *Suda* Δ 1491) to one drachma during the archonship of a certain Diophantus have further complicated matters. For there was a Diophantus, who was archon in 395/4, and another Diophantus (Σφήτιος), who was an associate of Eubulus in the middle of the fourth century.²⁰ While mention of Agyrrhius in this passage could be the result of a confusion with his introduction of Assembly pay (*Ath. Pol.* 41.3), or may reflect a contemporaneous increase in the amount of the *theorika*, the language of Harpocration's passage is noteworthy.²¹ He writes that *theorika* were first (πρότερον μὲν) used for military expenses and called *stratiorika* and were later used for public works and distributions, which Agyrrhius the demagogue first started (ὑστερον δὲ). Whereas Ruschenbusch claims that this reference to Agyrrhius is incorrect on account of the mention of the public building program commonly associated with Eubulus (and *not* with Agyrrhius), the relative pronoun (ὧν) need only refer to distributions (διανομάς); the sentence may only invoke Agyrrhius in the context of the

¹⁹ For Agyrrhius as the originator of the *theorikon* see Buchanan, *Theorika* 29–34, 48–60; Lentini, *AnnPisa* (2000) 247–250; Valmin, *OpAth* 6 (1963) 171–206. R. S. Stroud, *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 29 [1998]) 20–21, connects the institution of the *theorikon* with Agyrrhius in 395/4 and suggests its transformation under Eubulus; see also P. Harding, *The Story of Athens* (London/New York 2008) 112, for the connection between Agyrrhius and the increase in the amount of the subvention.

²⁰ See Rhodes, *Commentary* 514, for brief discussion (with reference to *PA* 4417 and 4438). Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals* 267, suggests that the amount of one drachma was for three days of tragedies; Buchanan, *Theorika* 50–51, canvasses other views.

²¹ Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* III.1 343, distinguishes Agyrrhius' role in increasing Assembly pay from this misattribution. A. Boeckh, *The Public Economy of Athens*² (London 1842) 220, suggests that the passage refers to Agyrrhius' increase in the amount of the *theorikon*. See Loomis, *Wages* 20–22; Rhodes, *Commentary* 514, for additional references. This part of Harpocration's entry may in fact derive from Philochorus: Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328 F 33, I p.319.

distribution of state funds.²²

Before discussing the evidence from Philochorus in some detail, it is worth remarking the hints about the structure of his discussion. As Jacoby argued, “we have lost the full account of Ph., which presumably was not quite brief. *πρῶτον* and *πρότερον* (if *θεωρικά* – *Ἀγύρριος ὁ δημαγωγός* belongs to the excerpt from Ph.) shows that he gave a history of this item of the budget which, judging from the drafting of the whole sentence, was probably given at the time of Demosthenes, i.e. in the sixth book.”²³ The language of the passage and the use of *πρῶτον* suggest some kind of summary of the institution or “at least” calls attention to the history of the fund.²⁴ Philochorus’ account of the *theorikon* most likely provided a *history* of the “drachma for the spectacle [or seat].”²⁵ It is thus plausible that Philochorus’ account of the *theorikon* in the *Atthis* described the early history of these fifth-century distributions.

According to Harpocration, Philochorus in the third book of his *Atthis* explains that the *θεωρικόν* was first considered the drachma for the *θέα* (i.e., the spectacle or a seat on the *ikria*,

²² Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 308; cf. Faraguna, *Atene* 189. The tendency in the sources to connect demagogues with state pay (either initiating new funds or increasing the amounts of old funds) may have contributed to the association of Agyrrhius with the popular distribution of state funds. *Suda* s.v. *θεωρικά* omits reference to Agyrrhius.

²³ Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328 F 33, I p.319.

²⁴ Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328, I p.247, and ad F 33, II n.7; see also Harding, *Story* 112. See Jacoby I pp.245–247 on Philochorus’ digressions, the existence of which “occasionally leads to doubts in regard to the correct placing of a quotation which has come down to us without the number of a book” (247). One might add that such doubts can lead to reassignment of a fragment *even when* the number of a book is given.

²⁵ Harpocration’s testimony that the funds (*θεωρικά*) were earlier used for war and called *στρατιωτικά* and later used for public buildings and distributions likely reflects fourth-century debate concerning the Theoric Fund (cf. *FGrHist* 328 F 56a referring to events in 339/8). For discussion of the Theoric Fund see Harris, *Democracy* 121–139 (with additional bibliography), who argues that Libanius’ information about the use of the Theoric Fund in Demosthenes is incorrect and that Demosthenes in the *First Olynthiac* is attacking the misuse of the Stratiotic Fund; cf. Hansen, *GRBS* 17 (1974) 235–246.

the wooden benches in the *theatron*: schol. Ar. *Thesm.* 395), from which it got its name.²⁶ Whereas Philochorus' first two books deal with the reign of Cecrops and the early rulers of Athens, fragments clearly marked as belonging to the third book include discussion of the early (pre-Solonian) Areopagus (F 20a, 20b). The stone before which Athenian officials made their oaths is also explicitly located in the third book (F 21); the introduction of this practice is attributed to Solon (*Ath.Pol.* 7.1). Another fragment without a book number refers to Solon's *seisachtheia* (F 114).²⁷ A reference (F 32a, 32b) to Aethaea, a city in Laconia, most likely alludes to events surrounding the uprising of the Helots and the *perioikoi* in 464.²⁸ Firmly attested for Philochorus' third book, fragment 35a with its discussion of *orgeones* has been plausibly connected with Pericles' citizenship law of 451/0.²⁹ The third book appears to have ended its account in the middle of the fifth century, for a fragment assigned to the fourth book (F 34a, b) refers to events during the Second Sacred War in 448/7. Another fragment (F 36) from the fourth book refers to Philochorus' extensive discussion of the construction of the Propylaia during the archonship of Euthymenes (437/6).³⁰ While the end of the third book cannot be dated with precision, a terminus at some point between the time of the reforms of the Areopagus Council in 462/1 and the late 450s is plausible.

²⁶ For θέα as both spectacle and seat (both senses are apt in this case, as I will discuss below) see Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 90.

²⁷ For recent discussion of these fragments see Harding, *Story* 34, 89–90, and *passim*. See Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328, I pp.251–255, for discussion of the dating of the individual books of *Atthis*.

²⁸ Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328 F 33, I p.318. Steph. Byz. s.v. Αἰθαία, who preserves F 32a, connects the mention of Aethaea with a passage in Thucydides (1.101.2) that refers to the revolt of the Helots and the *perioikoi*.

²⁹ C. Theodoridis, “Eine unbeachtete Buchangabe zum Bruchstück des Philochoros über die attischen Orgeonen,” *ZPE* 138 (2002) 40–42, for the attribution of F 35a to the third book of *Atthis*. See Harding, *Story* 185; Rhodes, *Commentary* 68–69, for discussion of this fragment and its relation to Pericles.

³⁰ For discussion and additional references see Harding, *Story* 119; Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328, I pp.251–252, 323–324.

In light of the chronology of the material covered in Philochorus' third book, the latest possible dating for *theorika* is from the end of the 460s to the end of the 450s. Although Jacoby suggests that the introduction of "the *Theorikon* ... hardly was as early as the sixties," a one-off distribution of state funds for attendance at festivals for citizens during the turbulent years following the Areopagus reforms and the introduction of the *dikastikon* could have been a tactical move by Pericles.³¹ The close link between Pericles and the theater as a site of political influence is further attested by his association with choregic performances (Plut. *Per.* 9.3) and his role as *choregos* for Aeschylus in 472. Although the excerpt from Philochorus (F 33) does not mention Pericles, the placement of Philochorus' discussion of *theorika* in the chronology of the *Atthis* indicates a date that would coincide with Pericles' rise to power. However, there has been some debate about the fragment's attribution to the third book. Since the books of the *Atthis* were organized chronologically, this debate is of some importance for understanding Philochorus' passage and evaluating the existence of fifth-century *theorika*. Although some scholars have suggested emending the book number provided by Harpocration and thus pushing Philochorus' discussion of *theorika* into the fourth century, the arguments for the proposed emendation do not stand up to closer scrutiny.

The apparent absence of other direct and explicit references to *theorika* and *theorikon* in Old Comedy and in speeches down to the middle of the fourth century is a key component of the argument to emend the book attribution.³² On the basis of this observation Beloch argues for the introduction of the *theorikon* first under Eubulus, and it is on this basis that he proposed to emend the book attribution of Philochorus: "muss die Buchzahl Γ verderbt sein, offenbar aus E oder F, da das IV. Buch

³¹ Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328, II n.245.

³² Beloch, *Gr.Gesch.* III.1 343 n.2: "In dem Komödien aus der Zeit des Peloponnesischen und Korinthischen Krieges und bei den Rednern bis zur Mitte des IV. Jahrhunderts wird das θεωρικόν denn auch niemals erwähnt." See further Buchanan, *Theorika* 31; Rhodes, *Commentary* 514; Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 305.

die Zeit von spätestens etwa 450 an behandelte.”³³ Later Jacoby tentatively suggested that the “alteration of Γ to F seems indicated” for the placement of the digression on the *theorikon*. The basis for Jacoby’s emendation is the fact that Philochorus refers to the military fund in another fragment (F 56) dated to the archonship of Lysimachides in 339/8 and that the question of the use of funds “was urgent during the whole administration of Eubulos in 354/339 B.C.”³⁴ At best, Jacoby’s argument for emending the book attribution rests on the fact that we do have evidence for ongoing debate about the use of the Theoric and Military Funds in the fourth century.³⁵ In his discussion of the introduction of the *theorikon* Ruschenbusch reasserts Beloch’s arguments, while incorporating part of Jacoby’s independent suggestions, and promotes the value of Philinus as a source.³⁶ However, there are two main problems with Ruschenbusch’s arguments: the Theoric Fund is confused with all distributions of state funds for attendance at festivals, and the Fund is presented as a fourth-century institution created by Eubulos.

The emendation of Philochorus’ book number is not, however, required by any of the extant evidence. As Beloch had

³³ Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* III.1 343 n.2; he emphasizes the fact that the *Ath. Pol.* (27.4) refers to jury pay introduced by Pericles but does not mention the *theorikon*. The *Ath. Pol.* is, however, silent on the creator of the *theorikon*. According to Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 308, Plutarch, for whom Pericles is “der Begründer des Wohlfahrtsstaates,” is responsible for attributing the *theorikon* to Pericles.

³⁴ Jacoby, ad *FGrHist* 328 F 33, I p.319.

³⁵ See Harris, *Democracy* 121–139, for discussion of the relationship between Demosthenes and the Theoric Fund.

³⁶ Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 304, claims that Philinus is “das wichtigste Zeugnis”; see also Lentini, *AnnPisa* (2000) 247–250, for an emphasis on Philinus’ testimony. Sommerstein, in Pelling, *Greek Tragedy* 66, states a fourth-century date for the introduction of the *theorikon* with reference to Ruschenbusch; see also Stadter, *Commentary* 116. Despite Ruschenbusch’s endorsement of Jacoby’s emendation of the book attribution of F 33, Jacoby (I pp.319–320) in fact claims that the “date of the first introduction [of the *theorikon*] cannot be determined with certainty ... general considerations lead with greater probability to the (first half of) the ’forties. In any case the period of 454–449 B.C. cannot be proved.”

argued in his earlier discussion, what is attributed to Eubulus are changes in the organization of the Theoric Fund and in the frequency and amount of the distributions.³⁷ Jacoby's emphasis on the urgency of the question of the Theoric Fund during Eubulus' administration merely reflects fourth-century discussions about the Theoric Fund (e.g. Dem. 1.19–20, 3.10–13; [Dem.] 49.4–6). While Beloch had earlier attributed the introduction of the *theorikon* to Pericles on the basis of the testimony of Plutarch and the scholiast to Aeschines, his subsequent argument *required* that the Philochorus excerpt come from the fifth or sixth book instead of the third book (as in Harpocration's entry). The apparent uncertainty over the book assignment of Philochorus' digression on the *theorikon* is significant. For there is little justification for reassigning the fragment beyond an *a priori* notion that public distributions of state funds to citizens for the attendance of festivals was a fourth-century creation.³⁸ Evidence for the fourth-century debate on the Theoric Fund does not, however, preclude fifth-century distributions of state funds for festivals (*theorika*). There remains no reason to emend the book number. Evidence for Philochorus' discussion of *theorika* in the third book of his *Atthis* locates these distributions to some point around the middle of the fifth century, and this early date is supported by the evidence associating *theorika* with Pericles (e.g. Plut. *Per.*, schol. Aeschin. 3.24).³⁹ The profound

³⁷ Beloch, *Die attische Politik* 178, attributes to Pericles the introduction of the *theorikon* and suggests that Eubulus “feierte die Feste mit grösserem Aufwand, vertheilte das Theorikon öfter und reichlicher als irgend Jemand vor ihm, und erwarb sich dafür in dem grossen Hafen eine zuverlässige Stütze seiner Politik”; Beloch, *Gr.Gesch.* II.1 157, mentions “Geldspenden an die Bürger” under Pericles (with reference to Plut. *Per.* 9, Philochorus, and Ulpian). Beloch's later discussion (*Gr.Gesch.* III.1) reflects a clear change of position.

³⁸ Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 307, claims (without evidence) that “Dass Androtion Eubulos und die Einführung und das weitere Schicksal des Theorikon erwähnt hat, bedarf keiner Frage ... ebenso wenig bedarf es der Frage, dass Androtion, der ja die Einführung des Theorikon durch Eubulos miterlebt hat, nur Eubulos als Schöpfer des Theorikon genannt hat.”

³⁹ While one might hazard a guess that Philochorus in his third book refers to payments of state funds *generally* following upon his treatment of Pericles' pay for the courts and thus his digression on *theorika* does not reflect

confusion surrounding the evidence, nonetheless, remains to be explained.

One likely source of confusion in both ancient and modern sources that has fueled the debate concerning the introduction of the *theorikon* is the tendency to conflate “theoric distributions” and the Theoric Fund.⁴⁰ This confusion tends to privilege the evidence attesting the fourth-century Theoric Fund that is closely associated with Eubulus (Hesych. and *Suda* s.v. *δοξαμὴ χαλαζῶσα*; schol. Aeschin. 3.24). But these sources are not explicit in attributing the creation of the Theoric Fund to Eubulus. Theopompus (*FGHist* 115 F 99, cf. 100) emphasizes Eubulus’ distributions of state funds (*ἀργύριον συχνὸν πορίζων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις διένειμε*) and notes their deleterious effect on the temperament of the city, making it most cowardly and carefree (*ἀνανδροτάτην καὶ ῥαθυμοτάτην*).⁴¹ Aeschines (3.25) refers to the citizens’ trust in Eubulus when listing the wide array of public expenditure connected with the controllers of the Theoric Fund (*οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν*), which was clearly responsible for much more than dispersing funds to citizens for festivals.⁴² According to Demosthenes (19.291) Eubulus advised Athens to make “the theoric money stratiotic,” if peace was not

a fifth-century date, it is more likely that he engaged in a digression summarizing the history of theoric distributions (as Jacoby suggests) rather than a general history of *all* forms of state pay. The additional evidence for fifth-century *theorika* should not be overlooked in this context.

⁴⁰ This problem is noted by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *CR* 14 (1964) 191 (review of Buchanan, *Theorika*).

⁴¹ One might compare the use of the term *theatron* with the term *theorikon* in the lexicographers. Whereas previous scholars (ancient and modern) were content to assume that the *theatron* meant *any* theater structure on the south slope of the Acropolis, the lexicographers’ use of *theatron* generally refers to the fourth-century *stone theater* rather than to the space for the theater on the south slope with its earlier wooden seating. See S. Scullion, *Three Studies in Athenian Dramaturgy* (Stuttgart 1994) 52–65, for discussion.

⁴² For discussion of the Theoric Fund and its controllers see Faraguna, *Atene* 187–189; Rhodes, *Athenian Boule* 235–240; *Commentary* 514–516, 596–597. On Eubulus and Athens’ finances: Cawkwell, *JHS* 83 (1963) 47–67; Ste. Croix, *CR* 14 (1964) 190–191, who rightly notes the rhetorical purpose of Aeschines’ passage, designed to make the controllers of the fund appear as powerful as possible.

made with Philip. These sources do not attribute the introduction of the Theoric Fund or *theorika* more generally to Eubulus but likely reflect some of the changes that took place in the financial organization of Athens and in the debates surrounding the Theoric Fund under Eubulus. These changes are suggested in Philinus' testimony preserved in Harpocration's entry.

In Philinus' speech, *Against the Statues of Sophocles and Euripides*, delivered ca. 335, the reference to Eubulus should not be interpreted as signifying his creation of the theater dole. Much like Beloch's 1922 discussion, in which Philinus' testimony is the basis for attributing the introduction of the *theorikon* to Eubulus, Ruschenbusch's argument privileges Philinus' statement and emphasizes the fact that Philochorus F 33 does not explicitly refer to Pericles.⁴³ As noted above, it is important for Ruschenbusch's case that Philochorus *also* discusses the *theorikon* in the sixth book (F 56a); according to this argument, all discussion of the *theorikon* is to be placed there. However, since Eubulus made modifications to the Theoric Fund, it is precisely these changes that may have occasioned Philochorus' treatment of these issues in the sixth book. According to Harpocration, Philinus states that "it was called *theorikon* because when the Dionysia was approaching, Eubulus distributed it for the sacrifice, so that all could take part in the celebrations and none of the citizens would be deprived of the spectacles on account of poverty." While Philinus' text does not attribute the institution of the *theorikon* to Eubulus, the passage highlights Eubulus' involvement with its distribution (e.g. schol. Aeschin. 3.24) and thus his clear involvement with the Theoric Fund.⁴⁴ It is the reorganization of the Theoric Fund and the fact of its distribution that is most relevant to the excerpt from Philinus' speech.⁴⁵

⁴³ Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 305–306; see also Lentini, *AnnPisa* (2000) 248. That Philochorus does not mention Pericles in the brief excerpt preserved by Harpocration need not imply that the theater dole was instituted under Eubulus (cf. Ruschenbusch 307).

⁴⁴ Cf. Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 306: Philinus names "Eubulos als Schöpfer des Theorikon"; see also Beloch, *Gr.Gesch.* III.1 343.

⁴⁵ Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 306, notes the aspect of innovation stressed by Philinus. See further Buchanan, *Theorika* 53–60, for the develop-

3. *Theorika*, *Diôbelia*, and Old Comedy

Philochorus F 33 may, however, provide some additional evidence, not previously considered, for the early history of *theorika* in the fifth century. For Philochorus writes that the *theorikon* was that which was first considered to be the drachma for the *θέα*, either the spectacle or a seat on the *ikria*, and that it took its name from this.⁴⁶ A possible implication of this passage is that there was some kind of theater dole prior its conception as the *theorikon*, for it was first (πρώτον) considered to be the drachma for the theater seat/spectacle from which it took its name (ὅθεν καὶ τοῦνομα ἔλαβε).⁴⁷ There is a logical if not a chronological ordering to Philochorus' statement: there was the drachma for the *θέα*, and from this it acquired its name. It would seem that according to Philochorus the early theater dole was not considered to be the "*theorikon*" proper but could be more generally conceived as payment for the *θέα*, perhaps as *misthophoria*. This is in fact suggested in Plato's *Gorgias* (515E) with the association of Pericles with the (allegedly "demagogic") distribution of state funds to the people. According to Socrates, Pericles' introduction of *misthophoria* has corrupted the populace, making them worse where they were better before; Pericles' mob-pleasing policies corrupt the *polis* through the lavish feasting of the *demos* on its desires (518E–519A). The term Socrates uses also surfaces in Plutarch to describe Pericles' distributions, ἄλλαις μισθοφοραῖς (*Per.* 9.3; cf. *Ath. Pol.* 24.3).

Philochorus' testimony that the *theorikon* was first considered

ment of the Theoric Fund under Eubulus. If Eubulus did use funds from metics for his building projects, the potential distribution of state funds to non-citizens (perhaps suggested in Philinus' text by πάντες, which is coordinated with μηδεις τῶν πολιτῶν) for particular festival events would be part of a larger fourth-century trend towards greater inclusiveness of the residents in the festivals. See Wilson, *Khoregia* 266, for discussion of the significance of Eubulus' use of metics' funds in the theater as moving further away from a "citizen-centered view of the theater."

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g. Buchanan, *Theorika* 50–51 (noting only the "derivation of the word from *θέα*"), and Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 303–308, both of whom ignore the language of the text.

⁴⁷ See also Faraguna, *Atene* 189, referring to this passage as a possible indication of distribution of state funds before the mid-fourth century.

the δραχμὴ τῆς θέας may thus provide some additional indication for the way in which the dole was viewed (if not also called). The fact that it was “considered” to be the drachma for the θέα is consistent with the idea that the dole formed part of a general system of state distributions that was not permanent in the fifth century.⁴⁸ Although Plato’s reference to Pericles and *misthophoria* is generally understood to refer to jury pay (based on *a priori* assumptions about the absence of fifth-century distributions of public funds to citizens at festivals), the use of the cognate verb in Aeschines (3.103 μισθοφοροῦντα) to refer to the one-obol subsidy provided to *adunatoi* (Lys. 24.13, 26) suggests that rendering civic service was not necessary in order to receive state funds.⁴⁹ The verb and its cognates (e.g. *misthophoria*) could thus be applied generically to *theorika*—i.e., another kind of state subsidy.⁵⁰ Philochorus’ δραχμὴ τῆς θέας may have been distributed for festivals and viewed as *misthophoria* and thus part of the general distribution of public funds.

Philochorus’ reference to a δραχμὴ τῆς θέας further connects the theater dole with the business of selling seats in the theater. This is the very connection made in ancient sources between

⁴⁸ Sommerstein, in Pelling, *Greek Tragedy* 70–71, suggests (mistakenly, in my view) that access to the theater needed to be controlled on account of an increase in population in the fifth century and that the solution was to “ration it by price”; he goes on to suggest that as a result of this “admission charge” to the theater “Perhaps ... some of the *misthoi* paid (to citizens only) from public funds were increased in compensation and this may be the explanation for the claim in some sources that the *theorikon* was instituted by Pericles.” Cf. Stadter, *Commentary* 116: “although it is possible that P[lutarch] is using the generalizing plural θεωρικά in this vague sense of support for festivals, it is more likely that he is following an old tradition found in Ulpian’s note to Demosthenes 1.1.”

⁴⁹ Pay for *adunatoi*: Loomis, *Wages* 224–225. For Plato’s reference to Pericles’ *misthophoria* as the *dikastikon*: Buchanan, *Theorika* 30; Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 36 (1979) 308. *Misthophoria* and *misthophora* often refer to pay for service: e.g. *Ath.Pol.* 27.4 (dikasts), *Ar. Av.* 1367 (soldiers).

⁵⁰ See also *Ar. Eq.* 1352; Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F 100 (Athen. 166D–E) τὰς προσόδους καταμισθοφορῶν διατετέλεκε; cf. Harp. s.v. Εὔβουλος. There may be a hint of a subsidy for dramatic festivals in the Old Oligarch’s snide remark (2.9) that the poor by themselves are incapable of arranging and enjoying festivals.

the costs for seats and the introduction of *theorika* (anachronistically referred to as the Theoric Fund, τὸ θεωρικόν, in these sources). For Harpocration's entry (s.v. θεωρικά) includes precisely Philochorus' reference to the costs for the spectacle or a seat (i.e. δραχμὴ τῆς θέας) in an explanation of the name θεωρικόν. It is for this reason that we should understand Philochorus to be referring equally to the spectacle and a seat on the *ikria*. For the seat was the very thing that was sold by theater-lessees.⁵¹ This connection between entrance fees and *theorikon* is also made explicit in several late sources.⁵² An inscription of 324/3 concerning the lease of the theater in the Piraeus indicates that spectators paid for a seat on wooden planks (*ikria*: e.g. Cratinus fr.360 *PCG*, Ar. *Thesm.* 395) constructed by four theater-lessees, [τοὺς πριαμένους τὸ θέ]ατρο[ο]ν πα[ρέχειν τοῖς δημότ]αις ἡδ[ω]λιασμένην τὴν θέαν [κατὰ τ]ὰ πάτρια, who paid the state 3300 drachmas for the franchise.⁵³ Epigraphic evidence from the fourth and third centuries attests the common practice of leasing out the *theatron*.⁵⁴ According to the Piraeus lease the members of the deme are to pay cash to attend the festival, all except those to whom the deme granted *prohedria*: τοὺς δὲ δημότας θεωρεῖν ἀργύριο[ν] διδόντας πλὴν ὅσοις οἱ δημόται προ[εδρίαν] δ[εδώκασι].⁵⁵

Although there is no epigraphic evidence for theater leasing from the fifth century, Pollux (7.199) provides a tantalizing

⁵¹ Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 90, notes that “the idiom for paying theatre admission focuses on the venue rather than the entertainment, presumably, because this is what the *theatropoles* sells or rents: not a *theatron* in any broader sense, but a place from which to watch the theatrical performances.”

⁵² E.g. schol. Dem. 1.1 (I p.15 Dilts), schol. Aeschin. 3.24, schol. Lucian *Timon* 49; see further Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 101.

⁵³ *Agora* XIX L13.18–20, 28–31; see Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 90–94, for discussion.

⁵⁴ E.g. *IG* II² 1206; Le Guen, *Les associations de technites dionysiaques* no. 1.54–57. Cf. Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 95.

⁵⁵ Lines 9–11. See Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 87–115, for discussion of theater leasing; see also N. Papazarkadas, “Four Attic Deme Decrees Revisited,” *ZPE* 159 (2007) 155–177, for discussion of *IG* II² 1206 and the leasing of the theater in Acharnae in the late fourth century.

reference to the term *theatropoles* from Aristophanes' *Phoenissae* (fr.575 *PCG*): ἐν ταῖς Φοινίσσαις θεατροπόλης ὁ θέαν ἀπομισθῶν. Aristophanes' comedy was performed at some point between 411 and 388 and presumably to some degree parodied Euripides' *Phoenissae* (performed in Athens ca. 409).⁵⁶ The explicit mention of the term in Old Comedy is itself suggestive. At the very least, it points to a common reference point among the audience members that the comic performance took for granted. As Old Comedy frequently made reference to its own production and performance in the theater, a reference to the theater-lessee(s), the individual(s) responsible for the seating of a significant portion of the audience, is thus not surprising.⁵⁷

Aristophanes' reference to a theater-lessee suggests that the *terminus ante quem* for the institutional practice of leasing out the theater is ca. 400 B.C. If the late sources are correct in synchronizing the introduction of entrance fees with a theater dole, then the existence of the *theatropoles* in Aristophanes' comedy strongly suggests the existence of the theater dole at the time of the play's production.⁵⁸ The reference to *ikria* in *Thesmophoriazusa* (395) further indicates that wooden benches were being used in the theater at least down to 411, and

⁵⁶ Although Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 96–97, cautiously notes that the occurrence of the term in Aristophanes could “refer to the production context of *Phoenissai*, but we still cannot be sure that it was Athens,” he nonetheless suggests that the “circumstantial and comparative evidence makes their [theater-lessees'] presence likely” in the theater of Dionysus in Athens.

⁵⁷ For old comedy's self-referentiality see e.g. M. Revermann, *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford 2006) 172–175; O. Taplin, “Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis,” *JHS* 106 (1986) 163–174.

⁵⁸ *Pax*, performed in 421, contains a puzzling reference to *theoria* (905–908): the economic logic implied in the passage involving the expectation of payment for the pleasures of viewing a spectacle is suggestive of the costs for a seat (and by extension the practice of theater leasing). As noted above, the practice of theater leasing extended to some deme theaters in the fourth century and presumably did so in the fifth century; there is no reason to assume (*pace* V. Rosivach, “The Audiences of New Comedy,” *G&R* 47 [2000] 169–171) that entrance fees were not sometimes charged at the Rural Dionysia or, for that matter, at the Lenaia.

archaeological evidence confirms that the stone theater is to be dated to the fourth century.⁵⁹

A passage from Aristophanes' *Frogs* sheds some additional light on this discussion. First performed in 405 at the Lenaia and subsequently reperformed (perhaps in 404), *Frogs* provides further evidence for the economic practices of the theater.⁶⁰ In his response to Heracles' instructions to pay Charon two obols for the fare across the Styx, Dionysus extols the great and universal power of "the two obols" (ὡς μέγα δύνασθον πανταχοῦ τῶ δὲ ὀβολῷ, 141). The basis for this remark might at first seem to revolve around the common practice of placing a coin in the mouth (or near the body) of the corpse before burial to ensure passage to the underworld; however, when the amount for this funerary practice is stipulated, it is always one obol. The reference to "the two obols" is thus not readily explained by the infernal context. A possible reference to inflationary fees for the journey in Athens (i.e., a higher fee of two obols was necessary) is also not reflected in the dialogue.⁶¹ Others have understood Dionysus' "two obols" as a reference to the *diôbelia*, a state subsidy introduced by Cleophon at the end of the fifth century (*Ath. Pol.* 28.3) that was perhaps "available to citizens not otherwise in receipt of money from the state."⁶² Distribu-

⁵⁹ Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 98; H. Goette, "Griechische Theaterbauten der Klassik – Forschungsstand und Fragestellungen," in E. Pöhlmann (ed.), *Studien zur Bühnendichtung und zum Theaterbau der Antike* (Frankfurt am Main 1995) 22–30.

⁶⁰ For the dates of the performances see K. Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford 1993) 73–75; A. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes IX Frogs* (Warminster 1996) 21–23.

⁶¹ See Sommerstein, *Frogs* 168, for discussion of the fare; S. T. Stevens, "Charon's Obol and Other Coins in Ancient Funerary Practice," *Phoenix* 45 (1991) 215–229, discusses the practice of placing money with the bodies of the dead but suggests (220) that the two obols reflects an "expensive one-way ticket."

⁶² Rhodes, *Commentary* 356. Boeckh, *Public Economy* 234, claims that Dionysus' reference to the two obols was "unquestionably" the *diôbelia*. See also Dover, *Frogs* 208, who understands this as a reference to the *diôbelia* and rejects any reference to the *theorikon*, "a matter to which fifth-century comedy never refers"; see further Loomis, *Wages* 222–223; Valmin, *OpAth* 6 (1963) 175. Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 140 explains Dionysus' two obols as jury pay.

tions of funds ἐς τὲν δωβελίαν are attested from 410 to 406 (e.g. *IG I³* 375), and Dionysus' reference to "the two obols" may have evoked these distributions in the minds of some members of the audience. While this interpretation cannot be ruled out, the comic dialogue does not provide any support for interpreting "the two obols" as *diôbelia* beyond the mere coincidence of the two-obol amount.

Other sources confuse *theorika/theorikon* with *diôbelia*, thus suggesting that the ancient sources did not always have a clear conception of the festival distributions early on and thus mixed up *theorika* with other state subsidies. *Et.Magn.* s.v. δωβελία states: ὀβελοὶ δύο· οὗς ὁ δῆμος καθήμενος ἐμισθοφόρει (cf. *Lex. Seg.* 237.15–16 δωβελία).⁶³ Although καθήμενος could be understood as *sedens in theatro*, it is just as plausible for the entry to refer to dikasts. What is significant about the entry is the apparent ambiguity to which it attests. Aristotle provides another difficult passage concerning the δωβελία: "although at first a two-obol amount (*diôbelia*) alone is sufficient, when this has now become an ancestral custom, humans always want more until they reach an infinite amount" (*Pol.* 1267a41–b3). It is unlikely that this refers to the δωβελία instituted by Cleophon, for this fund appears not to have increased significantly and to have been distributed only at the end of the fifth century;⁶⁴ the

For additional discussion see Buchanan, *Theorika* 37–38. Some scholars suggest that the *dikastikon* was restored after 411 to two obols (M. H. Hansen, "Misthos for Magistrates in Classical Athens," *SymbOslo* 54 [1979] 2–22, at 13; see Rhodes, *Commentary* 356, for additional references); Loomis, *Wages* 17, regards "late references to dikast pay of 2 ob., 4 ob. and 1 dr. p.d. as mistakes."

⁶³ See Loomis, *Wages* 223, 225–226. Buchanan, *Theorika* 35–36, and Valmin, *OpAth* 6 (1963) 172, regard the definition as inconsequential. The continued spending on festivals in 410/09 after the restoration of the democracy (e.g. *IG I³* 375) may have helped associate Cleophon with festival spending and thus contributed to the confusion between the *diôbelia* and festival funds; see Buchanan 39.

⁶⁴ The monetary amount of the *diôbelia* fluctuated between one and two obols, rising perhaps to three obols (*Ath.Pol.* 28.3). Date and amount of the *diôbelia*: Loomis, *Wages* 222–223; Rhodes, *Commentary* 355–356; Valmin, *OpAth* 6 (1963) 176. See further Buchanan, *Theorika* 40, and Loomis, *Wages* 222–223, for discussion of the *diôbelia* payments. If distributions of grain

absence of the definite article in Aristotle's account further suggests that he refers to a general monetary amount and not the specific fund. His critical remarks on a *diôbelia* better suit festival distributions (*theorika*) or Assembly pay (*ekklesiastikon*: *Ath. Pol.* 41.3, 62.2; *Ar. Plut.* 329–330), both of which are recorded as increasing throughout the fourth century.⁶⁵ Indeed, festival distributions may have increased significantly in the fourth century: Demades allegedly distributed fifty drachmas to each citizen for the Choes in 331 (*Plut. Mor.* 818E). Nonetheless, the potential confusion between the *theorika* and the *diôbelia* suggests a certain area of overlap between the two funds.

Two passages of fourth-century oratory can further help pin down the meaning of Dionysus' remark. In his commentary on Aristophanes' *Frogs* Sommerstein suggests that the "universal" power of these two obols calls attention to the costs associated with attending the theater and the audience members who paid to watch.⁶⁶ Dionysus' "two obols" may provide evidence for the economics of the theater, for "the two obols" refers either to the amount of the financial transaction made by theatergoers for a seat or to the funds (i.e. *theorika*) paid out by the state to citizens for attendance at the festival. Demosthenes' *On the Crown*, delivered in 330, mentions the costs for a seat (18.28): he refers to Philip's ambassadors, who came to Athens in 346, and asks whether he should not have asked the *architekton* to assign them seats, for they otherwise would have watched the per-

took the place of the *diôbelia* in 405/4 (*IG I³ 379*), then the distributions cannot be identified with *theorika*: according to the Piraeus lease deme members were required to pay *cash*.

⁶⁵ *Hyp. Dem.* col. 26 states that Conon received the *theorikon* for his son, who was outside of Athens: for receiving five drachmas he was fined one talent; see also *Din. Dem.* 56. It is unclear whether the five drachmas were for a number of festivals (Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals* 268) or for the entire year (Ste. Croix, *CR* 14 [1964] 191). Cf. Pickard-Cambridge 267 suggesting that Aristotle's διωβελία is not the *theorikon*.

⁶⁶ Sommerstein, *Frogs* 168: "as later in *Dem.* 18.28, 'the two-obols' has come to mean 'the two-obol seats, the accommodation for ordinary spectators' ... and hence, by extension, those who occupied these seats." Sommerstein does not, however, consider the evidence from [Dem.] *On Organization*, discussed below.

formances from “the two obols” (ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν).⁶⁷ The implication becomes clearer when considered in light of the charges made by Aeschines to which Demosthenes is responding. For in *Against Ctesiphon* (3.76; cf. 2.111) Aeschines claims that this was the only embassy to which Demosthenes extended the privilege of *prohedria* and that he took the additional step of providing pillows and a purple coverlet over them. According to Demosthenes if they had not been granted *prohedria* and thus the right to sit in the front seats for free, Philip’s ambassadors would have sat in the two-obol seats.

Another reference to “the two obols” surfaces in a speech ascribed to Demosthenes, *On Organization*. Here the speaker suggests with much chagrin that whereas few remember all of the noble things that have been done by the state, everyone remembers “the two obols” (13.10). The context does not explain the reference, but it is most probable that the well-known “two obols” is none other than the popular theoric distributions. The popularity of *theorika* would indeed suggest itself by the very absence of any necessary further details in the speech (as is perhaps the case in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*). Furthermore, in this passage a reference to the costs for seats would be out of place, for the *institution* of such costs cannot have been described as a *noble* proposal. The rhetoric of a noble and memorable action undertaken by the state most assuredly belongs to the *theorikon*, and two obols is the amount frequently mentioned as its value.⁶⁸ “The two obols” could thus refer to both the costs for a

⁶⁷ For the role of the *architekton*, a salaried public official, in the fourth-century theater see now Csapo, in Wilson, *Greek Theatre* 108–113. Schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 1189d confuses the role of the theater-lessees at the time when there was wooden seating with the later role of the *architekton* after the stone theater had been built: <ἀπ’> ἰκρίων θεωροῦντες τοὺς δύο ὀβολοὺς παρ-εἶχον τοῖς ἀρχιτέκτοσιν.

⁶⁸ See e.g. Liban. *Hyp.Dem.* 1.8, *Decl.* 32.15–16; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. θεωρικὸν καὶ θεωρικῆ; schol. Dem. 1.1; schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 1189; *El. Magn.* s.v. διωβελία; *Suda* s.v. θεωρικόν. Two obols is explicitly mentioned as an early amount of the festival dole (Dem. 18.28, [Dem.] 13.10; cf. Ar. *Ran.* 141), and the late sources appear to record this amount. For the two obols in [Dem.] 13.10 as *theorikon*: Loomis, *Wages* 227; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals* 266. The δύο ὀβολῶ in Ar. *Vesp.* 1189 does not seem to refer to the entrance fee (or the διωβελία); the immediate context suggests either payment to Philocleon

seat as well as the distributions for festivals intended to cover such costs.

Old Comedy provides some tantalizing evidence on the economic practices of the theater and thus has something to contribute to the discussion of the introduction of the theater dole (*contra* Beloch and others). Although Aristophanes does not vouchsafe the existence of *theorika*, Dionysus' reference to "the two obols" nonetheless invokes the economic practice of attending dramatic festivals in the late fifth century. If there are more references to payment for the courts (e.g. *Nub.* 863, *Vesp.* 606) or Assembly (e.g. *Eccl.* 303, *Plut.* 329) in Aristophanes, this may be due to the ad hoc basis for approving distributions for attendance at festivals: *theorika* may not have been forthcoming for every festival. Both Plutarch's evidence for the introduction of *theorika* under Pericles and Philochorus' comment that the θεωρικόν was first considered the δόραχμή τῆς θείας may nonetheless find some support in Aristophanes' *Frogs*.

Although "the two-obols" appears to relate to the economic practices of the theater, there is much confusion in the ancient sources over the exact amount of the distributions for festivals. The stipulation of a δόραχμή in Philochorus' text better suits an amount from the later fourth century, when it perhaps increased more significantly (cf. *Plut. Mor.* 818E). If, as I have suggested above, in the fifth century the distribution of state funds to citizens for attendance at festivals was authorized by the Assembly on an ad hoc basis, the amount of the distribution would have fluctuated with respect to the available funds in the central treasury. The amount likely increased over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries as did the *dikastikon* (*Ar. Eq.* 797–800, schol. *Vesp.* 88, 300) and the *ekklesiastikon* (*Ath. Pol.* 41.3),⁶⁹ while the varying amounts of money provided by any surplus to the fourth-century Theoric Fund would also explain the different amounts of the *theorikon* attested in our sources.⁷⁰

as a *theoros* (Loomis *Wages* 17–18) or as his wage for rowing on a state trireme (A. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes IV Wasps* [Warminster 1983] 226).

⁶⁹ See Loomis, *Wages* 15–17, 20–22.

⁷⁰ Hansen, *GRBS* 17 (1974) 243, restricts the transference of surplus funds

The annual allotment in the *merismos* could have been supplemented in some years with excess revenue, thus altering the amount of the *theorikon* from year to year. While the differences in the amount may have made it more difficult for ancient writers to determine the typical amount of the distribution, the frequency with which these sources refer to the fifth-century distribution as two obols may in fact go back to Aristophanes' (famous?) reference to *theorika* in *Frogs*. And even if Dionysus' "two obols" was intended to refer exclusively to the entrance fee, the synchronizing of these fees with *theorika* in ancient sources still suggests an early date for *theorika*.

4. Conclusion

Plutarch and Philochorus provide valuable evidence for the *theorika* and fifth-century public finance. Reference in Aristophanes to the economic practices of the theater is more ambiguous. Nonetheless, the likely existence of a fifth-century theater-lessee, the evidence for the cost of a seat on the *ikria*, and the explicit connection in late sources between the introduction of entrance fees and *theorika* strongly suggest the existence of fifth-century payments for citizens to attend festivals. *Theorika* would have provided state *misthos* when other forms were not available (e.g. *dikastikon*, *ekklesiastikon*);⁷¹ they would have also compensated citizen laborers for their lost daily wage during festivals.

I suggest that the misleading and anachronistic citation of the Theoric Fund in the late sources (and in modern scholarship) when referring to *all* distributions for festivals, including those in the fifth century, has resulted in the obscuring of earlier distributions of state funds, indications of which are preserved by Plutarch, Philochorus, and, I have argued, Old Comedy. The confusion in our sources over the date of the introduction of *theorika* can be explained as a conflation of two different his-

to the Theoric Fund "in times of peace"; cf. Rhodes, *Commentary* 515. Boeckh, *Public Economy* 222, notes that the *theorikon* was "very variable."

⁷¹ Hansen, *Athenian Democracy* 98. Wilson, in Pelling, *Greek Tragedy* 100, notes the advantage of the *theorikon* when "standard civic μσθοφοραί were not forthcoming" and stresses its significance in "affirming one's position in the *polis*."

torical moments in the theater dole: (1) ad hoc distributions of state funds for festivals (designed in part as a replacement for other suspended forms of *misthophoria*) and (2) the institution of a permanent Theoric Fund. The earlier *theorika*, one-off payments of state funds, used for (dramatic) festivals were likely developed and transformed by Eubulus and Diophantus (schol. Aeschin. 3.24) into a permanent fund receiving an annual allotment in the *merismos*. As Wilson and Ste. Croix have suggested, the immense popularity of *theorika* likely contributed to its adoption by Eubulus and his associates for what became one of the most important financial bodies in fourth-century Athens: the name, *theorikon*, drawing upon the earlier practice of distributing public money for a $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, was selected with a view toward that part of the system “likely to have the widest appeal.”⁷² The evidence of Plutarch conforms to fifth-century payments of public funds, and when this is combined with additional testimony from Philochorus, Old Comedy, and the state’s practice of theater-leasing, the overall picture strongly suggests that the history of the fourth-century Theoric Fund (*theorikon*) has its roots in fifth-century *theorika*. At an early date Athens took an active role in subsidizing attendance at dramatic festivals, at which there were (surprisingly for the ancient world) entrance fees. While there was no permanent fund in the fifth century that distributed funds to citizens for the attendance of festivals, occasional distributions to the people (*theorika*) authorized by the Assembly on the likely suggestion of Pericles nonetheless formed part of fifth-century Athenian public finance.⁷³

August, 2008

Department of Classics
Scripps College
1030 Columbia Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711
droselli@scrippscollege.edu

⁷² Ste. Croix, *CR* 14 (1964) 192; see also Wilson, *Khoregia* 265.

⁷³ Parts of this essay were originally presented as a paper at the AIA/APA Annual Meeting in 2007. I thank the audience and panel members for helpful suggestions. I also wish to thank Edward Harris and the anonymous referee for their insightful comments on subsequent versions.