THE HEKATOMPEDON INVENTORIES, 414/3-411/0

As a result of the revolution and subsequent expulsion of the Four Hundred, two archons, Mnasilochos and Theopompos, and two groups of treasurers of Athena served during the year 411/0. Thus five groups of treasurers served during the Panathenaic penteteris 414/3-411/0 and five inventories, instead of four, were required in that penteteris for each of the three chambers of the Parthenon: the Pronaos, the Hekatompedon, and the cella designated in the inventories as the Parthenon.

The Hekatompedon inventories for these years were inscribed on a large stele on which four fragments are known:

a. *I.G.*, I, 151-152, *a* (transcribed by U. Koehler); *I.G.*, I², 272.

b. K. S. Pittakys, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., nos. 165 and 2095; A. R. Rangabé, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., no. 255 and *Antiquités helléniques*, I, Athens, 1842, no. 104; Ph. Lebas, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, I, Paris, 1853, no. 172; August Boeckh, *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, II, 3, Berlin, 1886, pp. 172-173 (transcribed by L. Ross); *I.G.*, I, 151-152, *b* (transcribed by U. Koehler); *I.G.*, I², 272-273.

c. A. M. Woodward, "Some More Fragments of Attic Treasure-Records of the Fifth Century," *J.H.S.*, XLVIII, 1928, pp. 169-177; formerly E. M. 6791.

d. Woodward, *loc. cit.*; now E. M. 6792.

Fragments *a*, *b*, and *c* are now embedded in plaster at the Epigraphical Museum at Athens (E.M. 6778).

The years covered by these inscriptions are as follows:

First inventory (*I.G.*, I², 272)	414/3
Second inventory (*I.G.*, I², 273)	413/2
Third inventory	412/1
Fourth inventory	411 (Mnasilochos)
Fifth inventory	411/0 (Theopompos)

The relative positions of fragments *a* and *b*, which contain part of the first inventory, are fixed by horizontal equations. In examining the stones, this writer noticed that previous editions of fragment *a* omitted its twelfth line. (It has fourteen lines, altogether.) Since the twelfth line of fragment *b* was recorded, horizontal equations cannot be made at this point and editors have assumed scribal error. The author also found traces of three letters in line 14, where Koehler had found traces of one and Hiller (in *I.G.*, I²) of none.

Subsequently, A. M. Woodward (by letter) supplied the information that the late Bert Hodge Hill had discovered a join between fragments *a* and *c*. After checking with the Director of the Epigraphical Museum, M. Th. Mitsos, B. D. Meritt (by letter) made the following report: "The join between *I.G.*, I², 272 (EM 6778) and EM 6791 is actually concealed by about an inch and a half of plaster, but the lateral surfaces (not concealed) leave no doubt that the assignment is correct. Mitsos assured me that the stones actually do join, and this fact is noted in the Inventory Book."[1]

We can now transcribe fragments *a* and *b* and the beginning of fragment *c* (including the first four lines of the second inventory):

40 50 60 70 80

a

α ν τ̣

υ μ ε δ

ε υ ε π̣

ἐ γ ρ α̣[μ μ ά τ ε υ ε ἐ ν τ ο̃ ι ν ε ο̃ ι τ ο̃ ι ϟ ε κ α τ ο μ π έ δ]ο ι•φ[ι ά λ]α̣ ι̣ α̣ b

σ τ έ λ̣[ε ς,ἄ σ τ α θ μ ο ς•ἀ π ο ρ ρ α ν τ έ ρ ι ο ν ἀ ρ γ υ ρ]ο̃ ν,ἄ σ τ α θ μ ο ν•τ ο̣ 5

ο ν τ ο[ῦ τ ο ι ν ᵽ Δ Δ Δ•σ τ έ φ α ν ο ς χ ρ υ σ ο̃ ς δ ν ἐ Ν]ί κ ε ἔ χ ε ι,σ τ α θ μ δ ν̣

α ρ χ ἑ̣[σ ι ο ν ἀ ρ γ υ ρ ο̃ ν,σ τ α θ μ δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο Η Η•κ α]ρ χ ἑ σ ι ο ν ἀ ρ γ υ ρ̣ ο̃ ν

σ τ α θ[μ ο ν τ ο ῦ τ ο . . . Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ ||•σ τ ε φ ά ν ε χ ρ υ σ ε̃],σ τ α θ μ δ ν τ α ῦ τ ε ς ᵽ Δ

|| σ τ έ φ α ν[ο ς χ ρ υ σ ο̃ ς,σ τ α θ μ δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο Δ Π Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ]||•χ ρ υ σ ί δ ε̣ ||,σ τ α θ μ δ

Η Δ Δ Δ Π Ϝ[Ϝ Ϝ ||•χ ρ υ σ ί ς,σ τ α θ μ δ ν τ α ῦ τ ε ς Η Δ Π]Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ•σ τ έ φ α ν ο ς χ ρ υ 10

ε ς Η ᵽ Δ Δ[Δ Δ Ϝ Ϝ•θ υ μ ι α τ έ ρ ι ο ν ἀ ρ γ υ ρ ο̃ ν,σ τ α]θ μ δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο Χ•σ τ έ φ α

ς,σ τ α θ μ[δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο . . Ϝ•σ τ έ φ α ν ο ς χ ρ υ σ ο̃ ς,σ]τ α θ μ δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο Δ Δ Δ

χ ρ υ σ ο̃[ς,σ τ α θ μ δ ν τ ο ῦ τ ο . . . . . σ τ έ φ α ν]ο ς χ ρ υ σ ο̃ ς,σ τ α θ μ δ

‾Λ‾[. . . . . .]σ τ έ φ α ν ο ς χ ρ υ σ ο̃

ν τ̣ ο̣[. . . . . .]ᵽ Η Η Δ Δ Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ V̲ V̲ V̲ 15

ν α ί[α ς Π ο λ υ χ σ ε ν ί δ ε ς Ἀ χ α ρ ν ε ὺ ς κ α ὶ χ σ υ ν ά ρ χ ο ν]τ ε ς ϟ ο ῖ ς Λ ε

α μ[ί α ι ς ϟ ο ῖ ς Α ὐ τ ο κ λ ε ί δ ε ς Σ ο σ τ ρ ά τ ο Φ ρ ε ά ρ ρ ι ο]ς̣ ἐ γ ρ α μ μ ά τ

τ ο̃ ι̣[ν ε ο̃ ι τ ο̃ ι ϟ ε κ α τ ο μ π έ δ ο ι•φ ι ά λ α ι χ ρ υ σ α ῖ ι ι ι],σ̣ τ α θ μ

μ ο ς̣[ἀ π ο ρ ρ α ν τ έ ρ ι ο ν ἀ ρ γ υ ρ ο̃ ν,ἄ σ τ α θ μ ο ν•τ ο]

c

Epigraphical Commentary: The letters underlined are given on the authority of one or more of the earlier editors. In addition to these, we can recover two letters in line 19. In lines 18 and 19 Rangabé (in *Antiquités*) gives the following:

[1] The author would like to express his thanks to B. D. Meritt and A. M. Woodward for much assistance during the preparation of this paper.

[2] That the correct weight of the gold crown is .².Ϝ and not .³. . Ϝ can be seen from E. L. Hicks, *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, I, Oxford, 1874, pl. XXVIII, lines 14 (a misprint, but the number of spaces is correct), 29, and 44.

ΣΤΑΘΜ
ΟΝ

Lebas has this:

ΤΑΘΜ
ΟΝ

Ross and Pittakys (no. 165) read the letters without an indication of their position in the line. Pittakys later (no. 2095) denied the existence of the letters. Whatever their exact position, these letters form part of a phrase which follows the usual description of the *ἀπορραντέριον* and occurs for the first time in *I.G.*, I², 272, line 5, beginning *τo̲* – –. It happens that the first item in the Pronaos lists, *φιάλε χρυσε̂, ἐχς ἓς ἀπορραί-νονται, ἄσταθμος*, is not to be found after the inventory of 414/3 (*I.G.*, I², 248). It seems likely that its disappearance at this time is connected with the new rubric in the Hekatompedon inventories. Perhaps the phiale was removed from the Pronaos to the Hekatompedon and associated with the *ἀπορραντέριον*.

The traces in line 14 of fragment *a* are a horizontal bar at the top of the stoichos, an apex (indicating alpha, gamma, or delta), and another horizontal at the top of the stoichos. They are located at the very bottom of the preserved portion of the stone.

In line 15 it is possible that the space following the four drachme signs was inscribed.

The restorations printed in the *Edito Minor* for *I.G.*, I², 272 are substantially correct through line 161 (our line 11), including item 19. It should be noted that the five inscriptions of this stele are regularly ΣΤΟΙΧ. 85. Syllabic division, however, was apparently employed throughout the first inventory, causing a few lines to have 83, 84, or 86 letters. We restore the last few lines of the inventory, therefore, on the basis of syllabic division, noting the variations from the regular pattern of ΣΤΟΙΧ. 85. Now that we have found the true reading of line 12, we can restore the twentieth and twenty-first items there on the basis of earlier inventories, *I.G.*, I², 268 and 269:

[*νος χρυσο̂ς, σταθμὸν τούτο* XHH[H]. *στέφανος χρυσο̂*]*ς, σταθμ*[*ὸν τούτο* .². ⊢
στέφανος χρυσο̂ς, σ]*ταθμὸν τούτο* ΔΔΔ [Γ ᵛ]²

Line 13 will begin with item 22, which is the last item known from earlier inventories, and the rest is clear from the preserved portions:

[*στεφάνο χρυσὸ* ||, *σταμὸν τούτοιν* [H]⊢⊢⊢, *στέφανος*] *χρυσο̂*[*ς,*
σταθμὸν τούτο . . .⁷. . . . *στέφαν*]*ος χρυσο̂ς, σταθμὸ*[*ν*]
[*τούτο* – – – – – – – – –]

Lines 14 and 15 can be transcribed in the following manner:

[*τούτο* – – – –³⁵– – – –] ¯Λ¯ [– – – –²⁸– – – –] *στέφανος χρυσο̂*[*ς,*]
[*σταθμὸν τούτο* – – – –¹⁸– – – – *σταθμὸ*]*ν τ̣ο̣*[*ύτ* – – – *ca.* 13 – – – *σταθμὸν*
– – – *ca.* 10 – – –] [H]HHΔΔ⊢⊢⊢. ᵛᵛᵛ

It is possible to find the correct restoration of these lines by comparison with the inventories inscribed on fragments *c* and *d*. Woodward's texts show that the lists of dedications on those two fragments are identical and can be used to supplement each other. It will be seen, however, that these texts are not identical with that of the first inventory. We now list a column of letters found in fragment *c* and another from *d* along with the stoichoi in which they must be restored in the first inventory between fragments *a* and *b*: (NOTE: Fragment *c* contains part of the last line of *I.G.*, I², 272 and parts of three lines of the prescript of the second inventory; *I.G.*, I², 272 has four lines of prescript; thus they come into agreement with the final lines of the prescripts. The first line of fragment *d* equals line 5 of 272.)

	Fragment *c* 272		Fragment *d* 272	
Line 1	nu	—		
Line 2	nu	—		
Line 3	alpha	—		
Line 4	tau	52nd		
Line 5	mu	50th	theta	49th
Line 6	delta	51st	nu	47th
Line 7	alpha	47th	nu	46th
Line 8	omicron	47th	omicron	47th
Line 9	rho	48th	chi	47th
Line 10	chi	48th	drachme	45th
Line 11	delta	46th	delta	45th
Line 12	nu	46th	omicron	45th
Line 13	alpha	48th	sigma	43rd
Line 14	alpha	?	omicron	?
Line 15	alpha	?	sigma	?
Line 16	nu			
Line 17	iota			
Line 18	alpha			

Since it is clear that the position of the letters in both columns is gradually shifting to the left in the first inventory, we may expect that the alphas in lines 14 and 15 of *c* will be found in about the forty-seventh stoichos in the first inventory and that the omicron and sigma of lines 10 and 11 of *d* will be found in about the forty-second stoichos of lines 14 and 15 of the first inventory. The letters in question are part of the rubrics *σταθμὸν ταύτες* and *φιάλε vel στεφάνε χρυσῆ*, *σταθμὸν ταύτες* in lines 14 and 15, respectively:

	c	*d*
(14)	[*σταθμὸν*] *τα̲ύτ̣*[*ες*]	[*στα*]*θμ̲ὸν τ̣*[*αύτες*]
(15)	[*σ*]*τα̲θ*[*μόν*]	[*χρυ*]*σῆ*, *σ̲τα*[*θμόν*]

If the texts of the inventories which are partially preserved in fragments *c* and *d* were identical with that of the first inventory, we could expect *σταθμὸν ταύτες* to begin in about the thirty-eighth stoichos in line 14 and about the forty-third stoichos of line 15 of the first inventory.

This, however, is manifestly impossible. The traces in lines 14 and 15 of the first inventory cannot be reconciled with *σταθμὸν ταύτες*. Moreover, if that rubric began in about the forty-third (and ended in about the fifty-fifth) stoichos in line 15, there would be a gap of some sixteen spaces before the numeral 𐅵 in the seventy-second stoichos, which would be far too long for the rest of the numeral and too short for another item involving *σταθμὸν τούτο*.

Leaving aside the possibilities of scribal error or of the appearance here of an item which is listed only here and in no other inventory, we must ascribe this discrepancy between the first inventory and those represented by fragments *c* and *d* to the presence in the first inventory of the rubric *ἐπέτεια ἐπεγένετο*, which introduces a list of accessions. This is the only reasonable way to find an entry which will occur only here and not in the same position in the other inventories. Since the text of the first inventory agrees with the texts of the other two inventories through line 13, the accessions rubric must occur in line 14 and precede or include the traces which we have reported in that line, where the first inventory differs from the others.

The presence of the rubric *ἐπέτεια ἐπεγένετο* (sixteen letters) in the first inventory and its absence from the other two means that in the first inventory *σταθμὸν ταύτες* in lines 14 and 15 must begin sixteen spaces to the right of the places which we have calculated, i.e., about the fifty-fourth stoichos in line 14 and about the fifty-ninth in line 15. Thus we have the following schema for these lines:

[*τούτο* . . . . . .[35]. . . . .] ¯Δ¯ [– – –[ca. 10]– – – *σταθμὸν*
ταύτες – – –[ca. 5]– – –] *στέφανος χρυσο̂*[ς,]
[*σταθμὸν τούτο* . . . . . .[18]. . . . . *σταθμὸ*]*ν τ̣ο̣*[*ύτ* – –[ca. 12]– – *χρυσε̂,*
σταθμὸν ταύτες] 𐅵HHΔΔHHH. *vvv*

Thus the object with which the numeral 724 should be associated is a stephane or phiale of gold.

There seem to be two possible interpretations of the traces in line 14. The first of these does not agree with our expectations:

[*τούτο* . . . . . .[15]. . . . . *ἐπέτεια ἐπεγένετο· φιάλ*]*ε ἀ̣ρ̣*[*γυρα̂, σταθμὸν*
ταύτες . . . . .[11]. . . . .] *στέφανος χρυσο̂*[ς]

Moreover, the space after *τούτο* is unreasonably long for a numeral and too short for another item.

On the other hand, the following agrees with the schema which has been developed and is certainly preferable:

[τοῦτο .....[26]..... ἐπέτεια ἐπ]ε̣γέ̣[νετο· χρυσίς *vel*
ἀργυρίς, σταθμὸν ταύτες – –[5 *vel* 4]– –] στέφανος χρυσô[ς]

The short lacuna makes it likely that the item before the accessions rubric is also a χρυσίς or an ἀργυρίς.

The restorations of lines 12-15 which we have proposed seem the best obtainable on the basis of the evidence now available and there appears to be little probative value in attempting to use the fragmentary inscription *I.G.*, I², 274 to provide additional information. Thus we have learned the identity of the following items:

(23) a gold crown (weight: seven spaces)[3]

(24) a gold crown

(25) probably a χρυσίς or an ἀργυρίς

and the accessions of 414/3:

(26) a χρυσίς (weight: five spaces) or an ἀργυρίς (weight: four spaces)

(27) a gold crown

(29) a gold phiale or stephane (weight: 724 drachmai; 1724 drachmai is very unlikely.)

Since item 28 contains the rubric [σταθμὸ]ν τ̣ο̣[ύτ – – – – – –], it cannot be a feminine singular noun.

How the new restorations are related to fragments *c* and *d* will be seen later, when we restore the inventory to which *d* belongs. Now that Hill's discovery shows that fragment *c* forms a large portion of the *second* inventory (not the third, as Woodward thought, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-171), combining this fragment with the last four lines of fragment *b*, we can present a revised text of the opening of the second inventory, *I.G.*, I², 273:

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 85

[τάδε *hoι* ταμίαι τôν *hι*ερôν χρεμάτον τêς Ἀθε]ναί[ας Πολυχσενίδες
Ἀχαρνεὺς καὶ χσυνάρχον]τες, *hoῖς* Λε[υκαῖ–]
[ος Ἀφιδναῖος ἐγραμμάτευε, παρέδοσαν τοῖς τ]αμ[ίαις *hoῖς*
Αὐτοκλείδες Σοστράτο Φρεάρριο]ς ἐγραμμάτ[ευε,]
[Καλλαίσχροι Εὐπυρίδει καὶ χσυνάρχοσιν, ἐν] τôι̣ [νεôι τôι

[3] *I.G.*, I², 270, the inventory for 416/5, lists twenty-two items, followed by [ἐ]πέτε[ι|α ἐπεγένετο]. Then we have fifty-six spaces before an uninscribed area (cf. Hicks, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVIII, line 45). There is not enough space here for both the twenty-third and twenty-fourth items. Therefore, restore this line as follows: [α ἐπεγένετο· στέφανος χρυσôς, σταθμὸν τούτο ...[7].... *vacat*] *vacat* The twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth items must be accessions of 415/4.

hεκατομπέδοι· φιάλαι χρυσαῖ III,] *σταθμ*[*ὸν τούτ–* ᵛ]
[*ον* XXΓΔΔΔΔHHH *κόρε χρυσε̂ ἐπὶ στέλες, ἄσταθ*]*μος.* [*ἀπορραντέριον*
ἀργυρῶν, ἄσταθμον· το – – – – – –]*ον*[– – – – – –]

The contents of the rest of the inscription are identical to those of the fourth inventory, which we shall restore in full.

A portion of the first few lines of the third inventory (not the fourth, as Woodward thought) will appear at the bottom of fragment *c*. Although it is apparently impossible to devise a fully acceptable restoration,[4] we offer the following *exempli gratia*:

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 85

[*τάδε hοι ταμίαι τὸν hιερὸν χρεμάτον τε̂ς* ʼ*Αθ*]*ενα*[*ίας Κάλλαισχρος*
⟨*Εὐπυρίδες*⟩ *καὶ χσυνάρχοντες, hοῖς Αὐτοκλείδες Φρ–* ᵛ]
[*εάρριος ἐγραμμάτευε, παρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμί*]*αις* [*hοῖς Εὔανδρος Εὐονυμεὺς*
ἐγραμμάτευεν, ʼ*Ασοποδόροι Κυδα–*]
[*θεναιεῖ καὶ χσυνάρχοσιν, ἐν τῶι νεῶι τῶι hε*]*κα*[*τομπέδοι· φιάλαι*
χρυσαῖ III, *σταθμὸν τούτον* XXΓΔΔΔΔHHH ᵛ]

Finally, we turn to fragment *d*, which contains part of eleven lines of one inventory and after a lacuna of two lines two more lines of another inventory. These two inscribed lines are separated by a lacuna of one line:

ΣAME
vacat
Σ

When Woodward assigned the bulk of fragment *c* to the third inventory, he had the fourth and fifth inventories for fragment *d* by elimination. Now that most of fragment *c* has been assigned to the second year, the third and fourth years are also available for the pair of inventories partially preserved in fragment *d*. This new alternative, however, presents a great difficulty. Although there appears to be some minor error on the part of the secretary or the mason in the prescript of the third inventory, we have no reason to assume another following [*ἐν τῶι νεῶι τῶι hε*]*κα*[*τομπέδοι*] in its third line, which will end, therefore, with the first item. The next line will begin with the second item, [*κόρε χρυσε̂ ἐπὶ στέλες, ἄστα*]*θμ*[*ος.*] The dotted letters are preserved in the first line of *d*. Theta will, then, be the twenty-third letter of the line, as will mu of ΣAME, which is in the same vertical stoichos. Woodward recognized the difficulty here (*op. cit.*, pp. 174-175): how to account for the two vacant lines between the inventories of fragment *d*, the vacant line between ΣAME and Σ, and a prescript

[4] In assigning this heading to the fourth inventory, Woodward (*op. cit.*, pp. 173-174) was unable to devise a completely satisfactory restoration either.

beginning [. . . . . .[13]. . . . . *παραδεχ*]*σάμε*[*νοι*] or [. . . . . .[20]. . . . .]ς *Ἀμε*[*ι-νιάδες*]. (Ameiniades is a treasurer of 411/0.)

These difficulties cannot be overcome if we continue to connect the first inventory of fragment *d* with the last lines of *c* and if we assign the second inventory of *d* to the fourth year.

On the other hand, if we free fragment *d* from a connection with *c*, thereby allowing mu of ΣΑΜΕ to be in a position other than the twenty-third stoichos, we can achieve a reasonable restoration of these lines, as follows:

[*τάδε hοι ταμίαι τὸν hιερὸγ χρεμάτον τὲς Ἀθεναία*]ς *Ἀμε*[*ινιάδες* – – – – – –
καὶ χσυνάρχοντες hοῖς – – – – – – – –]
[– – – – – – – – *ἐγραμμάτευε παρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμίαις vacat*] *vacat*
[*vacat*]
[*Καλλιστράτοι Μαραθονίοι καὶ χσυνάρχοσι, παραδεχ*]*σ*[*άμενοι παρὰ τὸν προτέρον ταμιὸν* – – – – – – – –]

This is almost identical to the prescript of the Pronaos inventory of 411/0, which is also separated from the preceding inventory on its stele by a vacant space of some three lines: [5]

non-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

[*τάδε hοι ταμίαι τὸν hιερ*]*ὸγ χρεμάτον τὲς Ἀθεναίας Ἀμεινιάδ*[*ες*
– – – – – – – – *καὶ χσυνάρχοντες, hο*]–
[*ἷς* . . . . . .[13]. . . . .]ς *ἐ*[*γ*]*ραμμάτευε, παρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμίαις. vacat*
[*Καλλιστράτοι*] *Μαραθονίοι καὶ χσυνάρχοσιν* – – – – – – – –

This is the text of *I.G.*, I², 253, lines 265-267. (There is really no evidence for the number of letters in the secretary's name.)

It is clear that the treasurers of 411/0 had their three annual inventories inscribed before their successors had chosen a secretary. Although they left room on the three stelai for his name, they failed to fill it in later. Since no additional inventories were inscribed on these stelai, there were no subsequent users to detect the omission. The same thing happened at the end of the previous penteteris, as the Pronaos inventory of 415/4 makes clear: [6]

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 69

[*τάδε hοι ταμί*]*αι τὸν hιερὸν χρεμάτον τὲς Ἀθεναίας Λεοχά*[*ρες*
. . . . .[11]. . . . . *καὶ χσυνάρ*–]

[5] Cf. *I.G.*, I, 137-138.

[6] *I.G.*, I², 247, lines 192-195. We now show the number of vacant spaces necessary to complete an arrangement of ΣΤΟΙΧ. 69; cf. the Appendix. The left leg of alpha in the name Melesias is preserved.

[χοντες, *hoîς* Τ]ελέας Τελενίκο Περγασêθεν ἐγραμμάτευε, π[αρέδοσαν
τοῖς ταμίαις ^{vvvv}]
[*vacat*] *vacat* Μελε[σ]ίᾳ[ι . . .^{6}. . .
καὶ χσυνάρχοσι, πα–]
[ραδεχσάμενοι π]αρὰ τὸν προτέρον ταμιὸν – – – – – – – –

The Hekatompedon inventory for this year, *I.G.*, I², 271, shows the same thing when we alter the restorations of the *Editio Minor* to account for the vacant area in the second line (cf. the Appendix):

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 72

[τάδε *hoι* ταμίαι τὸν *hι*ερὸν χρεμάτον τêς Ἀθεναίας Λεοχάρες
. . . . .^{11}. . . . . καὶ χσυν]άρχο[ν–]
[τες, *hoîς* Τελέας Τελενίκο Περγασêθεν ἐγραμμάτευε, παρέδοσαν
τοῖς ταμίαις ^{vvvvv}]^{vvvv}[^{v}]
[*vacat* Μελεσίαι . . .^{6}. . . καὶ
χσυνάρχοσι, παραδε]χσάμε–
[νοι παρὰ τὸν προτέρον ταμιὸν *hoîς* Λυσικλêς Δρακοντίδο Βατêθεν
ἐγραμμάτευε, ἐν τ]ὸι ν[εοῖ]
[τὸι Ἑκατομπέδοι· φιάλαι χρυσαῖ |||, σταθμὸν τούτον XXΓΔΔΔΔ⊢⊢⊢
κόρε χρυσê ἐπὶ στέλ]ες, [ἄστ–]
[αθμος. – – – – – – – – –]

It is clear, then, that we have in fragment *d* parts of the fourth and fifth inventories of the penteteris 414/3-411/0. Since mu of ΣΑΜΕ is the forty-third letter in the line, so is theta in line 1 of the fragment, and we can restore the fourth inventory as follows:[7]

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 85

[τάδε *hoι* ταμίαι τὸν *hι*ερὸν χρεμάτον τêς Ἀθεναίας Ἀσοπόδορος
Κυδαθεναιεὺς καὶ χσυνάρχοντες, *hoîς* Εὔα–]
[νδρος Ἐριθαλίονος Εὐονυμεὺς ἐγραμμάτευε, παρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμίαις
hoîς – – – – – – – – – ἐγρ–]
[αμμάτευε, παραδεχσάμενοι παρὰ τὸν προτέρον ταμιὸν, ἐν τὸι νεοῖ
τὸι *hε*κατομπέδοι· φιάλαι χρυσαῖ || |, σταθ–]
[μὸν τούτον XXΓΔΔΔΔ⊢⊢⊢. κόρε χρυσê ἐπὶ στέλες, ἄστα]θμ[ος.

[7] The weight of the crown of Nike (line 6) is not definitely known. In *I.G.*, I², 269, line 122 it begins ΓΔ, and according to Hicks, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVII, line 30 it ends ΔΔ. The only previous editor of the stone, H. J. Rose, records no reading for the weight in line 30 (*Inscriptiones Graecae Vetustissimae*, Cambridge, 1825, pl. XXIV.) Nor was Professor Meritt able to see more than the second delta on his squeeze. The restoration ΓΔΔ disturbs the stoichedon order in several places; cf. especially Hicks, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVII, line 29 and pl. XXVIII, lines 22 and 37.

ἀπορραντέριον ἀργυρôν, ἄσταθμον· το – – – – ον – – – –]
[. . . . . .[16]. . . . . *στεφάνο χρυσὸ* ||, *σταθμὸν τούτοι*]*ν* 𐅄Δ[ΔΔ.
στέφανος χρυσôς ὃν ἑ Νίκε ἔχει, σταθμὸν τούτο 𐅄]
[Δ? *φιάλαι ἀργυραῖ* Γ|||, *σταθμὸν τούτον* 𐅄ΗΗΗ. *καρχέσι*]*ο*ν
ἀ[*ργυρôν, σταθμὸν τούτο* ΗΗ. *καρχέσιον ἀργυρôν Διὸς* ^{v}]
[Πολιôς, *σταθμὸν τούτο* ΗΗ. *στέφανος χρυσôς, σταθμὸν*] *τ*[*ύτο*
. . . ⊢⊢⊢||. *στεφάνε χρυσε*ῖ, *σταθμὸν ταύτες* 𐅄Δ⊢⊢⊢. *σ–* ^{v}]
[*τέφανοι χρυσοῖ* || ||, *σταθμὸν τούτον* ΗΔΔΔΓ||. *στέφαν*]*ος χρυ*[*σôς,*
σταθμὸν τούτο ΔΓ⊢⊢⊢|||. *χρυσίδε* ||, *σταθμὸν το–* ^{v}]
[*ύτοιν* ΗΗ𐅄ΔΔΔΔ⊢⊢⊢|||. *χρυσίς, σταθμὸν ταύτες* ΗΔΔ]ΔΓ⊢⊢⊢[||.
χρυσίς, σταθμὸν ταύτες ΗΔΓ⊢⊢⊢⊢. *στέφανος χρυσôς,*]
[*σταθμὸν τούτο* ΔΔΓ⊢|||. *ἀργυρίς, σταθμὸν ταύτες* Η𐅄]ΔΔΔΔ⊢[⊢.
θυμιατέριον ἀργυρôν, σταθμὸν τούτο Χ. *στέφανο–* ^{v}]
[*ς χρυσôς, σταθμὸν τούτο* ΧΗΗ𐅄. *στέφανος χρυσôς, στα*]*θμὸν τ*[*ούτο*
. . ⊢ *στέφανος χρυσôς, σταθμὸν τούτο* ΔΔΔΓ. ^{vvv}]
[*στεφάνο χρυσὸ* ||, *σταθμὸν τούτοιν* 𐅄⊢⊢⊢. *στέφανος χ*]*ρυσôς,*
[*σταθμὸν τούτο* . . .[7]. . . . *στέφανος χρυσôς, σταθμὸν*]
[*τούτο* – – –[ca. 25]– – – *χρυσίς vel ἀργυρίς, στα*]*θμὸν τ*[*αύτες* – – –[5 vel 4]– – –]
στέφανος χρυσôς, σταθμὸν τούτο . .[4]. . – – – – – – – –]
[. . . . . .[14]. . . . . *σταθμὸν τούτ* – – –[7 vel 5]– – *φιάλε vel στεφάνε χρυ*]*σε*ῖ,
στα[*θμὸν ταύτες* 𐅄ΗΗΔΔ⊢⊢⊢⊢. *vacat*]

APPENDIX: THE DEMOTIC OF LEOCHARES

We learn from *I.G.*, I², 302, line 52 that the nominative of the demotic of Leochares, a treasurer of Athena in 415/4, has eleven letters.[8] A demotic of eleven letters should also be restored in the Hekatompedon inventory of that year, as we have done *supra*.[9] The author noted the following letters in the last three preserved lines of the heading:

OIN
ΕΣ
traces

The necessary supplements require a minimum of seventy-two spaces between omicron and epsilon (exclusively). Hicks' arrangement would permit only seventy-one. Rather than crowd an additional letter into the right margin, which in Hicks' text already has one more than the margins in the other inventories on the stele, we should assume an additional space to the left of the preserved letters, allowing eleven spaces for the demotic of Leochares.

[8] Cf. B. D. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, Ann Arbor, 1932, p. 162.
[9] *I.G.*, I², 271; cf. Hicks, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVIII, lines 46-50.

The demotic also occurs in *I.G.*, I², 246 and 247, the Pronaos inventories of 416/5 and the following year. We maintain that these two inscriptions are engraved in strict stoichedon order with every letter-space filled in every line and without crowding of two letters into a space.[10] On the other hand, it has been noted that in many of the inscriptions of the treasurers of Athena of the fifth century the stoichedon order is apparently not rigidly observed.[11] In view of the fact, however, that several of the inventories can easily be restored with an identical number of letter spaces per line it will be necessary to judge *I.G.*, I², 246 and 247 individually.[12] If one plots the layout of letters in these two inscriptions, the contents of which are known from other inventories, he will find that the first has sixty-one spaces in each line and that the second has sixty-nine spaces in each line without exception. No manipulation is necessary in the portions restored; the necessary supplements fall right into place. The only irregularities in these two inscriptions occur in the preserved portion of the second. The stone mason left room for the name of the secretary of the incoming treasurers, but the space was never filled. We have seen other occurrences of this phenomenon and conclude that it is not an error. The mason did, however, omit the rubric *σταθμὸν ταύτες* in line 205 and used the spelling *τούτο* in line 199 instead of his normal *τότο*.

The nominative of the demotic occurs in line 192 of *I.G.*, I², 247, where eleven spaces are available in a line of sixty-nine spaces, thereby agreeing with *I.G.*, I², 302. The dative occurs in line 175 of *I.G.*, I², 246. The line division of this inscription is given wrongly in the *Editio Minor*, where it is based on the assumption that the final line (191) begins with the rubric *ἐπέτεια ἐπεγένετο*. Since the first line of the inventory is not preserved, it is proper to turn to the last line for a clue to the line division of the entire inscription, but there is no reason to assume that it did begin with the accessions rubric. On the contrary, that rubric is divided between the final two lines of the next inventory in this series (*I.G.*, I², 247). It is inscribed directly below *I.G.*, I², 246 and opens as follows (line 192):

[*τάδε hοι ταμί*]*αι τὸν hιερὸν χρεμάτον τῆς Ἀθεναίας*

The hasta of the tau in [*ἐπεγέν*]*ετο* in line 191 is directly above and between the alpha and iota of line 192, i.e., above the 12½th space of that line. The position of tau in its own line is determined from the following proportion:

[10] The spacing of unit and obol signs is as follows: in *I.G.*, I², 246 one, two, and three occupy a single space and four occupy two spaces; in *I.G.*, I², 247 one and two occupy a single space while three and four occupy two spaces.

[11] W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1947, pp. 100-101; Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963, pp. 291-292; and Pritchett, "Epigraphica Restituta," *A. J. P.*, LXXXV, 1964, pp. 46-47.

[12] Cf. Hicks, *op. cit.*, pls. XXVII-XXVIII. Pritchett and Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, p. 101, refer to a text restored by West and Woodward with lines of varying length, rightly noting that their "knowledge of Attic *tabulae* is unrivalled." Note, therefore, Woodward's plate facing p. 40 in *J.H.S.*, XXXI, 1911, where the length of line is uniform.

$$61:69::x:12\tfrac{1}{2}$$
$$x=11.1$$

This conclusion is confirmed by measurements made from a squeeze: the space occupied in *I.G.*, I², 247 by twelve letters measured from the left edge of the first (a tau) to the middle of the space following the twelfth (a lambda) is 0.132 m.; the space occupied in *I.G.*, I², 246 by eleven letters measured from the left edge of the first (a tau) to the middle of the eleventh (an epsilon) is 0.135 m. Thus the line division in lines 190 and 191 is [ἐπέτ|ια ἐπεγέν]ετο. The solitary epsilon in line 172, then, is the thirty-eighth letter, and the inscription begins as follows:[13]

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 61

[τάδε *hοι* ταμίαι τὸν *hι*ερὸν χρεμάτον τὲς Ἀθεναίας Δεχσίθεος
.³.. ἄσιος καὶ]
[χσυνάρχοντες, *hοῖς* Λυσικλὲς Δρακοντίδο Βατ]ὲ[θεν ἐγραμμάτευε,
παρέδοσαν]
[τοῖς ταμίαις *hοῖς* Τελέας Τελενίκο] Περγασὲθεν ἐγρ[αμμάτευε
Λεοχάρει .³..]
175 [...⁷.... καὶ χσ]υνά[ρχοσι, παραδεχσ]άμενοι παρὰ τὸν προ[τέρον ταμιὸν κτλ.]

Thus the dative of the demotic should have ten letters, a finding strengthened, paradoxically enough, by the fact that only eight spaces are available for it in the Hekatompedon inventory of 416/5.[14] The reduction of one letter from the nominative to the dative means that the demotic terminates in –εύς, and two of the three possibilities could easily cause a mason to omit two letters: [Ἀλοπεκει⟨εῖ⟩] and [Τρινεμει⟨εῖ⟩]. Less likely is the other possibility, [Λευκονοι⟨εῖ⟩].[15]

CORRIGENDUM

Under the date 428/7 on p. 148 above, the second sentence should read: A demotic of eleven letters would fill the usual 59 spaces in that line and would complete the regular 61 spaces in *I.G.*, I², 262, line 38.

WESLEY E. THOMPSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

[13] For Dexitheos cf. W. E. Thompson, "Prosopographical Notes on Athenian Treasurers," *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, p. 154.

[14] Cf. Hicks, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVIII, line 33.

[15] The purpose of this final note is not to claim the late B. H. Hill as a supporter of the views of the author, but to give him credit for discoveries which he made but did not live to publish. After the present article had been prepared, the author received from A. M. Woodward copies of two letters written by Hill in which he announced the discovery of the join between fragments *a* and *c*, the missing (twelfth) line of fragment *a*, the three letters in line 14 of that fragment, which he regarded as εγε, and the argument advanced by the author for dating fragment *d*.