

# NOTES ON THE TREASURERS OF ATHENA

## A. CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

THE late fifth century inventories of the treasurers of Athena are linked in such a way that, if we can establish the correct date of one of them, several others will fall into their proper place, or again, if we reject an accepted date for one, we must revise the chronology of almost the entire group. A similar connection exists between these inventories and the building accounts of the Erechtheion. For example, Aresaichmos of Agryle appears in these accounts as the eponym of the treasurers of Athena in 408/7.<sup>1</sup> If his name also appears as one of the recipients of the sacred dedications in the Pronaos inventory *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254, then that inscription must belong to the previous year, 409/8. Dinsmoor reported traces of the rho and the epsilon of his name in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254, line 282,<sup>2</sup> and Charneux has expanded this to read [’Α]ρε- [σ]αίχ[μοι].<sup>3</sup> After a reexamination of the stone I am convinced that even more of this name is visible. The key to deciphering the name is to ignore the usual criterion of the spacing of the letters, which is very irregular here. The first alpha and the hasta of the rho plus part of its curve joining the hasta appear mainly as traces of rust. These are far to the left of the letters in the line below.<sup>4</sup> The remaining letters are not rusted and appear very faintly on the stone: I saw the three bars of epsilon, a complete alpha, a complete iota, and possibly a chi. In view of the fact that the man’s demotic is preserved as Agrelethen, the name Aresaichmos is certain. Thus *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254 belongs to 409/8, and it follows that the next two inventories on this stone, *i.e.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255 and 255a, almost certainly belong to the next two years.<sup>5</sup> This is the chronology recently proposed by Tréheux.<sup>6</sup>

Another important name can, I think, be read for the first time in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254, that of the secretary of the treasurers of Athena of 409/8. In the *Editio Minor* it is given as — — — es of Eleusis (line 281). More of his name is visible in a photograph published by Tréheux<sup>7</sup> and on the stone. We can read it as — — — υχ[ά]ρες. The whole upsilon is sure, the whole chi is very faintly preserved, and part of the curve of the

<sup>1</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 374, lines 117-118, 188, and 273-274. This inscription is dated by the archon’s name in line 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Apud* James Morton Paton, *The Erechtheum*, Cambridge, Mass., 1927, p. 649, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Apud* Jacques Tréheux, *Études sur les inventaires attiques*, Paris, 1965, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> This is why I did not accept the hasta as an intentional stroke in my previous treatments; cf. *A.J.P.*, LXXXVI, 1965, p. 174 and *Gnomon*, XXXIX, 1967, p. 720.

<sup>5</sup> By *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255a we mean lines 323-331 in the numbering system of the *Editio Minor*; cf. *S.E.G.*, X, 191.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 30-36.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pl. 1.



rho appears on the stone.<sup>8</sup> The significance of this new reading is that it enables us to date another inventory, one of those for the Hekatompedon, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 275, in which the patronymic and demotic of the secretary for the previous year appear as — — — οχάρως Ἐλευ[σίνιος] (line 188). In all probability this man is — — — ychares of Eleusis,<sup>9</sup> so that 408/7 is the date of *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 275.

Now we are in a position to date two other Hekatompedon inventories, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274 and the one which is inscribed on the stone immediately above it, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274a. Ferguson has shown that the former must belong either to 409/8 or 407/6.<sup>10</sup> If we were to assign *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274 to 407/6, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274a would belong to 408/7, but this cannot be, for *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 275 is the inventory of this year.

We may now outline the results of this investigation as follows:<sup>11</sup>

	Pronaos inventories	Hekatompedon inventories	Erechtheion accounts
410/09	lost <sup>12</sup>	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 274a	none
409/8	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 254	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 274	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 373
408/7	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 255	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 275	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 374
407/6	<i>I.G.</i> , I <sup>2</sup> , 255a	lost	???

In order to accept these conclusions we must clear away an objection which Dinsmoor raised to placing *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274 in 409/8.<sup>13</sup> We learn from *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 274, line 169 that the eponym of the treasurers of Athena in 409/8 came from Paiania, while in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254, line 280 his name begins Phi — — —. Can a name be fashioned from these data which will fit the space available for the eponym in fragment X of the

<sup>8</sup> Only the epsilon and part of the chi appear in the photograph.

<sup>9</sup> Presbychares, Polychares, and Eucharis are all possibilities. If, as I argue below, the name of the eponym in line 280 is a short one, only Presbychares will fill the space in line 281.

<sup>10</sup> *The Treasurers of Athena*, Cambridge, Mass., 1932, pp. 46-54.

<sup>11</sup> For the Parthenon inventories of this penteteris cf. *Phoenix*, XVIII, 1964, pp. 262-271.

<sup>12</sup> Normally the four Pronaos inventories of a Panathenaic penteteris were inscribed on a single stele. The same thing is true of the Hekatompedon inventories, the Parthenon inventories, and (after 430/29, as far as we know) the accounts (*rationes*) of the treasurers of Athena. However, the Pronaos inventory of 410/09 was not inscribed on the same stone with *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254, 255, and 255a. It does not appear on the front face with them, and after reexamining the stele I am convinced that we have an original rough-picked back. One possible explanation of this anomaly comes to mind. With the naval victory at Kyzikos in 410 Athenian finances improved greatly. The demos voted to repay its debts to Athena, and the stele with this decree, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 109, was crowned with sculpture. The treasurers of Athena in 410/09 had their accounts inscribed on another sculptured stele, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 304A. As a result the treasurers of the following year preferred to post their accounts on another stone, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 301, and the tradition of inscribing four records on a single stele was breached. This is what I suggest may have happened with the Pronaos accounts: the treasurers of 410/09 set up a special sculptured stele, and their successors had to find a separate slab.

<sup>13</sup> *A.J.A.*, XXXVI, 1932, pp. 151-152.

Erechtheion accounts of 409/8? <sup>14</sup> Ferguson suggested Phi[linos] of Paiania,<sup>15</sup> but Dinsmoor felt that this was too long for the space. If, however, the name is Phi[leas],<sup>16</sup> it will fit:

[λέμματ]α παρὰ ταμ[ιὸν τῆς θεᾶς Φιλέο Π]  
[αιανιέος] καὶ χσυναρχ[όντων]

The lettering of this fragment is non-stoichedon and varies in size. Line 16, for example, contains thirty-three letters, of which fifteen are inscribed to the right of the pi which is directly below the mu of line 4.<sup>17</sup> Dinsmoor correctly calls attention to the importance of very wide and very narrow letters. To the right of the pi in line 16 are four iota's, which fill a small space, and two mu's, which fill more than a normal amount of space. Line 4, as we have restored it, has only two iota's but no mu's. Therefore, it seems possible that fifteen letters did follow TAM in this line. (Furthermore, if the writing continued as far into the right margin as it did in line 33, an extra letter might be accommodated.) Dinsmoor argued that only seven letters can be restored at the beginning of line 5 before καί. The kappa, however, is directly above the ninth letter of line 16, epsilon. Therefore, the Erechtheion accounts of 409/8 do contain room for the name of Phi[leas] of Paiania.

We can now turn to the chronology of the Erechtheion accounts, where the records for 409/8 and the following year are surely grounded.<sup>18</sup> There remain, however, several fragments from different inscriptions which have not been dated with certainty. One of these inscriptions (fragments XXVII-XXVIII = *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1654) lists a different set of workmen from that found in the records of 409/8 and 408/7. Thus it was thought to come from some period in the fourth century when repairs were being made on the building.<sup>19</sup> Then, however, Schweigert published a new fragment,<sup>20</sup> XXVIIIa (EM 12910), which "does not join the two fragments (XXVII-XXVIII) previously known, but is unquestionably from the same accounts. And its particular importance lies in counteracting an impression drawn from the two other fragments, wherein the nine names mentioned do not recur in the accounts

<sup>14</sup> The fragments are numbered according to the system adopted in *Erechtheum*.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Johannes Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, Berlin, 1901-1903, nos. 14229-14248; Philios, nos. 14341-14343, is also a possibility.

<sup>17</sup> See the facsimile of the inscription in *Erechtheum*, pl. 48.

<sup>18</sup> The record for 408/7, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 374 is dated by the archon's name in line 1, while Caskey in *Erechtheum*, p. 323 says that the contents of *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 373 "show that it is earlier than the account . . . of the year 408/7 B.C., and later than the report of the commission [in charge of the Erechtheion], which is dated in the first prytany of 409/8 B.C. It follows that it must be the account of this same year, 409/8 B.C."

<sup>19</sup> Dinsmoor, *Harv. St. Cl. Phil.*, Supp. I, 1940, pp. 173-175; cf. *A.J.A.*, XXXVI, 1932, pp. 152-160.

<sup>20</sup> *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 268-269.

of 409-407 B.C. and so might be regarded as belonging to a new generation of workmen; for the new piece contains only three names, Prepon, Sisypheos, and Parmenon, all well known from the accounts of 408/7 B.C. and forming a connected group which would hardly be imaginable a generation later."<sup>21</sup> The late B. H. Hill, however, in a letter to Meritt writes, "IG II<sup>2</sup> 1654: The small fragment EM 12910 has been, I think, surely mistakenly assigned to this ins[cription]. The spacing of letters in EM 12910 is appreciably different from that of II<sup>2</sup> 1654, and it was only the supposed exact correspondence that led to the attribution of the little fragment to II<sup>2</sup> 1654."<sup>22</sup> Hill's observation is certainly correct, for nine letter spaces in EM 12910 measure .072 m., while the same number of spaces in fragments XXVII-XXVIII measure .082 m., and additionally the sigmas are made differently in the two inscriptions.<sup>23</sup> Thus we must heed the prosopographical evidence and assign fragments XXVII-XXVIII to the fourth century.<sup>24</sup> The new fragment EM 12910 must, however, belong to the fifth century.

It has no affinity with another fragment, XXIX, which Dinsmoor assigns to the fifth century on the grounds that it formed part of a series of slabs doweled together like the accounts of 408/7.<sup>25</sup> Thus we seem to have evidence of work on the Erechtheion in at least two years following 408/7.

## B. THE ENGRAVING OF *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254 AND 255

Ferguson believed that the Pronaos inventories of 409/8 and 408/7 (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 254 and 255) were inscribed simultaneously, at the beginning of 408/7,<sup>26</sup> but Tréheux disputes this, for he holds that the inventories were *always* inscribed at the time of the transfer of the dedications from one group of treasurers to the next.<sup>27</sup> This is very probably what actually happened in the vast majority of cases, for the inventories of a Panathenaic penteteris are normally in four different hands. Presumably, a different mason was called upon each year to perform the task. On the other hand, on the basis of lettering the Parthenon inventories of 434/3 and 433/2 (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 276 and 277) appear to be in the same hand, and a second man seems responsible for the Hekatompedon inventories of both 434/3 and the following year (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 256 and

<sup>21</sup> Dinsmoor, *Harv. St. Cl. Phil.*, Supp. I, 1940, pp. 174-175.

<sup>22</sup> Hill sent a carbon copy of his letter to A. M. Woodward, who has generously turned it over to me.

<sup>23</sup> I examined the stone with Donald Laing, who pointed out the difference in the sigmas.

<sup>24</sup> For the various possibilities cf. *A.J.A.*, XXXVI, 1932, pp. 152-160. Laing and I also formed the firm opinion that the disputed letter in line 26 (cf. *A.J.A.*, XXXVI, 1932, p. 155) can be nothing but iota.

<sup>25</sup> *Erechtheum*, p. 648. This fragment lists a treasurer of Athena from Probalinthos. If the fragment belongs to 407/6, then we should probably identify him with the treasurer Kalli—who appears in *I.G.* I<sup>2</sup>, 255a.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

257). The natural assumption in both cases is that the inventories for two years were inscribed simultaneously. Aside from the identity of hands another fact points to the same conclusion. All the fifth century inventories except two begin at the left margin of the stone. The two exceptions are the Parthenon and Hekatompedon inventories of 433/2 (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 277 and 257), which begin in the middle of the same line where the inventories for 434/3 (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 276 and 256) end. The Hekatompedon inventories have a special mark of punctuation (┐) to show where one ends and the other begins. We do not know whether the Parthenon inventories had such a mark or not. At any rate, it appears that the mason simply continued in the same line with the second inventory after he had finished the first. Here then we have two probable instances of the inventories for successive years being inscribed at the same time.<sup>28</sup>

The same thing is surely true of the Pronaos inventories of 409/8 and 408/7, which are in the same hand and, moreover, offer the only examples in the fifth century inventories of *ἐν* spelled with the *daseia*.

There is another consideration which supports this view. We would expect that the transfer of the dedications in the three chambers of the Parthenon would occur at the same time, not at intervals of two or three days. Thus the three inventories, on Tréheux' hypothesis, would all be cut at the same time. But this cannot be the case for the two inventories which have survived from 408/7. The Hekatompedon inventory which we have assigned to this year, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 275, is perfectly normal, but the Pronaos inventory (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255) lacks most of its preamble, including the designation of the treasurers, their predecessors, and successors.<sup>29</sup> Thus the one was inscribed before the necessary information became available, and the other after it was available.

## C. THE OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN

This problem of the exact date when inventories were cut on stone is important in another connection. In an influential article Dover has done much to discredit the idea of a "chairmanship" among Athenian magistracies.<sup>30</sup> I still hold, however, to the view that the treasurers of Athena had a chairman, a man formally chosen to be the leader of the group throughout their year in office, since this seems to me the natural interpretation of the consistency with which a single treasurer is named in the

<sup>28</sup> These inventories are special in being the first ones prepared in accordance with the Second Kallias Decree; cf. Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, II, Princeton, 1949, D2, lines 26-29.

<sup>29</sup> It was the missing preamble which led Ferguson to conclude that *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255 had been inscribed before the treasurers of 407/6 had been chosen.

<sup>30</sup> *J.H.S.*, LXXX, 1960, pp. 61-77.

accounts (*rationes*) and inventories (*traditiones*) of a given year, e.g., Καλλίστρατος Μαραθόνιος καὶ χσυνάρχοντες.<sup>31</sup>

Now Dover in my opinion is certainly right in saying that when a general or ambassador is called δέκατος αὐτός by Thucydides or some other writer this does not mean that he holds a constitutional position of authority over his colleagues.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, the bulk of his evidence concerns the *strategia*, not the treasurers of Athena, and there is a major difference between the two offices. The treasurers had a collective responsibility throughout the year, but the generals did not. For instance, we hear of an instance of embezzlement of sacred funds during the fourth century.<sup>33</sup> In this case all the treasurers of Athena and all the treasurers of the Other Gods as well were arrested, but when the Athenians were dissatisfied with the results of the first Sicilian Expedition they tried only the three generals who had participated in the campaign and even then did not mete out the same punishment to all three.<sup>34</sup> And it is also perfectly clear from the accounts of the treasurers that generals were responsible individually, not as group, for the monies which they received.<sup>35</sup> Thus the treasurers and the generals must be studied separately.

The case for the proposition that the treasurers of Athena had a duly constituted chairman rests on the fact that with few exceptions the same man always appears as eponym in all the financial records of a given year. Dover, on the other hand, fastens on these exceptions, three in number, as proof that the eponym was not officially chosen for that honor. If the treasurers had chosen one man chairman, how could another appear as eponym in the same year? There is, I think, an explanation of these exceptions which will prove compatible with the official selection of a chairman.

The first exception is more apparent than real: the eponym in the Pronaos inventory for 425/4, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 241, is Phokiades of Oion, but that name seems to be too short to fill the space for the eponym who appears in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 240. But the problem disappears when we restore the latter as follows [hoi δὲ ταμίαι — — —] παρέδωσαν τοῖς τα[μίαισι τ]ῆς θεῆς Φοκιάδει ἔχς Οἶο καὶ χσυνάρχουσιν].<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 253, line 267 and *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 304A, line 2, which belong to 411 and 410/09, respectively.

<sup>32</sup> To the examples cited by Dover, *op. cit.*, p. 70 where the formula does not signify superiority I would add Plato, *Apology*, 32c and Hypereides, *Pro Euxenippo*, XIV. In the former Socrates does not want to imply that the Thirty selected him as the *leader* of a group of five men assigned to arrest one of their enemies. In the latter instance Hypereides' client had been selected as one of three to sleep in the temple of Amphiaraos in order to receive a divine dream. He was later indicted for falsifying his dream. Since one of his main points is that his client is an ordinary citizen and not a political leader, Hypereides wants to minimize Euxenippos' part in the affair.

<sup>33</sup> Demosthenes, XXIV, 136, with scholia.

<sup>34</sup> Thucydides, IV, 65, 3.

<sup>35</sup> For instance, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 296 records several transfers of money to the generals in charge of an attack on the Peloponnese, Karkinos, Sokrates, and Proteas, who are the same generals named by Thucydides (II, 23, 2). Undoubtedly, the other seven generals were not responsible for this money.

<sup>36</sup> For τῆς θεῆς in an inventory cf. *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 244.

Far more serious are the facts (1) that Charinos of Pelekes appears as the eponym for 418/7 in the records of the treasurers of Athena for the preceding year,<sup>37</sup> while Pythodoros of Halai is named as eponym for 418/7 in the inscriptions of that year;<sup>38</sup> and (2) that Melesias of Oe is listed as the eponym for 414/3 by his predecessors,<sup>39</sup> but Teisimachos of Paiania holds that honor in the records of that year.<sup>40</sup> These instances should be considered in connection with another phenomenon which we meet in the inventories, the omission of the name of the secretary of the incoming board of treasurers. In the inventories of 415/4 and 411/0 space was left for the name of the secretary of the new board but was never filled in.<sup>41</sup> To put it in diagram form we have the following:

	419/8	415/4	411/0
Extra eponym	x	x	
Missing secretary		x	x

The connection between these phenomena is the fact that they all occur at the end of one, and the beginning of another Panathenaic penteteris, which is the epochal date for the treasurers of Athena. Although we do not know precisely how the system worked,<sup>42</sup> the four boards which served a term of one year each in a penteteris had some kind of responsibility until the end of the penteteris, as their documents make clear: *τάδε παρέδοσαν και τέτταρες ἀρχαί, καὶ ἐδίδοσαν τὸν λόγον ἐκ Παναθηναίων εἰς Παναθήναια*.<sup>43</sup> It would also appear from this rubric and from the Logistai inscription, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 324, that a complete accounting was due at the end of each penteteris. The importance of the penteteris for the treasurers of Athena probably explains the fact that we have two sets of double eponyms and two examples of the omission of a secretary's name. It is clear that in 415/4 and 411/0 the inventories were engraved before the final organization of the incoming board had been completed. I would suggest that the same thing is true of 419/8. Either the outgoing treasurers were in a hurry to close out their records in order to prepare for their audit and consequently had their inscriptions cut before the actual transfer of the dedications took place, or else their successors had been unable to organize themselves until after they took office.<sup>44</sup> In either case Charinos and Melesias may simply have been representing the board in a temporary capacity until the final organization could be completed.

<sup>37</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 283; in addition this name is needed to fill the available space in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 267.

<sup>38</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 244 and 268; cf. *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302, line 7.

<sup>39</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 247; for his demotic cf. *Hesperia*, XXXV, 1966, p. 345. From a squeeze I have confirmed that the first letter of the demotic is a round one.

<sup>40</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 248; again this name is needed to fill the available space in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 272 and 286.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 305-306.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-103.

<sup>43</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 232, 240, 256, 260, 264, 268, 280, 286.

<sup>44</sup> Tréheux, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15, suggests that some treasurers did not complete the preliminary qualifying process before the scheduled beginning of their term in office.

The inscriptions do not specify that the eponym is the "chairman," and we cannot always take the man as such. But in my opinion except at the end of the penteteris, when no chairman had been formally selected, the eponym in an inventory or account of the treasurers of the Athena is the *official* head of the board.

#### D. THE TREASURERS OF ATHENA AND THE OTHER GODS

The constitution of the Five Thousand provided for the selection of *ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῇ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς δέκα*,<sup>45</sup> which means that the separate boards of treasurers of Athena and treasurers of the Other Gods were to be combined. However, we know from epigraphical evidence that this proposal was not put into effect until several years after the restoration of the democracy.<sup>46</sup> The exact date remains to be established.

The new board had come into existence by 405/4, for a decree of that year mentions *τοὺς ταμίας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν*.<sup>47</sup> Ferguson<sup>48</sup> thought that he had fixed the *terminus post quem* for the new office on the basis of a fourth century inscription which lists a group of stelai set up on the acropolis by various boards of treasurers, including the following:

[..... τῶ]ν ταμιῶν [τ]ῶν τῇ[ς θεοῦ .....]  
[..... ἐπ' Ἀν]τιγένους.<sup>49</sup>

This he took as evidence for the separate existence of the treasurers of Athena in the archonship of Antigenes, 407/6. However, we can scarcely rely on this entry with so much of it missing, especially when it is possible to restore it as:

[..... στήλη τῶ]ν ταμιῶν [τ]ῶν τῇ[ς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλ- "  
[λων θεῶν ἐπὶ Ἀν]τιγένους.

Thus we cannot be certain on the basis of this inscription that the merger had not taken place before 406/5, and now that Tréheux has dated *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255a to 407/6 there are two slight indications that the joint board of treasurers was at work in that year. The fact that the treasurers in this inscription call themselves simply *ταμίαι* without any further qualification may indicate that only one office of treasurer now existed,<sup>50</sup> and the style of this inventory, which lists the names of all the treasurers,

<sup>45</sup> Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, XXX, 2.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 253, 254, and 304A.

<sup>47</sup> Andokides, *De Mysteriis*, 77. The earliest epigraphical evidence for the joint board is *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1370 from the year 403/2.

<sup>48</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 3-7.

<sup>49</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 1498, lines 5-6.

<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, Tréheux, *op. cit.*, p. 35, says, "Puisque les trésoriers d'Antigénès y sont appelés *ταμίαι*, sans autre précision, il faut conclure que leur titre et leurs fonctions sont les mêmes que ceux de leurs prédécesseurs." Their predecessors were, of course, treasurers of Athena.



agrees with the procedure followed by the combined board of treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods, and not with that of the treasurers of Athena, who list only one of their number each year.

Much more weighty evidence for a *terminus post quem* has been overlooked. The Erechtheion accounts of 409/8 and 408/7 record contributions *παρὰ ταμίων τῆς θεᾶς*.<sup>51</sup> The same formula appears in fragment XXIX, which, as we have seen, must be dated in 407/6 or later. Thus it would appear that the treasurers of Athena were separate from the treasurers of the Other Gods as late as 407/6. Unfortunately, however, this rubric is not proof positive. Since the treasurers of Athena regularly call themselves *hoi tamiai tōn hierōn chremátōn tēs 'Athenáias* (with or without the articles),<sup>52</sup> *ταμίαι τῆς θεᾶς* appears to have been the popular, but unofficial, name of the office. In addition to the instances in the Erechtheion accounts we find it in a decree<sup>53</sup> and even one board of treasurers of Athena during the fifth century applied it to themselves.<sup>54</sup> It does not seem impossible, therefore, that even after the merger of the two offices the new board was popularly called *ταμίαι τῆς θεᾶς*. In fact, the treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods called themselves by this title in 398/7.<sup>55</sup> Thus it is only probable, not certain, that the merger of the two offices occurred in one of two years: 406/5 or 405/4.

The first half of Ferguson's book *The Treasurers of Athena* consists of a series of studies of individual problems in Athenian finance. In a chapter entitled "The Amalgamation of the Two Boards"<sup>56</sup> he summarizes the results of these studies and finds that they all point to the same conclusion: the date of the merger of the two boards is 406/5. But the validity of this conclusion depends on the validity of the earlier findings. Dinsmoor immediately disputed most of them,<sup>57</sup> and research during the past thirty-five years has overturned others.<sup>58</sup> As a result, in my opinion, there is little solid evidence in favor of 406/5 as the date of the merger.

<sup>51</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 373, line 91, and 374, lines 117, 187-188, and 273.

<sup>52</sup> Normally they include the article in their inventories and omit it in their accounts (*rationes*).

<sup>53</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 106, line 22. In *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 88, lines 22-23 we find ἀργύρ[ιον δὲ δότο ἡο ταμίας ἡ]ο τῆς θεᾶς ἡόθενπερ ἐς τὸ —. But there certainly was no official called *the* treasurer of the goddess. Therefore, I propose the following restoration: ἀργύρ[ιον δ' ἐς ταῦτα εἶναι ἀπ']ὸ τῆς θεᾶς ἡόθενπερ ἐς τὸ [ν νεόν]. Cf. *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 94, lines 8-9: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἐς τὸν ἔρχσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ τεμένους εἶναι.

<sup>54</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 244 and 302, line 7, both of 418/7. The latter may represent the terminology of a decree. I have restored the phrase in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 240, *supra*, p. 59. It also occurs in some sort of financial document, *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 379.

<sup>55</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1391.

<sup>56</sup> Pp. 104-109.

<sup>57</sup> *A.J.A.*, XXXVI, 1932, pp. 149-151.

<sup>58</sup> For instance, his conclusions about the accounting procedure followed in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1686 are based on an incorrect disposition of the fragments of that inscription; cf. Woodward, *Hesperia*, XXV, 1956, pp. 109-121. Also his dates for *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 255a, 289, and 290 are probably wrong; cf. Tréheux, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-38 and Thompson, *Phoenix*, XVIII, 1964, pp. 262-271.

What Ferguson considered his "main point" should receive further attention. "Once it has been shown that the creation of the amalgamated board antedates 405/04 B.C., we are bound to go back to 406 B.C. for an appropriate occasion for the change."<sup>59</sup> For him that occasion was the inception of the Athenian gold coinage, the result of the "crisis of Arginusai."<sup>60</sup> On this "crisis" view of the gold coinage, Arginousai would indeed be the natural occasion for the merger of the two offices. The evidence, however, seems to me to support an "evolutionary" view of the coinage, that it was the outcome of financial difficulties which had vexed Athens over a period of years. According to Thucydides,<sup>61</sup> by 412/1 Athens had nearly exhausted its reserves of silver, and we can see from the accounts of 409/8 (*I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 301) that no great progress had been made in replenishing them. We know that in 408/7 it was necessary to strip the treasury of the Eleusinian goddesses.<sup>62</sup> We also know that the issuance of gold coinage had been contemplated as early as the beginning of the Peloponnesian War by Perikles<sup>63</sup> and that prior to the actual minting of coins Athens had tried to make use of its gold reserves by selling bullion.<sup>64</sup> Finally, since Ferguson's book appeared we have learned that the gold coinage was issued and used over a period of years.<sup>65</sup> Thus there was no one single issue of gold in response to a particular crisis.

Yet on general grounds Hekatombaion 28, 406/5 is the most likely date for the merger, for this was the end of a Panathenaic penteteris. As we have said, the four boards of treasurers of Athena which served during a penteteris worked very closely together, and the Panathenaic penteteris is the unit of time by which their activities were reckoned. As for the treasurers of the Other Gods, the First Kallias Decree orders: *καὶ ἐκ Παναθηναίων ἐς Παναθέναια τὸν λόγον διδόντων, καθάπερ οἱ τὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίας τ[α]μειούντες*.<sup>66</sup> In view of this, if a merger was being contemplated, the end of the penteteris was the logical time for it. On the other hand, these were unusual times, and we cannot be certain that the administration of Athenian finance proceeded in a normal, predictable fashion.

WESLEY E. THOMPSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
DAVIS

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 94.

<sup>61</sup> VIII, 15, 1.

<sup>62</sup> *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 313, lines 173-183.

<sup>63</sup> Thucydides, II, 13, 5.

<sup>64</sup> *S.E.G.*, X, 233, lines 103-114.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *Mnemosyne*, XIX, 1966, pp. 337-343.

<sup>66</sup> *A.T.L.*, II, D1, lines 27-29.