

SEG XXI, 80 AND THE RULE OF THE THIRTY

THE OLIGARCHY of the Thirty in Athens, 404/3 B.C., has been the subject of a great deal of debate in the 20th century, as it must have been in the 4th century B.C.¹ Our literary evidence is tainted by the passions of 4th-century democratic politics; epigraphic evidence is almost non-existent. All the more reason, therefore, to squeeze every possible bit of information out of the record of payments made by the *tamiai* of Athena and the Other Gods which was published by A. M. Woodward in 1963.² Woodward set out the text of the two fragments as follows:

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 84

α. 404/3 α.

A, α [Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνήλωσαν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρο ἄρχοντ]ος καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ[s βολῆς
 ἡμὶ Δύκων(?) Πρασιεὺς πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτενε, ταμ]
 [ἰαί τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας ἡσ]αν Χαριάδης Ἀγ[ρυλῆθεν
 -----³⁴-----]
 [- -----²⁴----- Ξυπεται]ών, Μενεκράτης Οἰ[ναῖος,
 ----- οἷς -----^{ca. 15}-----]
 [ἐγραμμάτενε, ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἡμὶ Δύκων(?) Πρ]ασιεὺς πρῶτος
 ἐγ[ραμμάτενε, Ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος(?)]
 5 [καὶ Λεωντίδος καὶ Αἰγείδος] καὶ Π[αν]διονίδος πρυταν[ευοσῶν
 οὐδὲν παρέδοσαν Ἑλληνοταμίαις ἐπὶ τῆς Κε]
 [κροπίδος(?) πέμπτης πρυτανε]ύσεως παρέδοσαν Χαιρε[- - - -
 -----⁴⁴-----]
 [- - - -¹⁶----- (?) Νικομά]χῳ [Πε]ραιεῖ, Ἀνθεμίῳ
 Ῥ[αμνοσίῳ, -----³⁴-----]
 [- - - -²⁰----- τ]ῇ καὶ δεκάτῃ τῆς πρυτ[ανείας
 -----³⁸-----]
 [- - - -¹⁷----- μιᾷ(?) κ]αὶ εἰκοστῇ XXX· τετάρτ[ῃ
 καὶ εἰκοστῇ ----- τριακοστῇ(?) ----- κεφάλαιον]
 10 [ἀργυρίο ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδος(?)] παραδοθέντος ΤΤΤϞΗΗ[...?.....
 ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνείδος ἔκτης πρυτανευόσης Ἑλλ]
 [ληνοταμίαις τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνεί]δ[ο]ς ἄρχουσιν ἐς τ[ῇ]ν [διωβελίαν
 παρέδοσαν -----²⁶-----]
 [- - - -²²----- Ἀν]ακαεῖ, Ὀνησιφῶντ[ι -----
 -----⁴⁴-----]

¹ I would like to thank Naphtali Lewis for reading and criticizing an earlier draft of this paper.

² *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 144-155, no. 1 and pl. 55 = SEG XXI, 80 = SEG XXIV, 45. For convenience I will refer to the inscription as SEG XXI, 80.

[...⁸...· κεφάλαιον ἀργυρίο ἐ]πὶ τῆς [Οἰ]νείδ[ο]ς [παραδοθέντος
 -----³⁴-----]
 [-----²⁶-----] traces [-----
 -----]

(lacuna of about twenty lines)

B, a [...⁷... κα]ὶ τριακοστῇ[ι ἐς τὴν διωβελίαν(?) πέμπτη(?)
 καὶ τριακοστῇ κεφάλαιον ἀργυρίο ἐπὶ τῇ]
 [ς] Αἰαντίδος παραδοθέν[τος¹¹..... ἐπὶ τῆς Ἱπποθωντίδος(?)
 δεκάτης πρυτανεύσεως τάδε παρέδωσαν τ]
 ρίτηι τῆς πρυτανείας Η[-----
 -----⁶⁵-----]
 ΠΗΗΗΗΗΠ· ἐνδεκάτει ΧΧΠΗ[.....¹¹..... δωδεκάτει¹⁵.....
 τρίτει καὶ δεκάτει¹³.....]

5 Η· τετάρτει καὶ δεκάτει [-----⁴⁸-----
 ----- ἐνάτει(?) καὶ δεκάτει]
 [ΧΧ]ΧΗΗΔΔΗΗΗ(· μιᾷ [καὶ εἰκοστῇ -----
 -----⁴⁷----- ἐνάτει(?) κα]
 ἰ εἰκοστῇ[ι -----⁶⁵-----
 -----ει καὶ τριακ]
 [οστ]ῇ ΤΤ -----⁷⁷-----
 -----]

(not more than one line missing to bottom of stone)

A, b [----- ..]στ[.]ν[.]κο[.]ε[-----]
 [----- ..]φ[.]ων ἀμφ[ι]δέ[αι -----]
 [----- ..]|| ἀμφιδ[έ]αι δ[-----]
 [----- ..]νος σταθμὸν ΧΠΗ[-----]
 5 [----- κα]τὰ ψήφισμα βολῆς [-----]
 [-----]σιο σταθμὸν [-----]
 [-----] ^ι[.] ^ [-----]

B, b [-----]Ι[.]ΙΙΙ ξ[ι][.....]
 [----- ἐπὶ ----- ἄρ]χοντος ἀργ[υρ.]
 [-----]στατήρες Α[.]ε
 [-----στατήρε]ς Κορίνθιοι Π ἀρ
 [-----Φ]ωκαικὸ χρυσίο
 [-----]ΔΗ > vacat

vacat

My intentions in this paper are to reconsider the dating and the restoration of the inscription in order to bring out more of its historical significance.

THE DATE

Woodward followed the arguments of W. B. Dinsmoor in dating the inscription to 404/3 at the end of the series of accounts already known.³ In brief, Dinsmoor's reasoning was as follows:⁴ The general time period is indicated by the appearance of Chariades of Agryle, known to have been the second of the epistatai in the Erechtheion building record of 409/8 (*IG I*², 372, line 2) and a hellenotamias in 406/5 (*IG I*², 255, line 328). Secondly, the Ionic script indicates a late date, probably after 407/6.⁵ Thirdly, the similarity of both the style of writing and the presumed size of the stone to the accounts for 405/4 (*IG II*², 1686+) suggests a close chronological relationship between the two,⁶ and this relationship is confirmed by the contents of the decrees: in contrast to *IG I*², 305 (406/5) and *IG I*², 304 b, c (407/6),⁷ the payments of *IG II*², 1686+ and *SEG XXI*, 80 are dated by days of the prytanies, without reference to the months.

These arguments are supported by the phrase [κα]τὰ ψήφισμα βολῆς in line 5 of A, b. In a matter of expenditure the democratic boule put forward *προβουλεύματα*; it could not authorize "borrowing" from Athena's treasury. Such a *ψήφισμα* of the boule should have been passed in the time of an oligarchy.⁸ Compare the phrases *φσεφισαμένο τῷ δέμῳ τὴν ἀδειαν* (used or restored five times in *IG I*², 302 = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 77, lines 15, 28, 30, 33, 63-64) and *φσεφισαμένο τῷ δέμῳ* (*IG I*², 304 a = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 84, line 3) with the phrase used by the oligarchy of the Four Hundred in 411 B.C., *ψηφισαμένης τῆς βολῆς* (*IG I*², 298, lines 14-15).⁹ The bouleutic decree referred to here, then, was passed either under the Four Hundred in 411 or under the Thirty in 404/3, and the other dating considerations make the former alternative most unlikely.¹⁰ We should accept the date of 404/3 for *SEG XXI*, 80 without hesitation.

³ A convenient guide to the bibliography on these accounts is given in R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1969, p. 260.

⁴ See W. B. Dinsmoor, *HSCP*, Suppl. I, Cambridge, Mass. 1940, p. 172.

⁵ See W. S. Ferguson's appendix on the use of Ionic in Athenian inscriptions before 403/2 in *The Treasurers of Athena*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932, pp. 175-178.

⁶ For further fragments to be added to *IG II*², 1686 see B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 11, 1942, pp. 275-278, and the discussion by Woodward in *Hesperia* 25, 1956, pp. 109-121.

⁷ If W. K. Pritchett is correct (and I find his reasoning attractive) in maintaining that *IG I*², 304 c contains part of the record for 408/7, there are no vacant years in the period 410/9-405/4, making it very likely that *SEG XXI*, 80 belongs in 404/3 based on the Ionic script alone. See Pritchett's *The Choiseul Marble*, Berkeley 1970, and his earlier article in *BCH* 88, 1964, pp. 455-481, which has excellent photographs.

⁸ A number of early 4th-century decrees appear to have been passed by the boule alone (they begin *ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ* without the normal *καὶ τοῖς δήμοις*), but none of them authorize an expenditure. This group of inscriptions is discussed by P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford 1972, pp. 82-87.

⁹ *IG I*², 298 = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 81, where the editors call attention to the oligarchic usage.

¹⁰ Rhodes, *op. cit.* (above, footnote 8), p. 95, note 6, comments that *SEG XXI*, 80 is dated to 404/3, "but the decree of the boule which is cited could be earlier." It could, indeed, date back to 411, but that possibility seems remote.

THE PREAMBLE: A, *a*, lines 1-4

There are several disquieting things in Woodward's restoration of the preamble. The first is his restoration of the verb in line 2 as [ῆσ]αν, an unparalleled usage, on the grounds that "the position seems to rule out [παρέδοσ]αν,"¹¹ the verb used in all the treasure records of this period. Aside from the fact that the formulas in Attic inscriptions are not as regular as Woodward's reasoning assumes, we do have an exact parallel for this position of παρέδοσαν in an inventory of the Hekatompedon dated to 390/89 (*IG* II², 1400, line 3).¹² I think we can be confident, therefore, in restoring the normal verb [παρέδοσ]αν.

Secondly, Woodward restored the title of the tamiai as ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας, leaving out any reference to the Other Gods. His objection that adding καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν would mean that the inscription had close to 100 letters per line (much higher than the average in these accounts) is well taken, but the omission of the Other Gods would still be surprising. The joint board of tamiai had been created by 404/3,¹³ and *SEG* XXI, 80 is most easily interpreted as a joint account: the payments recorded on B, *b* look as if they were made from the treasury of the Other Gods.¹⁴ The Other Gods ought to be mentioned in the preamble. Now none of the preambles from the records of the joint board in its first years have survived, but we do have a decree of 405/4 quoted in Andokides, *de mys.* 77 which mentions τοὺς ταμίας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν. Here is just what we are looking for: a shorter title which still includes both Athena and the Other Gods. I propose to take Andokides' evidence as reliable, and to conclude that the joint board called itself ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν in 405/4 and also in 404/3.¹⁵ Their title must have been lengthened thereafter to the form familiar in the 4th-century inventories.

Thirdly, I am troubled by the phrase in line 4, [--- Πρ]ασιεὺς πρῶτος ἐγ[ραμμάτευε], which Woodward took as a second reference to the first secretary of the boule mentioned in line 1. If this is correct, it is an unparalleled (so far as I know) repetition which seems redundant and unnecessary. We would expect a secretary to be mentioned in approximately this position, but the secretary of the board, not of the boule. If [--- Πρ]ασιεὺς was a secretary of the tamiai, we know nothing about the name of the first secretary of the boule. I will return to this problem below; for the moment I prefer to leave Πρασιεὺς out of line 1.

We are now ready to consider the full restoration of line 1 and the number of

¹¹ *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 146.

¹² Where Kirchner proposed that it must be deleted and attributed to the negligence of the preamble's composer.

¹³ Debate continues on whether the joint board was created in 407/6 or 406/5; see W. E. Thompson, *Hesperia* 39, 1970, pp. 61-63.

¹⁴ Noted by Woodward, *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 155.

¹⁵ The treasurers of Athena seem to have been called unofficially ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ in the 5th century; see W. E. Thompson, *Hesperia* 39, 1970, p. 62. Thus when the two boards were combined they may have used this popular version for the first half of what was still a lengthy title.

letters in each line. The beginning of line 1 can be filled in with confidence; it read, following the pattern of other accounts (e. g. *IG* I,² 298, 302, 304 a), [Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνήλωσαν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρο ἄρχοντι]ος. We know, then, the width of the stele to the left; and incorporating the restorations suggested above we can set out lines 1 and 2 as follows:

[Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνήλωσαν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρο ἄρχοντι]ος καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ[s
 βολῆς ἥι ----- πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε, τα]
 [μίαι τῆς θεῶ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν παρέδοσ]αν Χαριάδης
 Ἀγ[ρυλῆβεν -----]

The number of letters in line 1, therefore, depends on the number of letters in the missing secretary's name, about which we have no clue. The range is quite large and we need to turn to other methods of getting at the length of line.

Woodward, admitting that it is "largely a matter of conjecture," opted for a line of 84 letters as that number "is not infrequent in this class of document."¹⁶ We can be more precise. There is another possible means of discovering the number of letters per line: by restoring the beginning of the first line of the reverse (A, b). Then by adding the length of the end of that line (the length of the beginning of line 1 on the obverse, A, a) we would have the whole line.¹⁷ Comparing the two sides, Woodward said that the first letters of the reverse are just after the center of his 84-letter line, i. e. that there are 42 letters from and including the first preserved letters in line 1 of A, b to the end of the line. I propose to restore the first half of the line (for reasons which will be explained below) as [τάδε ἐκ τῷ νεῷ τῷ Ἑκατομπεδῷ παρέδομεν ἡ Νίκη ἦν Ἀρι], a total of 42 letters, giving a line of 84 letters. We thus have more solid ground for accepting Woodward's 84-letter line, though lines of 83 or 85 letters would not be surprising since stoichedon inscriptions had irregularities more and more frequently in the last decade of the 5th century.¹⁸

We turn now to the names of the treasurers listed on A, a in lines 2-4, beginning with the end of the list. I have hinted above that I believe [---Πρ]ασιεύς in line 4 was a secretary of the tamiai rather than of the boule. The curious phrase that he was the *first* secretary can be explained by the supposition that the 404/3 board consisted of one Athenian from each tribe, each representative serving as secretary for one prytany. This fits both what is and what is not present on our fragment. We

¹⁶ *Hesperia* 32, 1963, p. 147, where he cites his note 68 in *Hesperia* 25, 1956, p. 119. This footnote, however, shows that an 84-letter line is infrequent, even rare:

... of the six stelai with accounts of the Tamiae available for comparison, whilst *I.G.*, I², 296 has 84 letters to the line, and 302 has 85, 293 (as restored by Meritt, *Ath. Financial Documents*, pp. 42 ff.) has 93; 297 has 78; 304A (non-stoichedon) has ca. 74-88; 304B has mostly 73-74; and 301 cannot be more precisely estimated than ca. 80. The length of line in the *Traditiones* of the Pronaos, Hekatompedon and Opisthodomos shows a much wider range.

¹⁷ As the height of the letters is the same on both sides it seems fair to assume the number of letters per line was the same on both sides.

¹⁸ See R. P. Austin, *The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions*, London 1938, p. 52.

know the name of the first secretary from *IG* II², 1370 + 1371 as restored by Tréheux, *SEG* XXIII, 81, lines 7-8. It is [Δ]ρομοκλε[.....^{ca. 12}.....]; we can fill this out as [Δ]ρομοκλε[ίδης Πρασιεύς] and restore Δρομοκλείδης in line 4 here. We now have three full names; between Χαριάδης Ἀγ[ρυλῆθεν] in line 2 and Μενεκράτης Οἰ[ναῖος] in line 3 there is a gap of 64 spaces, and between Menekrates and the phrase [οἷς Δρομοκλείδης Πρ]ασιεύς πρῶτος ἐγ[ραμμάτευε] a gap of 48 spaces. I propose that the first gap had four names of treasurers with their demotics, the second gap an additional three. If this is correct, the position of Menekrates of the tribe Hippothontis (VIII) indicates that the treasurers were not recorded in the official tribal order, and I further suggest that their order was the order in which they held the post of secretary after Dromokleides.¹⁹

I would bolster this argument with the observation that totals were entered for the expenditures in each prytany (most clearly seen in B, *a*, line 2). Earlier treasurers entered totals for a single type of expenditure such as for an expedition (*IG* I², 296, line 28) or to the hellenotamiai (*IG* I², 301, lines 4-5), yearly totals (*IG* I², 302 = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 77, lines 21-22, 33-34, 49-50, 70-71 and *IG* I², 304 a = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 84, lines 40-41), and totals from different treasuries (*IG* I², 305, line 11). There does not seem to be any consistent pattern; but none of the earlier records contain totals for individual prytanies, totals which could be very low and not really worth adding up.²⁰ The rotation of the post of secretary gives us an ample explanation for the careful summations: if each tamias was in charge of the books for a prytany he would naturally have totaled the accounts for his brief term.

THE EXPENDITURES: A, *a* and B, *a*

One of the most interesting pieces of information to come out of *SEG* XXI, 80 is the fact that the Thirty used a system of prytanies (the oligarchy in 411 had some

¹⁹ Thus the eponymous official of the 404/3 board was its first secretary, which explains why the board was specified in 403/2 by its [first] secretary and a reference to the eponymous archon, without mentioning the "chairman" in the customary way. See the discussion and restoration of *IG* II², 1370 + 1371 by J. Tréheux, *Études d'archéologie classique* 3, 1965, pp. 41-44 = *SEG* XXIII, 81.

Woodward restored the demotic [---]ων before Menekrates in line 3 as [Ξυπεται]ών (Kekropis, VII) on the grounds that [ἐκ Κηδ]ών (Erechtheis, I) is excluded by the position and the fact that this phyle is already represented by Chariades. There is, however, a third possibility, [ἐκ Κεραμέ]ων (Akamantis, V), to which there is no objection if the official tribal order was not followed. I see no way of deciding whether [ἐκ Κεραμέ]ων or [Ξυπεται]ών is correct, and prefer to make no restoration.

²⁰ A possible exception is *IG* II², 1686 + (405/4), which may also have totals for individual prytanies; the suggestion is made by Woodward, *Hesperia* 25, 1956, pp. 111-120 *passim*. I am not sure he is correct, though the fragmentary nature of this account precludes certainty. Nowhere is there a prytany in the genitive case followed immediately by παραδοθέντος (indicating a summation), such as here in B, *a*, line 2 and A, *a*, line 10 (partially restored).

The reorganization of the board described above most likely occurred either when the tamiai of Athena and the tamiai of the Other Gods were amalgamated (407/6 or 406/5) or under the Thirty in 404/3. If the record for 405/4 has summations for each prytany, the former would be more likely; but since this is not certain the question must be left open.

kind of prytanies as well; see Thucydides, VIII.70.1). Whether the prytanies carried out all their normal functions may still be doubted, but the traditions of Athenian administration were at least respected.

Two of Woodward's restorations are unjustified and should be deleted. In the first place, there is no evidence to support any mention of the hellenotamiai. Woodward assumed that all disbursements were to the hellenotamiai; if such was the case the hellenotamiai were a different kind of hellenotamiai than we have seen before, as in A, *a*, line 11 we have (some of) them in office for only one prytany. If on the other hand A, *a*, line 11 refers to other magistrates, Woodward's assumption of payments only to hellenotamiai is wrong. It seems preferable to leave the hellenotamiai out of the picture entirely, and stick to the old theory that they died with the empire in 405/4. Secondly, Woodward's admittedly bold conjecture ἐς τ[ῆ]ν [διωβελίαν] in A, *a*, line 11 goes beyond the evidence. The purpose of expenditures is frequently indicated (when indicated at all) by the phrase ἐς ... (for example, *IG* I², 302 = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 77, line 67, ἐς Παναθέναια, and line 76, ἐς τὰ<ς> ναῦς τὰς ἐς Σι[κελίαν ἐσκομισάσα]ς τὰ χρέματα and *IG* I², 304 a = Meiggs and Lewis, no. 84, line 6, ἐς Παναθέναια τὰ μεγάλα, and line 7, ἐς τὲν ἐκατόμβην). Since, therefore, a number of other possibilities exist, it would be safer to make no restoration in A, *a*, line 11.

On the analogy of *IG* I², 304 a we might begin the record of expenditures proper with ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων. Meritt has observed that the accounts for 406/5 and 405/4 recorded first expenses from current income and then expenses from reserve;²¹ this division applies equally well to *SEG* XXI, 80. The obverse has the payments made from current income—now rather small—and the reverse has the payments from the various reserves, grouped by treasuries. I would insert ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων, then, immediately after the end of the preamble in line 4.

Following the preamble is an unusual formula in line 5, καὶ Π[αν]διονίδος πρυταν[-----]. I can do no better than to suppose with Woodward that at least one prytany preceded Pandionis and that no payments were made during these prytanies, which might be explained by the political turmoil in the summer of 404.

Using all the above suggestions we can set out the text of A, *a* and B, *a* as follows:

a. 404/3 *a*.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 84

A, *a* [Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλωσαν ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρο ἄρχοντ]ος καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ[ς βολῆς ἡι-----¹⁴---πρώτος ἐγγραμμάτευε, τα]
[μία τῆς θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν παρέδοσ]αν Χαριάδης Ἀγ[ρυλῆθεν, -----³³, -----, ----]
[-----, ³¹-----]ων, Μενεκράτης Οἰ[ναῖος, -----³⁴, -----, -----]
[---¹⁴---, οἷς Δρομοκλείδης Πρ]ασιεύς πρῶτος ἐγ[ραμμάτευε, ἐκ τῶν ἐπετείων ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος (?)]
5 [καὶ Λεωντίδος καὶ Αἰγυλίδος] καὶ Π[αν]διονίδος πρυταν[ευσῶν οὐδὲν παρέδοσαν· ----- ἐπὶ τῆς ----]
[...ίδος πέμπτης πρυτανε]ύσης παρέδοσαν Χαιρε[-----⁴³-----]
[-----²²-----]χωί [Πε]ραιεῖ, Ἀνθεμίωφι Ἐ[αμνοσίωφι, -----³⁴-----]

²¹ B. D. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1932, p. 64.

10 [-----²⁰---τ]ηι καὶ δεκάτῃ τῆς πρυτ[ανείας -----³⁸-----]
 [-----²¹---κ]αὶ εἰκοστῇ XXX · τετάρτ[ηι καὶ εἰκοστῇ ----- κεφάλαιον
 [ἀργυρίο ἐπὶ τῆς ---ίδος] παραδοθέντος ΤΤΤ ΠΗΗ [----- ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνείδος ἑκτῆς πρυτανεύσεως ---]
 [-----¹⁰--- τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνεί]δ[ο]ς ἄρχουσιν ἐς τ[.]υ [-----⁴⁴-----]
 [-----²²---'Αν]ακαίει, Ὀνησιφώντ[ι -----⁴⁴-----]
 [.....⁸..... κεφάλαιον ἀργυρίο ἐ]πὶ τῆς [Οἰ]νείδ[ο]ς [παραδοθέντος -----³⁴-----]
 [-----²⁸-----] traces [-----⁴⁴-----]
 (lacuna of about twenty lines)
 B, a [...] κα]ὶ τριακοστῇ [ι -----⁴⁸----- κεφάλαιον ἀργυρίο ἐπὶ τῇ]
 [ς] Αἰαντίδος παραδοθέν[τος ----- ἐπὶ τῆς ---ίδος δεκάτης πρυτανεύσεως ----- τ]
 ρίτῃ τῆς πρυτανείας Η [-----⁶⁵-----]
 ΠΗΗΗΗΗΠΙ · ἐνδεκάτει ΧΧΠΗ [-----⁶⁴-----]
 5 Η · τετάρτει καὶ δεκάτει [-----⁶⁴-----]
 [...] ΧΗΗΔΔΗΗΗ() · μᾶλ[ι καὶ εἰκοστῇ -----⁵³----- κα]
 ἰ εἰκοστῇ [ι -----⁷⁴----- κ]
 [οστ]ῇ ΤΤ [-----⁷¹-----]
 (not more than one line missing to bottom of stone)

THE EXPENDITURES: A, b, the Nikai

The top of Face *b* is badly weathered, and Woodward felt in 1963 that it offered "no hope of extracting any continuous sense." The ἀμφιδέαι (bracelets) which appear in lines 2 and 3, however, indicate that we are dealing with two gold-plated Nikai, presumably melted down for coinage (a continuation of the emergency gold coinage struck beginning in 407/6). W. E. Thompson has pointed out that the only ἀμφιδέαι known from 5th-century treasure records are parts of Nikai; and he suggested restoring other known parts in lines 2 ([στρο]φ[ι]ον, a type of band crossed between the breasts and tied around the waist) and 4([στέφα]νος, wreath).²² But Thompson saw evidence for only one Nike, and there were certainly two involved. The fact that ἀμφιδέαι appears in the plural in line 3, where we should restore ἀμφιδ[έ]αι δ[ύ]ο, is extremely significant. A Nike always had two bracelets, but only one per arm. In the 4th-century inventories, where the Nikai are normally weighed in five groups or ῥυμοί, the left and right arms appear in different groups and the singular ἀμφιδέα accompanies each arm. Two ἀμφιδέαι mentioned together indicate that another sort of grouping was used in which both arms were weighed in the same ῥυμός. This was done at least twice: in 371/0 (*IG* II², 1424 a, *Add.*) we find χεῖρες ἀμφοτέραι, ἀμφιδέαι δύο in the first group, and earlier in ca. 430-425 (*SEG* X, 215) a similar grouping was used, for although the stone is broken and no mention of ἀμφιδέαι is preserved, the third and incomplete ῥυμός includes the dual χεῖρε. So the ἀμφιδέαι here in line 3 belonged to one Nike, and those in line 2 must have belonged to another; hence two Nikai were melted down.

A possible objection is that full descriptions of Nikai (as in *IG* II², 1388, for

²² W. E. Thompson, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 19, 1966, pp. 338-339. Woodward suggested the restoration [στρο]φ[ι]ον for line 2 in a letter to A. G. Woodhead (see *SEG* XXI, 80).

example) took up much more space than we have here. But the few examples we have from the 5th century do not adhere to the pattern so well attested in the 4th; one of them (*SEG* X, 215) appears to describe a Nike weighed in only three ῥυμοί and somewhat lighter than the normal two talents.²³ The full description, though one cannot be sure since it breaks off, looks to have been complete in approximately 185 spaces; two of this size would fill roughly four lines of our text, about what is available if we assume the last figure ended immediately before [κα]τὰ ψήφισμα βολῆς in line 5, which we may take as authorizing the coining of the gold from these two Nikai.

Full restoration of these lines is out of the question, however, as we have unusual grouping. To my knowledge this is the only place where στρόφιον and ἀμφιδέαι are adjacent; and the position of στέφανος indicates that the second Nike was not weighed in the head-to-foot order customary in the 4th century. In this respect *SEG* XXI, 80 is similar to other 5th-century Nike descriptions, which also do not conform to the 4th-century pattern.²⁴ But the important fact from the historian's point of view is well established: two Nikai were melted down in 404/3. If they were of average size, they weighed very close to four talents in all; if they were smaller than average, as the shortness of the entries suggests, they still must have weighed over three gold talents—which at a gold/silver ratio of about 12/1 means that the Thirty coined the equivalent of thirty-six to forty-eight silver talents. Most, if not all, of this money presumably went to pay for the 700 Lakonian hoplites who were called in to prop up the oligarchy.

As I have already said, I have higher hopes of restoring the beginning of line 1. The reverse contains the records of the disbursements from the reserves. At the bottom (B, b) are payments in Aiginetan and Corinthian staters and in Phokaian hektaí. These probably came from the reserve of the Other Gods—in the one surviving inventory drawn up by the treasurers of the Other Gods (*IG* I², 310) we find precisely these coins—and the heading of this section would have read τάδε ἐκ τοῦ Ὀπισθοδόμο παρέδομεν as in *IG* I², 305. I suggest that the group of payments at the top of the reverse began analogously τάδε ἐκ τοῦ νεῶ τοῦ Ἑκατομπέδο παρέδομεν (the Nikai appear in the Hekatompedon inventories in the 4th century). We can restore the next part of the line as well, knowing that it was the beginning of a description of a Nike and included the artist's name:²⁵ [ἡ Νίκη ἦν Ἀρι] στ[ό]ν[ι]κ[ο]ς ἐ[ποίησεν]. This formula appears in *SEG* X, 215 (ca. 430-425) and is restored in *IG* II², 1370 + 1371 = *SEG* XXIII, 81 (403/2) and in *Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 310-311, no. 28 (401/0). For line 1 of A, b, therefore, we have:

²³ D. B. Thompson, *Hesperia* 13, 1944, p. 206, speculated that it weighed a talent and a half, or slightly less.

²⁴ Of the two Nikai in *SEG* X, 215, the first had its θώραξ (torso) in the last ῥυμός (as restored by D. B. Thompson, *Hesperia* 13, 1944, p. 206), and the second was weighed from bottom to top in three groups; the Nike of *IG* I², 369, lines 2-6, which reappears in II², 1502, lines 5-10, was weighed in three or four groups, beginning with the legs and having the head in the middle.

²⁵ W. E. Thompson, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 19, 1966, p. 339, suggested that we have the artist's name in line 1.

[τάδε ἐκ τοῦ νεῶ τοῦ Ἑκατομπέδο παρέδομεν ἡ Νίκη ἥν
 Ἀρι]στ[ό]ψ[ι]κο[ς] ἐ[ποίησεν] ----²⁶----

W. S. Ferguson argued in 1932 that the emergency minting of gold ended before the Thirty gained power, as nowhere in the “copious record of their infamies” are they blamed for despoiling the temples.²⁶ We now see that they melted down two additional Nikai. Ferguson’s point still seems valid, however: melting down the property of Athena under the pressure of war was one thing, while using Athena’s gold to pay foreign mercenaries to guard the Acropolis was quite another. Could we explain the surprising lack of censure of the oligarchs by assuming that the restored democracy continued to mint gold?

In any case, when Athens surrendered in the spring of 404 she still had at least forty-five talents in gold (the chryselephantine statue and a minimum of three Nikai) worth about 540 talents in silver.²⁷

SEG XXI, 80 leaves many tantalizing questions unanswered, but some conclusions of historical importance can be drawn. The first is that the Thirty did not overthrow all the administrative machinery in Athens. We knew from *IG* II², 1370 that a board of tamiai had existed in 404/3; we see now that they fulfilled their duties, submitted detailed accounts to the usual audit, and had their records inscribed on the customary stele. We see also that the Thirty used a prytany system, at least for dating purposes. Secondly, the board of tamiai was reorganized into a ten-man committee, one member from each tribe, each of whom was secretary for one prytany. This reorganization may have been effected by the Thirty but it could have taken place earlier. Thirdly, two gold-plated Nikai were melted down in 404/3, a fact which has important implications for Athenian financial history before and after 404/3, as well as during the oligarchy.

PETER KRENTZ

YALE UNIVERSITY

²⁶ Ferguson, *op. cit.* (above, footnote 5), p. 95.

²⁷ The value of the two Nikai in SEG XXI, 80 should be added to W. E. Thompson’s calculations (504 silver talents) in *NumChron*, 7th ser., 10, 1970, p. 6.