

A FRAGMENT OF A GREEK INVENTORY

(PLATE 31)

AMONG THE UNPUBLISHED GREEK INSCRIPTIONS in the David M. Robinson Collection of the University Museums at the University of Mississippi is a fragment of an inventory.¹ Professor Robinson left no indication of where he had obtained the fragment or where it was found.²

The gray marble fragment is broken on all sides. The inscribed surface indicates a modern mechanical cleaning.

Height, 0.13 m.; width, 0.10 m.; thickness, 0.065 m.

Height of letters, 0.003–0.006 m.

University Museums Inv. No. 77.3.681

saec. III *a.*

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. *ca.* 12–18

[– *ca.* 4 –] ΠΙΩΝΔΚ[– – – –]
 [*ca.* 2] ΟΣΔΔΙ | | .νννν
 [ἐ]σχαρίς οὐχ ὑ–^ν
 [γ]ιῆς ὀγκή ΠΔΔΔ.^ν
 5 ἐσχαρίδια διαπε–
 πτωκότα καὶ φιά–
 λια | ὀγκή ΠΔΔΔ·
 φιάλη πρὸς τῶι τοίχῳ[ι]
 [ῆ]ν ἀνέθηκεν Σαλα–
 10 [μ]ινοκλής *vacat* 6–7
 [– *ca.* 3 – τ]άδε προσπα[ρέ]–
 [δοσ]αν ἐσχαρίδ[ια]
 [– *ca.* 5 –] Μ[.]ΙΟ[– – – –]

Line 1. The fifth letter may be alpha rather than delta. The crossbars on alphas are so low that they can be mistaken for deltas if the sense is not apparent.

Line 2. The stonecutter began to cut a third delta but apparently realized he had made a mistake and went on to the next numeral leaving only the top of the unneeded delta visible just beside the top of the next vertical stroke.

Line 10. Only the top of the dotted iota is visible. The upper third of the right hasta and the tip of the left hasta of the dotted nu are visible above a break.

¹ I wish to thank Professor Lucy Turnbull and Mrs. Jill Thomas-Clark of the University Museums for permission to publish this inscription and for their help in this endeavor. I also thank Professor Kevin Clinton of Cornell University for his advice and help in establishing the text of the inscription. Thanks are also owed to Mr. Christopher Moss for help with the research.

² A thorough search of the Robinson papers, including correspondence with various American and European dealers, has failed to discover any reference to inscriptions. That Robinson himself was unsure of the provenience of some of the inscriptions in his collection is indicated by his comments in print (cf. *AJP* 58, 1937, p. 38 and *Hesperia* 13, 1944, p. 19).

Line 12. Only the left slanting stroke of the dotted delta is preserved.

Line 13. The upper peaks of the mu are preserved on the edge of the break. The top half of the dotted iota survives.

The line length varies from 12 to 18 letters as indicated by the well-preserved lines 4 to 9. The fact that the lines are so short seems to indicate that this fragment comes from the inscribed side of a stele.³

The date of the inscription is determined in part by the use of the word *ὄλκῆ* instead of the standard 5th- and 4th-century Attic *σταθμός*. The term *ὄλκῆ* was not used in inscriptions until the 3rd century B.C.⁴

The most obvious clue to the identification of the fragment is the name Salaminokles in lines 9–10. On the basis of the reference to a *phiale* dedicated by Salaminokles, it might be assumed that this fragment comes from the Eleusinian treasure lists. A Salaminokles who dedicated a *phiale* is known from 5th-century Eleusinian inventories.⁵ There is, however, reason to question the assumption that the *phiale* in the Mississippi fragment is the same *phiale* as that in the Eleusinian lists. First, the *phiale* in the Eleusinian lists is described as “silver with a gold boss” (*ἀργυρᾶ χρυσόμφαλος*). The *phiale* in 77.3.681 is only described as “near the wall” (line 8). Moreover, the other objects inventoried on this list do not coincide with those on the Eleusinian lists. Likewise, the other items on the Eleusinian lists do not appear on 77.3.681. Finally, no known Eleusinian list uses the word *ὄλκῆ*.

The name Salaminokles is rare. The only other reference to a Salaminokles aside from the one who dedicated the silver *phiale* with the gold boss mentioned above is to an *epistates* in the Parthenon building accounts for the year 446/5 B.C.⁶ It may be that this was the same Salaminokles who gave the *phiale* in the Eleusinian lists. The possibility exists that the same Salaminokles or a descendant dedicated the *phiale* listed in the Mississippi fragment, although one cannot say more than that.

Efforts to find reference to exactly the same items mentioned in our list among other known Greek inventories have proved unsuccessful. The closest parallels are to be found in the 3rd-century B.C. lists of sacred objects in the Tabulae Hieropoeorum from Delos.⁷ The letter style used in the Mississippi fragment is similar to that found in 3rd-century B.C. Delian inventories and differs from that of the later Delian lists.⁸ One finds in those lists references to several of the same items mentioned on the Mississippi fragment and several

³ Compare *IG XI 2*, 161C and D; 199C and D; 203C and D.

⁴ One exception to this observation is *SIG*³, no. 247, col. II, line 5, an inscription recording the accounts of the *ναοποιοί* at Delphi dated 342/1 B.C., which uses the Doric form *ὄλκᾶ*.

⁵ *IG I*³, 385, line 2; 386, line 66; 387, line 73; 389, line 21.

⁶ *IG I*³, 437, line 36.

⁷ *IG XI 2*, 135–289, see esp. nos. 128, 161, 162, 199, 203, and 205. For a commentary on the accounts of the hieropoioi and the history of Delos from the 5th to the 3rd centuries B.C. see W. A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos*, Oxford 1933, pp. 77–90 (esp. pp. 80–85), 94–161.

⁸ The letter style of the Mississippi fragment can be compared to that of *IG XI 2*, 205 (see tabula IV) dated 267 B.C. and differs markedly from the 2nd-century lists from Delos which have distinctive alphas (Α) and serifs, see *IG XI 3*, 372, 400 (tabula III–IV). The accounts of the hieropoioi of Delos dated after 200 B.C. often use abbreviations for the weights of objects instead of the full form *ὄλκῆ* found on our fragment; see F. Durrbach, *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1929–1935, nos. 380, 385, 396, 399, 1400–1432.

parallels in formulas used. The Delian objects included ἐσχαρίδες,⁹ φιάλια,¹⁰ and a large number of φιάλαι.¹¹ Some of the *phialai* are distinguished by the use of the phrase found in 77.3.681, ἦν ἀνέθηκεν δεῖνα.¹² Likewise one finds parallel uses of the participle διαπεπτωκότα¹³ and of the descriptive phrase πρὸς τῶι τοίχῳ¹⁴ in specifying the location of objects inventoried. Finally, the Delian lists consistently use ὀλκή in describing the weight of objects. There is, however, no description exactly parallel to the objects on the Mississippi fragment nor is there any reference to a Salaminokles in the Delian lists.

The only Attic inventory inscriptions which might offer parallels to 77.3.681 are the catalogues of gifts to the Asklepieion in Athens wherein one finds references to φιάλια and φιάλαι and the use of the descriptive phrase πρὸς τῶι τοίχῳ and of the term ὀλκή.¹⁵ These lists date from 343/2 to the end of the 3rd century B.C.; only those in the 3rd century, however, use the word ὀλκή instead of σταθμός. Again there are no exact parallels to the items listed on the Mississippi fragment, nor is there any mention of a Salaminokles. The parallels are fewer, and it seems less likely that this fragment could be attributed to the Asklepieion lists.

In conclusion, the Mississippi fragment is best associated with the accounts of the hieropoioi of Delos in the 3rd century B.C.

ROBERT A. MOYSEY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI
Department of Classics
University, MS 38677

⁹ *IG XI 2*, 186, line 5; 194, line 4; 199B, line 16; and 201B, line 5. The word ἐσχάραι occurs in *IG XI 2*, 161B, line 124, cf. lines 128–129.

¹⁰ *IG XI 2*, 161B, lines 27, 30; 186, line 6; 199B, lines 6, 9; 202, line 12; 203, lines 47, 86; 205A, lines 18, 31; 208, line 17.

¹¹ *IG XI 2*, 122–128, 132, 137, 145, 155, 161B, 162B, 181, 184–185, 187–190, 194, 196–197, 199, 202–203, 205.

¹² E.g. *IG XI 2*, 128, lines 55–56.

¹³ *IG XI 2*, 161C, lines 58–59.

¹⁴ *IG XI 2*, 161B, line 96.

¹⁵ *IG II²*, 1533, lines 9–10, 54; 1534, lines 22–200; 1537; 1538, line 7.



University Museums (University of Mississippi) Inv. No. 77.3.681

ROBERT A. MOYSEY: A FRAGMENT OF A GREEK INSCRIPTION