A Fresh Look at the Kallias Decrees

A Decade Ago Lisa Kallet-Marx boldly challenged the accepted dating of the two decrees attributed to a certain Kallias. She proposed putting them in different conciliar years, having shown convincingly that Eupeithes was not also the epistates of decree B and having thrown considerable doubt on the reading [K]ολλίας for its orator. Daux and Pritchett indeed were willing to read no more than ΑΛΕΙ on the stone. Kallet-Marx would allow ΙΑΣΕΙ and a possible dotted lambda before the first iota, without seeing that this would undermine her main position. Attic names ending in -lias, apart from Kallias, are extremely rare. Only twelve are listed in Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II: Athens, none of which have more than two secure Attic entries. Bilias may not even be Attic and Thalias is known only ca A.D. 140. They can all reasonably be discounted for the fifth century B.C. If ΑΙΑΣ can be read, Kallias is the orator and we are in the same conciliar year for A and B. Second terms on Council are virtually unknown in the fifth century; indeed I can cite only Peisandros in 422/421 and 415/414. Kallet-Marx can escape from this dilemma, however, by joining Daux and Pritchett in their agnosticism. She would date decree A in 431/430, shortly after Pericles' survey of Athens' financial resources. B must belong to a Panathenaic year and she originally offered a wide range of dates—430/429, 426/425, 422/421, and 418/417. Recently she has settled

on the last of these. Internal evidence, though, suggests that B followed fairly closely on A, which arranged for the Treasurers of the Other Gods to share the Opisthodomos with Athena's treasurers: B.21-25 assigned the left side of the Opisthodomos to them. Kallet-Marx once saw the force of this and similar arguments. But is 430/429 a possible dating for B, as she then thought? It is hard to believe that Athens imposed drastic restrictions on spending from Athena's funds so early in the war.

But do we have to put A and B back in 434/433? I still find several serious objections to this. One concerns the Opisthodomos. There is only one certain payment from the Opisthodomos in the Archidamian War, namely in the first disbursement of 425/424. We may be meant to assume that all later payments from Athena's funds came from the Opisthodomos, though it is not specified. But why was this note not added with the first payment of 426/425, when it could have served for the whole quadrennium covered by the accounts of the Logistai?

Scholars have been tempted to introduce it into two other passages of IG I3. Two standard works, Meiggs and Lewis and IG I, have not accepted it in line 29f, where it hardly matters even if correct. Its introduction in line 58f—the first payment from the Other Gods in 423/422—is altogether more serious. It has been accepted in both standard works and thus given more currency. If the Treasurers of the Other Gods were already operating in the Opisthodomos in 423/422, then the arrangements of IG I3.13-18 were already in force and that virtually imposes the 434/433 dating. The supplement, however, is far from certain and there are surely valid alternatives to [---τές πρυτανείας ἔχει ὁ Οἰσθδόμος Ἀρτέμις Ἀγροτέρας---]. Before Meritt and Lang proposed it without argument in 1965, Meritt had thought of [τές πρυτανείας

---

4 Cf. a.115–18 carefully with a.21–25. This point was well taken by G. L. Cawkwell, Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War (London 1997) 107–10.
5 Kallet-Marx 112 n.84: 'If the decrees are in fact related in content to the extent that the sum of money in decree A voted for payment ... was the amount specified in decree B (line 22), then the latter should not perhaps be much later than decree A: 430 in that case is a likely date.' For the much discussed adeia vote in a.15–19 see infra.
6 See ML 212 no. 72; IG I 369, p.342, where the supplement is noted only in the apparatus criticus.
7 This thought probably ensured ready acceptance of the supplement.
But in line 30 we find just δοδεκάτει τές πρωτατείας and this shorter form of the date is found in lines 33, 39, 41f, 44f, and 79.8 Another solution may perhaps be discovered by deeper probing. The accepted supplement in line 55f is rather clumsy and I underline the offending phrase: [τάδε παρέδοσαν ὦ[οι ταμία] τὸν ἄλλον θεὸν Γόργιο]νος Ο[ἰνείδο ἵκαριες καὶ χυσύναρχοντες ἐκ τὸν ἐκάστῳ χρημάτων ἐπὶ Ἀμενίῳ ἄρχοντος στρατηγοῖς]. It does not correspond satisfactorily with the parallel passage as supplied in line 77f, where I again underline the crucial elements: [δὲν] ἐρ¬[ον δόσιν παρέδοσαν] ὦ οἱ ταμίαι τὸν ἄλλον θεὸν Γόργιονος Οἰνείδο ἵκαριες καὶ χυσύναρχοντες καθ' ἐκάστον θεόν] ἀπὸ τὸν χρημάτων. I propose instead [---καὶ χυσύναρχοντες ἀπὸ τὸν ἑρὸν χρημάτων τοῦ ἐκάστον θεόν ᾧ ἐπὶ τό [δος ᾧ ἀγρ[οτερας]-].9 The only sure early epigraphic reference to the Opisthodomos apart from IG 13 369.19f. is in the fragmentary decree IG 13 207, which has there the wide dating bracket 440–420. This can surely be narrowed. In line 10 we find the ‘modern’ middle/passive imperative form ἐνεχέσθον[v]. The earliest dated examples of this are in the Halieis Treaty and the second Methone decree, both inscribed in 424/423. The safe dating for IG 13 207 would seem to be the later 420s. It gives no support to the view that the Opisthodomos was already available for banking funds in 434/433.10

The evidence on the adeia vote required by IG 13 52 B.15–19 is also awkward on the traditional Kallias dating. It is missing from the accounts of 433/432, where one would expect it, as between 76 and 166 talents were spent from Athena’s funds on Corcyra.11 There seems to be no room for it either in the accounts of 432/431, though Meritt once followed Kolbe in inserting in

8 See M. Lang, “The Abacus and the Calendar, II” Hesperia 34 (1965) 232 n.7, 234, 236 (new text); B. Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century (Ann Arbor 1932) 131f, 140.

9 For ἐρὸν χρήματα of the Other Gods see IG 13 52 L.29f. καθ’ ἐκαστον θεόν may have been inadvertently omitted by the mason before ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑρὸν χρημάτων in line 53 and inserted in line 59 at the end, where it fits equally well.

10 On the imperatives see Mattingly 157f; IG 13 75.26 (ἔκπαρσόθος), 61.38 (ἔσπεσόθος). IG 13 157 (ἔσπεσόθος, line 14) was dated ca 425 by Meritt (“Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century,” Hesperia 14 [1945] 97f) because of the close similarity of its lettering to the Halieis treaty.

11 See IG 13 364: the totals in lines 12f, 23 are incomplete.
the first payment φασθεισαιμένο τῷ δέμο. This conjecture is not even recorded in IG I³. No comparable supplement has been suggested elsewhere this year. The adeia vote in fact is first recorded for certain in the second payment of 418/417, though there is room for it in the sixty-letter lacuna of the first. If its appearance is slightly erratic, it continues to be noted down to the first payment of 415/414. Kallias' strict rules may have been modified by this period.

Boards of Treasurers of the Other Gods certainly existed in 430/429, 429/428, and 423/422. Were these the same as Kallias' board? This numbered ten, one from each tribe, chosen by lot as Athena's treasureres. Such boards are found from 421/420 onwards. In IG I³ 383 of 429/428 only five treasurers seem to be listed with their secretaries. Boards of ten are sometimes listed incompletely, but never with less than seven members. Moreover, though the tribal order may be disturbed, traces of it remain. Thus in 442/441 eight treasurers of Athena were recorded, only six with demotics: the order is III, VII, VIII, IX, X, I. In 420/419 nine treasurers of the Other Gods were listed in the order VII, I, IV, V, VI, III, X, II, IX (IG I 472.13f). At this point I must reproduce the text of IG I³ 383.1–11 (stoich. 27):

12 See W. Kolbe, "Ein chronologischer Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des peloponnesischen Krieges," Hermes 34 (1899) 390f; Meritt (supra n.8) 80 and Pl. I.

13 See IG I³ 370.15 for the second payment. In line 6 τὸς πρωτανείας φασθεισαιμένο τῷ δέμο τὸν ἄδειαν ἀπὸ τῶν τριεράρχων ἑκατοντάρτες "Ἀργο would exactly fill the gap. The fourth payment, being from Samos (line 181 with IG I 2, p.962), would not require adeia. The third (line 16f) may have been below a new limit, substantially raised since Kallias. For further adeia records see IG 370.28 and 33 (417/416), and 63f (415/414). West wanted to restore the adeia phrase in line 48 (416/415), but the other payments this year seem to lack it. Was adeia waived for the Sicilian expedition? It was this late evidence for the adeia vote that persuaded Kallet-Marx (supra n.3: 112 n.84) to favour 418/417 for IG I³ 528 and there is much force in this view, though her own date is demonstrably too low.

14 IG I³ 52.10–15; 472.9–19

15 This is generally assumed. Boards are almost always listed with their secretaries: 473.7–10 is an isolated exception. The pattern of 383.1–9 (names of tamiai + secretary vacalt τῷ δὲ παρεδόθη[οςαν - -] would neatly parallel 472.2–5 (epistatai + secretary vacalt τῷ ἐξαντο τῶν ἐργασίων - -) and 474.1–5 (epistatai + secretary vacalt τῷ δὲ ἄνεγκρατον ἐργα τὸ νεότερον).

16 See IG I³ 457.12–20. In line 15 only Κ[-ς-] is preserved, but Κ[ολεώς] of VIII is surely preferable to Κ[έττιος] of IV.
Though only the tribes of the second and third tamiai are known, R. Develin has boldly argued that the five men were listed in tribal order—IX, X, I, II, III.\textsuperscript{17} but his arguments are flawed. His tribe for the first tamias depends on my hazardous guess 'Antiphefôn Paimôstîos. Thucydides asserts that Antiphon, whom he clearly knew, played no part in Athenian public life, preferring to work behind the scenes until the crisis of 411. So he would appear a very unlikely treasurer in 429/428.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, 'Antiphefôn Phreârptîos and 'Antimakhos Ermêiîos are equally possible supplements. The first, father of a Councillor of \textit{ca} 420, may still have been active a decade earlier. Antimachos was \textit{parhedoros} or \textit{hellenotamias} in 416/415. Tribe IV or V might be open for the first treasurer.\textsuperscript{19} Alternatively he might be a complete unknown like Alkiphron Anaphlystios, with a demotic and tribe beyond conjecture.\textsuperscript{20} Develin’s tentative suggestion for the fourth treasurer was K[alîbûs Gargêtîos]. A family from Gargettos (Aigeis) is known from 254/253 on, which alternated the names Thrasippos and Kallias. But, though an isolated Thrasippos Gargettios is known from \textit{ca} 445, no man from the deme with the very common name Kallias is recorded before the first half of the third century. So Kallias Gargettios must be rejected for the treasurer.\textsuperscript{21} Could Develin find


\textsuperscript{18} Mattingly 225; Thuc.8.68.1.

\textsuperscript{19} Antiphon Phrearrhios see \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 1040.19; Antimachos: \textit{IG I} 370.53, 55, 57 with W. E. Thompson, “The Regional Distribution of the Athenian Pentakosiomemnon,” \textit{Klio} 52 (1970) 442 with n.2.

\textsuperscript{20} There are only four entries in \textit{LGPN} II for Alkiphon.

\textsuperscript{21} For the Gargettios family see \textit{LGPN} II s.v. Kalîbûs nos. 127–30; for the earlier Thrasippos see \textit{IG I} 3 433.31.
another man from Gargettos, with a seven-letter name beginning with *kappa*? At first it looks hopeful. There are no less than seventy-one such names! But the great majority are very rare, ranging from one to four *LGPN* II entries. They can surely be ignored. Kratios (9), Kephalos (8), Kritias (7), and Kydenor (6) can also be discounted—they make little showing in the fifth century and have no links with Gargettos or Aigeis.22 The least uncommon names are Ktesias (38), Kointos (18), and Kleophon (17). Kointos is known only from the second century B.C. onwards. Only one man called Kleophon (no. 1) comes from the fifth century apart from the demagogue from Acharnai: indeed it is possible that the *kalos ca* 440-430 may be the demagogue in his youth. It is also conceivable that the name Kleophon was invented by his father Kleippides, as Eurymedon was devised for the general of 427/426, Paralos for Perikles’ son and Pasiphon for the secretary of 413/412.23 Two men called Ktesias come from the very early fifth century (nos. 2-3). Three (nos. 4-6) seem to belong to the period *ca* 445-425—an official cited in the Eleusinian *epistatai* decree of *ca* 432, the proposer of a decree for the Eteokarpathians and a litigious politician attacked by Aristophanes in 426/425. They could all be the same man. There is also a war-casualty of *ca* 411 from Antiochis, who may be from another family.24 More interesting is a Ktesias Euagidou Philaiades of *ca* 346/345. The family stemma can be reasonably established:

22 Kleitos (8) and Kelados (6) are confined to the Roman Imperial period. The family of the oligarch Kritios accounts for the sixth/fifth-century occurrences of the name, except for Kritaias Aphidnaios of 423/421 (no. 4). There is a Kritios a war-casualty of *ca* 450 (*IG* 13 1146.32) and Kratios Alopekethen, whose son was voted against at an *ostrakophoria* of the 480s. The fifth-century Kydenor—father of a Council secretary *ca* 390 (*IG* 13 49)—was also from Alopeke. Kephalos seems to appear only in the fourth century.

23 For Kleophon *kalos* see Beazley, *ARV* 2 1144 no. 7 and 1590 (Kleophon Painter); for the evidence for the other three names see *LGPN* II.

We might well supply a Ktesias Philaiades as the missing grandfather of the Ktesias of ca 346/345. He may then with some plausibility be identified with the proposer of IG I1 1454. The prytany was either Oineis or Aigeis, to which the demotic Philaiadai belongs. Now it was not unusual for the proposer of a decree to belong to the prytany in office. Thoudippos of Arraphen proposed a short decree in the prytany of Aigeis in 425/424 and in the same year probably Leon of Antiochis proposed the Hermione Treaty in the Antiochis prytany. Peisandros Acharneus honoured Lykon of Achaia in the Oineis prytany of 422/421 and Kleosophos and his fellow-prytanies honoured the Samians in 405/404. Finally Kleonymos, so active in the prytanies of Hippothontis and Kekropis in 426/425, was very possibly from the latter tribe. If Ktesias no. 5 from LGPN II is Philaiades, there is really no room for a Ktesias Gargettios in the fifth century. Tribe III then seems virtually ruled out for the fourth tamias. With a demotic ending in -tios there is anyway a wide field open. The choice is effectively between demes in IV, V (2) and VII. For the fifth tamias there is no possible control on demotic or tribe. The demotics are Kettios, Sphettios and Prosopaltios, Sypalettios. Anaphystios, already taken by the second tamias, can be discounted.
juxtaposition of tribes X and I is no more remarkable than the juxtaposition of V and IV in a board of ca 410 and of V and VI in the *epistatai* for the Hephaisteion statues in 421/420, neither chosen on a tribal basis. The *tamiai* of 429/428 look more like a non-tribal, elected group of five than a truncated tribal board of ten. Fifth-century Athens had a great liking for five-man elective boards—the *epistatai* for seven of building works ca 445, the *epistatai* for Eleusis and the Propylaia, the *archontes* for Miletos and the *oikistai* for the Kolophonians are good, varied examples of this. A disputed passage of *IG I 3* 52A (18–22) suggests that the five-man board of 383 does indeed belong with these. The basic structure is παρὰ τὸν νῦν ταμίαν—παράδεξσάθον ὅτι ταμίαι ὅτι λαχώντες. The board to be appointed by lot seems here contrasted with the current *tamiai* of a somewhat different type. This is how Beloch and Wade-Gery took the passage, and I do not think that their view has been effectively demolished, though Wade-Gery later gave it up.

I shall end with the problem of the Golden Nikai, of which at least three were to be completed under *IG I 3* 52B.2ff. We may assume as a starting-point that there were no more than eight Nikai in the fifth century, seven of which were melted down in the crisis of 407/406. From the 360s on we find διερείσματα τῶν Νίκων Ἰ Ἡ Ἐκκλησίας registered in the Chalkotheke and in *IG I 3* 468.28 (a Nike record) we have the cryptic reference [ά]πο τὸ διερείσματος. Each Nike evidently had an armature (*dieresis-ma*) round which its various parts were assembled and the seven armatures were presumably kept in the Chalkotheke in the fourth century in the pious hope that the statues themselves might some time be restored. Methods of weighing the parts of the Nikai suggest that *IG I 3* 467—often associated by scholars with *IG I 3* 52B—should in fact be placed between 468 (426/425) and 469/470 (ca 410–). I can now improve on my earlier case

28 See *IG I 3* 469.26ff with A. M. Woodward, *ArchEph* 100 (1937) 162 (seven *epistatai*); 472.2ff.
29 *IG I 3* 433.23–28; 462–65; 21.4; 37.20–23, 42.
The main points to note are these: (1) In 468 three objects (drapery, right and left leg: 17f and 22-25) are weighed on their own; in the other lists items are always weighed in groups. (2) The ‘appendix’ on the diereisma (468.28) comes between the first and second Nike: in 467 and 469/470 each new Nike seems to come immediately after the total weight of its predecessor. There are no such postscripts in the other records. (3) In 468.19 probably and in 467.8 the two arms+hands are weighed together; in 469.23 (=470.7) and 30–32 the arms are weighed separately and once the left hand is weighed apart from the arm (469.25=470.9). (4) In 468 skelos includes the foot. This is proved by the weights, to be plausibly restored as XHHHΔΔΔΔ+ (lines 22–26). Thompson (supra n.31: 185) estimated a leg at 1200 drachmas and a foot at 250 drachmas. In 467.5f and 469.31, 34, feet are weighed separately: note the emphatic phrase in 470.6. (5) In 468.26 π[-8-] may represent π[ροσπον · ], possibly weighed on its own. In 467.8f we have the sequence [π]ρόσ[ο]πον, χερε, h[ο]μος, θυπο[δερις]. In 469.24f this is echoed by πρόσπον, ορμος, h υπ[οδερις] and in Π2 1388.17 (=469.30) by [κ]εφαλη, στρεφανη, ἐνοιδι[α], ορμος, υποδερις.

Cumulatively this evidence is impressive. It is backed up by epigraphy. IG 1.3 467 was cut by the mason responsible for IG Π 77, 78 (Athens copy), 80, 82, 89, and 172, whose work belongs to the late 420s and the early 410s. 172 is probably his last surviving work. The spelling h[αυτον] in line 5 is otherwise found only in 73.43 (424/423), 122.10 (ca 413–405), 113.32 (ca 410), and 181 bis (ca 410–403). Walbank did not recognise 467 as this mason’s work, but my Plate I, showing 467 and 80 at actual size

---

32 See IG 1.3 467.2f; 469.26–29, 33. In 470.5f there seems to be room for some kind of postscript: this is clearer in Woodward’s text (supra n.28: 163), which IG 1.3 basically follows. But close comparison of 470.6–10 with 469.22–26 (the same Nike) shows that 470 should be restored as stōichedon ca 64, not ca 75 as 469. Moreover, the weight of the first Nike (470.5) should be read probably as TTHHH[-13-?] rather than TTHH [...]. The gap between the two Nikai records virtually disappears with these adjustments.

33 Thompson (supra n.31) 183ff.

34 Thompson (supra n.31: 193) showed conclusively that κεφαλη was fourth-century usage for πρόσομον. In 468.26 we are offered π[δεδυο; ...], but this is impossible, since skelos here is leg-foot.

35 See M. B. Walbank, Athenian Proxenies (Toronto 1978) 51, 309f (no. 57).
(letters at 10 mm.), surely reveals the same three-chisel hand following the same strict rules.\textsuperscript{36}

\textit{IG I\textsuperscript{3} 52 B.2f}, as we have seen, ordered the completion of at least three Nikai. If it must still be dated 434/433, then we have a disturbing picture of the fifth-century Nikai:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
434/433 & Nikai A B C \\
426/425 & Nikai D E (468) \\
ca 420 & Nikai F G (467) \\
ca 410 & Nikai H I J K (469/470)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The embarrassing total is eleven. Even if we assume that H and I are identical with two earlier Nikai, we are still left with nine—not eight.\textsuperscript{37} We can only escape, I think, by abandoning the 434/433 Kallias dating for the alternative 422/421. Then the Nikai of 467 can be two of his ordering. We thus obtain this pattern:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
426/425 & Nikai A B \\
422/421 & Nikai C D E F \\
ca 410 & Nikai G H
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Nikai were twice dedicated in pairs (468, 469.26–39), so we may conjecture that Kallias arranged for the completion of two pairs. C and D will be the pair represented by 467 as it survives. E and F are listed in 470.1–10 and F reappears in 469.22–26. There are exactly eight Nikai on this scheme.\textsuperscript{38}

I have reserved for two Appendices some more detailed evidence supporting my late dating of \textit{IG I\textsuperscript{3} 52 A–B}, but hope to have shown already that the balance of probability favours 422/421 and that Wade-Gery was wrong to abandon his own advocacy of that date.\textsuperscript{39}

\textit{Cambridge}

\textit{December, 1998}

\textsuperscript{36} For the rules see Mattingly 235, 303 n.87 (correction).

\textsuperscript{37} Neither H nor I can be the first Nike in 467, which weighed exactly two talents. H weighed 2 T 200/300 drachmas and I under 2 T (470.5, 10). The groups in I are quite differently arranged than in the second Nike of 467.

\textsuperscript{38} In the fourth century admittedly only one Nike was dedicated in 374/373 (\textit{IG} \textsuperscript{2} 1421+1423, 1424). But it would form a pair with the sole survivor from the fifth century (\textit{IG} \textsuperscript{2} 1388).

\textsuperscript{39} For this see \textit{JHS} 51 (1931) 57–85; 53 (1933) 135 (withdrawal).
Appendix I
Spelling Criteria for IG P 52 Α-Β

Wade-Gery long ago argued (supra n.30: 64, 78-82) that the change in feminine dative plurals from -αςι, -εςι to -αις began in the 420s and was complete about 418: the Kallias decrees have -αςι in b.21 and -αις in a.6, 18, and 29. In ZPE 83 (1990) 120 Table C (=Mattingly 514f) I updated his evidence. The case seems stronger now.

I would now add two other telling epigraphic criteria, which have been neglected in this debate. The first case involves non-assimilation and assimilation of final μυ before initial λάμβα, on which L. Threatte (Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I [Berlin 1980] 633f) comments:

έν assimilated to ἐλ is well attested in the fifth and fourth centuries ... The article is occasionally assimilated before λ ... But usually the article is not assimilated before λ in the fifth century ... The only other case of assimilation of ν to λ is in δλ λέγομαι Π 28.6 (387/6), decree ... δλ was certainly normal ... Only ἐν before λ....

My Table A resumes the evidence on the article.

TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-assimilated</th>
<th>Assimilated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>434/3 317.1</td>
<td>τὸν λόγον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434/3 292.2</td>
<td>τὸν [λόγον - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430/29 321.29</td>
<td>[- - -]δλ λόγον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426/5 300.1</td>
<td>τὸν λόγον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421/0 82.32</td>
<td>[- - -]λανπαδ[εδρο- μίαν - -]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421-415 472.149f</td>
<td>τὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409/8 474.190, 249</td>
<td>τὸν λείαν ἐρ[γασίαν]: τὸν λιθον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409/8 475.214</td>
<td>[- - τὸν λιθον: τὸν λιθον]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? 52A.9, 28</td>
<td>τὸν λογιστόν: τὸν λόγον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second case involves non-assimilation and assimilation of final ν—apart from ἐν, ἐν and the definite article—before γ, κ and χ. Threatte notes (629f) that “Assimilation is least common in these cases ... Fifth century instances are rare ... In this century [the fourth], especially during the first half, these assimilations are at their greatest frequency.” Table B shows the main evidence.
### TABLE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-assimilation</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ca 430/29</strong></td>
<td><strong>1454A.5ff</strong> Καρπάθιον κα[ι]: [κοινο]γ γράφαι</td>
<td><strong>A.6 τῶν Καρπάθιον</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1454B.48</strong> στήλην κατα[- -]</td>
<td><strong>A.18 [- -δοι δὲ] νῦγ καθελήφασιν</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422/1</td>
<td><strong>91.8f</strong> [- -ἐν τοίς προσθέν]ν χρόνο[οι - -]</td>
<td><strong>92.10f πρόξενου καὶ: αὐτὸν καὶ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420–415</td>
<td><strong>172.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>[- -]οῦτο κα[- -] Ιεροῦ χρεμάτων</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td><strong>312.52:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>313.72</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410/9</td>
<td><strong>375.23f</strong> [Δ]αλπέκδεθεν καὶ</td>
<td><strong>2 λ]εροῦ χρεμάτων</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408?</td>
<td><strong>118.7, 44</strong> [- -]κατάλογον κατ[- -]</td>
<td><strong>21 πλῆ γῆς</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407/6</td>
<td><strong>123.4</strong> [- -άφθ δικαί] Κα[ρχέ- δόνοι]</td>
<td><strong>10 [- - Αννίβα]Υ Γέσκον [ος - -]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405/4</td>
<td><strong>127.8, 15</strong> τοίς νῦν καὶ: τόν ἄλλων κοινῆ</td>
<td><strong>19 [Ε]ὰν δὲ τὶ ἀναγ- καιὸ γίγνεται</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403/2</td>
<td><strong>Π 2b.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>389</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52B.15, 26</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from one isolated outlier each table shows a concentration of assimilation ca 410: in B there is an earlier nucleus of examples ca 420. This all squares with dating Kallias 422/421. However, as the Eteokarpathian decree (*IG* Π 1454) has been dated *ca* 440 and that might seem to favour 434/433 for Kallias, I devote a second appendix to defense of my dating.

## Appendix II

The Eteokarpathians and Athens

Jameson’s claim that *IG* Π 1454 should be moved from the early fourth century to the later fifth has been fully corroborated by rediscovery of the squeezes (see *IG* Π 2, pp.899, 902). In 434/433 the Eteokarpathians opted to join the Athenian Empire on favourable terms and were enrolled under the rubric πόλες αὐταί φόρον ταχ- σάμεναί. In 1454.5–13 the *koινον* is thanked for a generous gift to Athens, recognised as a benefactor and assured of its autonomy. By spring 427, however, the situation has changed. They have lost their special status and are enrolled in the Ionic panel, like any subject ally (*IG* Ι Π 283 col.III.1). Now, in ‘List 25’ and ‘List 26’ they are missing.
from the rubric corresponding to the pre-war πόλες αὐτοῖ (281 col. III.54–58, 282 col. II.34–42). In IG I3 these lists are still dated 430/429 and 429/428. But I hope to have shown (Mattingly 525) conclusively that the lists must be dated 426/425 and 427/426. I have one more point to add to this case. In 282 col. IV.9f Brykos Karpathou pays both for the current and the previous year. In 283 col. II.26–32 and col. III.1–35 Brykos is missing from the Ionic panel, which admittedly has some gaps. But all Brykos’ neighbours survive on it—the Eteokarpathians, Arkesseia, Karpathos, Saros, and Kasos. On balance it would be an economy of hypotheses to assume that Brykos defaulted in 428/427 and paid up the following year.

Between 434/433 and 429/428 then we can be fairly sure that the Eteokarpathians remained autonomous and that the decree may fall in this period. The secretary Teisias should be the general Teisimachou Kephalethen of 417/416, on whom Davies (supra n.25: 501f) must surely be mistaken: he can hardly be the man who features in Lys. 12 as a friend of Alkibiades and Councillor under the Thirty. How long a gap should be postulated between Teisias’ post as secretary and his generalship? I tabulate the fifth-century evidence and mark with ‘S’ those men known to have been secretary and not just members of Council. In brackets after each name I note the number of the relevant LGPN entries.

**TABLE C: Careers of Generals ca 444–405**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIPPONIKOS KALLIOU ALOPEKETHEN (13) S</td>
<td>444/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHESTRATOS LYKOMEDOU (5f) S</td>
<td>442/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAGENES KOILEUS (4, 8) S</td>
<td>434/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KALLIAS KALLIADOU (27f)</td>
<td>433/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KALLISTRATOS EMPEDO OETHEN (5, 94) S</td>
<td>429/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYSIKLES (5, -)</td>
<td>429/8?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAROIADES EUPHILETOU (1f) S</td>
<td>430/29:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>428/7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLEON KLEAINETOU KYDATHENAIEUS (43)</td>
<td>428/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALKIBIADES KLEINIOU SKAMBONIDES (23)</td>
<td>422/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASIPHON PHREARRHIOS (3) S</td>
<td>413/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gap is certainly variable. The longest known is of eighteen years (Hipponikos). Now Hipponikos was born ca 480—his son Kallias was in his thirties in 421/420—and, in view of his wealth and power, he was surely not made to wait till his mid-fifties for the generalship. We should assume a first generalship in the 430s. Only 439/438 and 433/432 are ruled out, when other men from Antiochis held the post (IG I3 48.46, 364.20f). If we discount Hipponikos, the gaps range from one to eleven years. Set at thirteen years Teisias’ gap must be very near the limit.
The Eteokarpathians' gift was a cypress tree for the temple of Athena, queen of Athens (1454.5–12). Was this for the doors of the Parthenon? In *IG* I³ 461 we seem to have fragmentary accounts for this work, specifying cypress in line 35 and elm in 33 (woods much used for Greek temple doors: *Theophr. Hist. Pl.* 5.4.2 with 3.14.1, 5.3.5). Were the doors completed by 438, when the image of Athena was installed? Certainly they were in place in the three main chambers of the Parthenon by 434/433, when the treasures stored in them began to be published in annual inventories. But what of the western hall? W. Kolbe plausibly identified this as the Opisthodomos (*Phil. Woch.* 51 [1931] 72–84) and, though others have thought of the western part of the old Polias temple or a building between the Parthenon and the later Chalkotheke, I find Kolbe's view still most attractive: certainly the name did come to be applied to the western part of the Parthenon in later days. The Opisthodomos definitely had doors (*IG* I³ 52A.16ff), not just metal grilles. I submit that in 431, when the Athenians decided to create an iron reserve of 1,000 talents and keep it apart from the other funds (Thuc. 2.24.1), they proceeded to get the west chamber of the Parthenon ready for this purpose. By 430, when the Eteokarpathians' gift arrived, the Opisthodomos could duly receive its doors. Subsequently Athens decided to bring the rest of Athena's funds into the Opisthodomos and by early 425/424 money was first withdrawn from this location for the war.
(a) IG I3 467 (detail)

(b) IG I3 80 (detail)