

The Postscript of the First Attic Quota-List

Malcolm F. McGregor

IN RECENT years Professor W. K. Pritchett has devoted considerable attention to the *lapis primus* of the Attic quota-lists as reconstructed, restored and interpreted by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor.¹ His initial essay appeared in 1964;² he argues that evidence of anathyrosis and a “ridge” may be seen on the tops of fragments 1, 3 and 4, that the stele bore a large crowning member or finial, possibly a sculptured panel, that fifteen lists were inscribed in order on the stone, and that List 8 was cut on the reverse surface of the now missing finial.³ In his scheme our Lists 7 and 8 become Lists 6 and 7.

Pritchett returned to the subject in the following year in a study devoted primarily to “The Koan Fragment of the Monetary Decree.”⁴ The latest exposition of his views, however, was published in this journal.⁵ Here Pritchett reiterates his belief that the first stele was capped by a superimposed piece of marble, “possibly containing a sculptured panel,” weighing perhaps more than half a ton; “. . . aesthetically speaking, a sculptured block above might have added a

¹ *The Athenian Tribute Lists* I (Cambridge [Mass.] 1939); II, III (Princeton 1949–1950).

² “The Height of the *Lapis Primus*,” *Historia* 13 (1964) 129–34.

³ Pritchett of course denies that line 1 of the present List 9 is the prescript. He extends the list higher on the stone. For this problem see my discussion in *Phoenix* 16 (1962) 267–75 with the bibliography. In Pritchett’s investigation of the prescript of List 8 there is an error in the Greek (130); on 133 he puts Lists 8–13 on the obverse rather than the reverse.

⁴ *BCH* 89 (1965) 423–40, especially 437–9. Wade-Gery, *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 213 n.4, noting that the mason of List 9 began to cut well below the top of the stele and so left a substantial uninscribed surface, cited *IG* I² 304B as a parallel. “. . . we now recognize that this parallel, too, was false; see *BCH* 88 (1964), pp. 455–81” (Pritchett, 437 n.3). I make two observations: (1) Pritchett has misinterpreted the inscribing of *IG* I² 304B, as Meritt has proved in *TAPA* 95 (1964) 204–12, and the document remains a true parallel; (2) Pritchett’s own theory about a crowning member and an inscription on its reverse creates a parallel (which, I assume, he does not want) in the uninscribed area that would appear above List 14 on the left lateral surface.

⁵ “The Top of the *Lapis Primus*,” *GRBS* 7 (1966) 123–9.

great deal to the appearance”—although the monument is already some twelve feet high. He withdraws the term anathyrosis but he again urges that List 8 was inscribed on the reverse of the finial.⁶ Pritchett’s theories about the top of the *lapis primus* have already been refuted by Meritt.⁷ I have nothing to add to what I have already written concerning the prescript of List 9 and the missing list.⁸ What does concern me now is Pritchett’s attack on the readings of fragments 4 (*IG I² 197*, formerly thought to be the prescript of List 7) and 5 (*EM 6742a*), now recognized together as part of the postscript of List 1 on the right lateral surface, as published in *ATL I* and II.

I have a particular interest in fragment 5. In the summer of 1934 I went to Athens as the emissary of Allen West to read the quota-lists in preparation for what emerged as *ATL I*. My notebook shows the following entry, dictated by West: “*IG 1. 550, Rangabé 248. Does 197 go with 192? Does EM 6742a join top frag. of 197?*” In the Epigraphic Museum I met Wade-Gery, who had identical ideas. We worked together, removing the plaster from the vicinity of fragment 4. Under his direction my hands set fragment 5 in its proper home alongside fragment 4. This was the join that transformed our conception of the first two assessment-periods; it explained why *IG I² 197* (the supposed List 7) seemed so short, it revealed that List 1 had as a postscript a summation of the quotas, and it led inevitably to the conclusion that in one year no list had been inscribed (the missing list).

Fragments 4 and 5, in their new context, were not, and are not, easy to read. Wade-Gery’s version, in his publication of the discoveries of 1934 and their implications, was as follows:⁹

5 ε α . ε π ι ο ν : κ . . . ρ γ υ ρ ι ο : . . Χ Χ Η Η Η Δ Δ
10	. ρ υ σ ι ο σ υ μ ε ψ ρ ψ . ρ ε σ κ υ α η ε χ

⁶ On 127 he calls it the obverse.

⁷ “The Top of the First Tribute Stele,” *Hesperia* 35 (1966) 134–40 with plate 42.

⁸ “The Ninth Prescript of the Attic Quota-Lists,” *Phoenix* 16 (1962) 267–75.

⁹ *BSA* 33 (1935) 101–13 with plate 14. I number the lines as in *ATL I* and II, List 1.

“The reading of line 11 is very uncertain: the other readings of the original fragment are pretty sure. . . . I do not attempt to transcribe the very dubious letter before *πιον* in line 7.” The placement of fragment 5 facilitated the reading of fragment 4, which up to that time had been difficult.¹⁰ Wade-Gery at once concluded that we have here a summation, first of silver, then of gold, of List 1.

Meritt examined the fragments in Athens and published his text, with which Wade-Gery agreed, in 1937:¹¹

6 ε ρ υ ε
 ρ ι ο ν : κ
	. . α ρ γ υ ρ ι ο :
	. . Χ Χ Η Η Η Δ Δ
10	. ρ υ σ ι ο σ υ μ
	ε ν ο : κ . φ α
	ε σ κ υ
	α η ε χ

This is the text adopted in *ATL* I and II, with the significant dots of punctuation in line 11; the three authors were in full agreement and share responsibility for the text and restorations.

Pritchett asserts (I use his order of treatment) that (1) the circular letter in the sixth *stoichos* of line 11 is not a *phi* because “the original surface is preserved in the center of the deeply eroded area, and there can have been no vertical bisecting the letter”; (2) in the next *stoichos* nothing can be read, “the triangular depression at the very bottom . . . the basis for the *alpha* . . . is much too deep to afford any evidence”; (3) in the fourth *stoichos* of line 11 there is no suggestion of *nu* (Wade-Gery) or *kappa* (Meritt) and “κ[ε]φ[α][λαιον] must be regarded merely as a restoration and one that contradicts the traces”; (4) in the second *stoichos* (Pritchett misleadingly writes “third”) of line 11 “there is no suggestion of a *nu* . . . there are broken markings on the unweathered surface which might suggest any one of a number of letters, including a *nu*”; (5) he cannot see the *epsilon* read in the first *stoichos* of line 11, “unless the circular hole above but to the right of the *epsilon* in the line below is regarded as evidence”; (6) he is sceptical of the *chi* read in the fourth *stoichos* of line 13 because the alleged upper left-hand tip begins 0.068m. from the left edge whereas the corresponding distance for the

¹⁰ See, e.g., *SEG* V (1931) 7.

¹¹ *Documents on Athenian Tribute* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1937) 61–6, with drawings and restoration. West also had studied the squeezes.

chi in the fourth *stoichos* of line 9 is 0.064; (7) there is no trace of a cross-bar to the reported H in the eroded seventh *stoichos* of line 9 and “the sign for fifty drachmai might have eroded in the same way,” thus we cannot be sure what the numeral was; (8) the same applies to the fifth and sixth *stoichoi* of the same line. Pritchett’s conclusion is that “the reading κεφάλαιον in line 11 cannot stand, and there is sufficient doubt about some of the other letters and numerals . . . the text . . . the problem of the collection of 454/3 B.C. need restudy.” In a note he expresses misgivings about the recording of staters in words rather than in acrophonic numerals.

I consolidate these objections and examine them in their textual order.¹²

(1) LINE 9. The numerals HHH were read by Wade-Gery, by Meritt and by me, all from the stone, and have not been questioned until now. The surface of the marble where the chisel has cut is deeply eroded, though the surface is preserved between the sixth and seventh *stoichoi* and the seventh and eighth. The first two numerals may be easily identified within the erosion in the photographs in Wade-Gery and in *ATL I* fig. 7 (p.9). The second is not so obvious in Pritchett’s photograph. Still, this is the surest of all. No one doubts XX . . . ΔΔ and no one believes that a third *chi* was inscribed or that a *delta* preceded the two certain *deltas*; the middle one of the questionable trio must therefore be H. My squeezes leave no doubt whatever: on the first two numerals the cross-bars are quite clear, the four verticals actually stop at the proper level at the base of the *stoichoi*, and the right hasta of the first shows a clean join with the horizontal; this first symbol is affected comparatively little by erosion and is unmistakably H. The third figure is also H. The photograph in *ATL I* certainly fails to support a horizontal (I should hesitate to make this statement on the basis of Pritchett’s photograph). “The erosion begins much higher in the *stoichos* and takes the form of two deep valleys” (Pritchett, 129). Yes; but what Pritchett fails to notice is that the right-hand valley stops precisely at the foot of the *stoichos*, *i.e.*, where the chisel ceased to cut (my squeezes are striking confirmation); and that precisely at the top of the *stoichos* there is a significant break in the left-hand valley, *i.e.*, where the chisel ceased or began to cut. So we have two deep

¹² I use the photographs of *ATL I* as well as Pritchett’s, two squeezes of fragments 4 and 5 made in 1934, a squeeze of fragment 5 produced by my student Michael Walbank in 1965, and my notes written in Athens in 1934. The squeezes are good ones.

valleys, the right-hand one narrowing for about three-quarters of the *stoichos* as far as the foot. The symbol for fifty drachmai is thus out of the question. We now have XXHH.ΔΔ, *i.e.*, H is certain, whether or not the horizontal was cut. I must remark that, if we are to be disturbed by the absence of a cross-bar, we should be twice disturbed by the absence of two of them if we are to contemplate reading the symbol for fifty drachmai. My squeezes in fact hint that the horizontal was indeed cut, perhaps faintly. But I am willing to forego dogmatism until I see the stone again and in the meantime read H, undotted, with absolute confidence.¹³

(2) LINE 11. Of the first letter my squeezes reveal a horizontal, with a slight upward slope, along the base of the *stoichos*, *ca* 0.009m. in length at the bottom; this is about the same length as the middle horizontal of the *epsilon* in line 12 (but measurement is a hazardous undertaking). There also survives not much more than a suggestion of the right-hand end of a middle horizontal. Both traces are correctly located for *epsilon*, which Wade-Gery read in 1934. My squeezes leave me without confidence in Pritchett's "circular hole" and in his photograph. All epigraphists know that photographs can deceive; compare, *e.g.*, ATL I fig. 7 with Pritchett's plates 8 and 9. The squeeze, on the other hand, is not dependent on the vagaries of light and shadow and focus.

Of the letter in the second *stoichos* I identify on my squeezes most of the left-hand sloping hasta; the top perhaps disappears in erosion. A diagonal stroke, as in *nu*, is all but complete and the top at least of the right-hand stroke is present. The slopes are exactly right for *nu* (I use the undisputed *nu* of line 7 for comparison). The width of the letter is correct, the join of the diagonal and the right-hand hasta is appropriately high in the *stoichos*, and the right hasta is also characteristically high. Again, the photographs help little if at all.

I leap to the fourth *stoichos*, where I detect on my squeezes the bottom half of an upright on the left side of the letter-space and a diagonal running up to meet it at mid-point or perhaps a little higher (in the *stoichos*) from the lower right; that is, the traces fit *kappa*. But the erosion is severe and gives a distorted impression of the area where the join should take place.

¹³ I cannot overemphasise the evidence of the squeezes, which remove all doubt from the reading HHH; I do not dot any one of these numerals. I have been unsuccessful in persuading the camera to reproduce what the squeezes show so unequivocally.

A ruler connecting the horizontal of the first letter with the vertical of the fourth just about touches the left-hand stroke of the second.

I return to the third letter, study of which I postponed because the reader of stone or squeeze will be well advised to employ a straight-edge to locate the surviving traces of the chisel. Once the outlines of the *stoichos* have been identified, there is no difficulty in reading *omicron*. Just below and to the left (on the stone), a freak of weathering has left on the squeezes another circle, interlinked with the true *omicron*, which is high in the *stoichos*, not touching the base (compare the *omicron* of line 8).

We have now reached the sixth *stoichos*, where Wade-Gery read a dotted *rho* and Meritt a *phi*. My notes remind me that I had trouble with this letter and at different times in 1934 contemplated *pi*, *rho* and *omicron* (this was before any attempt to restore and interpret fragments 4 and 5).¹⁴ Pritchett concedes a circular letter. I find unconvincing his argument that the bisecting vertical cannot have been present when I view the faint verticals in the *phis* of *Στρεφσαῖοι*, *Γαλέφσιοι*, and *Φασελῖται* of List 1.¹⁵ The squeezes allow the top of a circular letter, no more. Epigraphically, I think, this letter is *omicron* or *phi*.

The “triangular depression” in the next *stoichos* is at the correct height for the top of a letter. It is slightly to the right of centre (as is the first *delta* of line 9). The erosion, to be sure, is deep; but in its outline it is nonetheless just what we should expect to find of the badly eroded apex of *alpha* or *gamma* or *delta*. Epigraphically, we are justified in reading any one, with a dot.¹⁶

With some hesitation I report that there is on the squeezes just a suspicion of the top of a vertical on the left side of the next *stoichos*. I suspend judgement until I see the stone.

(3) LINE 13. The fourth letter was read as a dotted *chi* by Wade-Gery, by me and by Meritt; in 1934 I noted that, epigraphically, the letter might be *upsilon*. What survives is the upper left-hand tip of a diagonal. Pritchett sees this but calls it a “small nick in the marble” and complains that it lies 0.004m. further to the right than the *chi* in the fourth

¹⁴ The top of a badly weathered circular letter (*rho*, *omicron*, *phi*) may easily be mistaken for *pi*. There is no doubt about the *rho* of line 7, which both Wade-Gery and I first read as *pi*.

¹⁵ Column 4, lines 14, 15, 24. See the photograph in *ATL I* p.8.

¹⁶ Pritchett’s photograph (plate 8) is of no value for this *stoichos*, as my squeezes prove; compare also the photograph in *ATL I*.

stoichos of line 9 above. It is far more than a nick; it is the tip of a diagonal, approximately parallel to the corresponding diagonal of *chi* above it in line 9. A straight-edge run down the *stoichoi* will demonstrate that the letters of this postscript are not perfectly spaced or centred. If we ignore the “nick,” we must assume that whatever letter was incised in this *stoichos* was inaccurately sited.¹⁷ I do not hesitate to read a dotted *chi* (epigraphically, a dotted *upsilon* is possible).

The length of line in this prescript has been established by Meritt as twenty letters¹⁸ and Wade-Gery and I agreed. In line 7 we must restore [ἀργύ]ριον. The genitive [τῶ] ἀργυρίου in the next line and the numerals in line 9 lead inexorably to the restoration of lines 6–9:

[χορὶς τό τε]
 [ἀργύ]ριον:κ[αὶ τὸ χρυσίον]
 [τῶ] ἀργυρίου: [κεφάλαιον ἔν]
 [. .]XXHHHΔΔ[.¹¹.]

Obviously, we have before us a summary of silver and gold. The total of silver begins in line 8. We now look for the total in gold and, not surprisingly, we find parts of the anticipated formula at once: [χ]ρυσίο συμ. To restore [χ]ρυσίο σύμ[παντος. . .⁵. . .] in line 10 is automatic. Since line 11 begins ενο: and we have εσκυ in line 12, then surely we can complete line 10 to give [χ]ρυσίο σύμ[παντος Κυζικ]ενῶ, followed by the punctuation (compare the similar punctuation in line 8: ἀργυρίου:[κεφάλαιον ἔν]). I am driven to believe that κεφάλαιον is now inevitable. We have the total in silver, here is the total in gold. The *kappa*, I think, is largely on the stone; we must therefore interpret the circular letter in the sixth *stoichos* as *phi* rather than *omicron* and the next letter as *alpha* rather than *gamma* or *delta*:

[χ]ρυσίο σύμ[παντος Κυζικ]
 ενῶ: κ[ε]φά[λαιον ἔν . . .⁶. . .]

If no trace whatever of κεφάλαιον survived, we should be compelled to restore the word.

What shall we say now of [. . .⁶. . .]εσκυ in lines 11–12? How can

¹⁷ The only possible letters that might not show some traces in the preserved surface are *alpha*, *gamma*, *delta* and *iota*.

¹⁸ DAT 61–2. Mathematically, twenty-one letters are possible, but we allow for symmetrical margins.

[στατῆρ]ες Κυ[ζικενοί] be avoided? We now expect the number of staters to be recorded. In *ATL I* we printed [στατῆρ]ες Κυ[ζικενοί]: *ἡεχσέκοντ*]α *ἡέχ*[ς] (lines 11–13); in *ATL II* we more cautiously left the first numeral vague, [...έκοντ]α, because [ένενέκοντ]α and [πεντέκοντ]α are possibilities. Pritchett's objection is that "according to the numerous examples of the word *stater* treated in Hiller's index to *IG I*², the Athenian rule was to record the whole numbers by acrophonic numerals."¹⁹ He ignores the final *alpha* of this word, which is on the stone at the beginning of line 13. True, only the right stroke is preserved, which could not possibly have anything to do with a figure for staters. It is *alpha* and, since a numeral is essential to record the number of staters of Kyzikene gold, it is part of a numeral expressed in a written word. The fact that in later inscriptions acrophonic numerals are employed is irrelevant. The tabular arrangement of the accounts of the Parthenon almost demands figures. Yet I see [στατ]ῆρας τέ[τταρας] in *IG I*² 69, line 21, and the Spartans used words in a list of contributions about 427 B.C.²⁰ How then can we conclude that the written word was contrary to "the Athenian rule" in 454/3?

The reading *ἡέχ*[ς] confirms what I have just written. Perhaps I should rather state that [...έκοντ]α and *ἡέχ*[ς] confirm each other, for I am not engaging in a circular argument. The stone listed 56 or 66 or 96 staters. In *ATL I* we then restored in line 13 [*ἡέκται τέτταρες*]; in *ATL II* we did not restore at all.

The changes advocated by Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor in the restorations of the amounts in lines 12 and 13, plus the adjustment of [ϜX] at the beginning of line 9 to [ϜΤ], have been interpreted by Pritchett (*loc.cit.*) to cast doubt upon "the whole matter of the totals for the quota." This is unfair. In *ATL III* we published our independent investigation of the assessment and collection of tribute in 454/3 B.C. The results convinced us that our restoration in *ATL I* of line 9 of the postscript produced too low a total. In other words, in *ATL II* we changed [ϜX] to [ϜΤ] in the light of new knowledge.²¹ That [ϜΤ] gave as the total (roughly) what we now thought was in fact realised by the Athenians in 453 merely indicated that our interpretation of the

¹⁹ GRBS 7 (1966) 129 n.21.

²⁰ M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*³ (Oxford 1946) no. 62.

²¹ See *ATL III*, esp. 6 and 266, for the justification.

nature of the postscript had always been right. We changed no readings of the stone.

In connexion with our restoration of [𐀓T] at the beginning of line 9 a colleague has questioned whether we should, in 454/3 B.C., expect to find the talent (T) as a unit of computation rather than ten thousand drachmai (M). The first known use of T, he points out, is in the accounts of the Samian War of 441/0 (*IG I² 293*), whereas before this time the symbol M prevails (*e.g.*, *IG I² 339–353*, the accounts of the Parthenon, from 447/6 B.C.). If we were to be moved by these doubts, then we should require more than two letter-spaces to restore, using the symbol M as a unit, an amount that would yield a satisfactory quota. This, in turn, would destroy the present restoration in line 8: [κεφάλαιον ἔν]. It would also, if we ignore the physical evidence for the moment, cast suspicion upon the same clause in line 11.

In my search of *IG I²* for confirmation of the objection here cited, I came across no. 186/7, a stele from Attic Ikaria bearing financial accounts on its obverse face (A). The entries inscribed in lines 11–20 are recorded in talents and the symbol T is employed. These lines, according to Hiller, show the three-barred *sigma* and sloping *nu* and should be dated about 450 B.C.

Apart from this parallel, if parallel it is (I have not examined the document), there is more to be said in answer to my colleague's query. The tribute-records deal with talents, not with tens of thousands. The prescript of List 1 (454/3 B.C.) tells us that the quota was determined at the rate of a mina on the talent: *μνᾶ ἀ[πὸ τοῦ ταλάντου]*. The restoration is supported by the prescript of List 34: *μνᾶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ταλάν[του]*. I do not see how it can be shaken. The assessment of Aristides amounted to 460 talents (Thucydides 1.96.2). The most convincing evidence, however, which comes as close to proof as may be, is that the cities were assessed in talents or multiples or convenient fractions of talents, as is overwhelmingly demonstrated by the "Index to Amounts of Tribute" in *ATL II* pp.122–124. Only two cities in fact were assessed at 10,000 drachmai. Observe, on the other hand, how popular were the sums of 500 drachmai, 1,000 drachmai, 1,500 drachmai, 2,000 drachmai, 3,000 drachmai, 4,000 drachmai, 1 talent, 1 talent 3,000 drachmai, 2 talents, etc.

I have already shown how the restorations in lines 8–13 of the postscript evolved; I emphasise the extent to which lines 8 and 11 support each other. I print here the complete text, adjusting the allocation of

dots in accordance with this restudy of the two fragments:

- [Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡεὶ]⁶
 [. . . . ἐγραμμάτευε: ἐλογί]
 [σαντο ἡοὶ τριάκοντα λογ]
 [ισταὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τῷ φόρ]
 5 [ο ἡοπόσαι τῆι θεοὶ ἀπὸ τῷ]
 [μ πόλ]εον ἔ[σαν: χορὶς τό τε]
 [ἀργύ]ριον: κ[αὶ τὸ χρυσίον]
 [τῷ] ἀργυρίο: [κεφάλαιον ἐν]
 [ϜΤ]ΧΧΗΗΗΔΔ[.]¹¹
 10 [χ]ρυσίό σύμ[παντος Κυζικ]
 ενδ: κ[ε]φά[λαιον ἐν στατῆρ]
 ες Κυ[ζικενοὶ: . . . ἐκοντ]
 α ἡἐχ[s -----]

The exact restoration of the first five and a half lines of the postscript is comparatively unimportant; the version in *ATL* I and II is printed *exempli gratia*. The rest of it is very important indeed. This is why I have taken the trouble to make as careful a reexamination as I can. Students will want to see the fragments for themselves; I advise them also to prepare squeezes and read them alongside the stone. In the meantime, I assure historians that they will not go far wrong if they depend on the text of the postscript of List 1 as they find it in *ATL* II.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

December, 1966