

The Kallias Decrees Again

Donald W. Bradeen

SEVERAL YEARS AGO B. D. Meritt, speaking of the date of the Kallias decrees,¹ wrote “it would be tedious to restate in full the case for 434/3.”² One must certainly agree with him,³ and I have no intention of trying to do that here. Yet the appearance within the past year of two articles purporting to offer new evidence or interpretations supporting later dates seems to demand a response.⁴ Unfortunately such a response as this must be, in a way, negative, devoted to exposing fallacies in the arguments which might appeal to the unwary. For the positive case has been stated over and over again, and there are really no valid new arguments, either *pro* or *con*.⁵

The only new observation I can make, new at least to the modern discussion, is that both decrees were inscribed by the same hand. This was noted by Kirchhoff⁶ but has not been accepted since Wade-Gery wrote that “the handwritings on the two sides, though not unlike, can be distinguished.”⁷ In commenting upon the letter-forms he says:

¹ IG I² 91/92=B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* [ATL] II (Princeton 1949) D 1 and D 2.

² GRBS 8 (1967) 130.

³ This is especially true in view of the reasoned commentary which has recently appeared in R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* [GHI] (Oxford 1969) 154–61 (no.58).

⁴ (1) C. W. Fornara, “The Date of the Callias Decrees,” GRBS 11 (1970) 185–96. The original version of the present article was read at a meeting of ancient historians in Buffalo on 8 May 1970 as a commentary on Mr Fornara’s; both have since been changed extensively. (2) H. B. Mattingly, “‘Epigraphically the Twenties are too Late,’” BSA 65 (1970) 147–49.

⁵ The classic statements of the orthodox position are E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* II (Halle 1899) 88–118; W. Kolbe, *Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden* (Stuttgart 1930) 50–77; A. B. West, “The Two Callias Decrees,” AJA 38 (1934) 390–407; Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, ATL III 320, 326–32. The major attempts to support a later date are K. J. Beloch, *RhM* 43 (1888) 113–22, and *Griechische Geschichte*² II 2 (Strassburg 1916) 344–56; Wade-Gery, “The Financial Decrees of Kallias,” JHS 51 (1931) 57–85 (repudiated by the author, JHS 53 [1933] 135); Mattingly, “The Financial Decrees of Kallias,” *ProcAfrCA* 7 (1964) 35–55, and “Athenian Finance in the Peloponnesian War,” BCH 92 (1968) 450–85.

⁶ IG I 32: *Ambo latera eadem manu, ut patet vel obiter inspicienti, inscripta sunt elegantissime.*

⁷ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 58; cf. GHI 155.

“The most distinctive letters are Y and N with flattish diagonals, on the undamaged side; and P with a small eye, on the damaged.” However, a close examination of all the letter-forms in both inscriptions reveals that all the distinctive letters, *sigma*, *mu*, *lambda*, *phi*, *rho*, the uneven yet small *omicrons* and *thetas*, and, above all, the very distinctive *upsilon* and *nu*, are the same on both sides. There are variations, *e.g.*, in the size of the loop of the *rho*, but they occur on both sides. I think that anyone who carefully examines squeezes or photographs side by side will agree.⁸ This fact does not contribute much to the argument except to make it certain that the two decrees were inscribed at the same time as well as passed on the same day,⁹ something that must be taken into account in analyzing the decrees.¹⁰ There is, however, one further observation to be made about the hand. The mason who cut these decrees is almost certainly the same man who inscribed the funeral epigrams on the public monument for the men who fell at Poteidaia in 432.¹¹ Although the letters on that base are larger than those in the Kallias decrees (0.015 m. *versus* 0.01 m.), the distinctive forms, especially of *upsilon* and *nu*, are the same. One could hardly claim that this proves the early date for the latter, but it certainly supports it.

In one of the two recent challenges to the orthodox date, Fornara bases his case on two presuppositions, of which the first, a new line of attack, is summed up in his statement: “Simply put, 434/3 is too early for what its proponents understand, and necessarily so, as the reason behind the enactment of these decrees.”¹² He goes on to define this reason as the decision to bring in and concentrate on the Akropolis the treasures of the Other Gods from the shrines throughout the countryside, and he insists that such a decision would have meant that the Athenians had already decided upon war and a strategy of not opposing Spartan invasions. Now of course the second of these propositions does not necessarily follow from the first, nor has anyone ever claimed that the Athenians had decided upon war and its strategy early in 433. All that has been said is that they thought a war was coming, and that on the basis of the best authority, Thucydides, who gives

⁸ There are very good photographs in Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) plates II–III.

⁹ See Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 59.

¹⁰ See *infra* pp. 472–73.

¹¹ IG I² 945. For a photograph see *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 21.

¹² *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 186.

as the first reason for the alliance with Kerkyra, *ἔδοκει γὰρ ὁ πρὸς Πελοποννησίους πόλεμος καὶ ὡς ἔσεσθαι αὐτοῖς* (1.44.2). Yet Fornara will not accept even this explicit statement, but dismisses it in a footnote, stating: "It may be noted that this is a retrospective judgement of Thucydides, who considered the crisis a 'cause' of the War. It stands to reason that the Athenians did not at the time recognize it as such" (p.188 n.15). He then claims, in effect, that to accept the statement "is to ignore Thucydides" (p.188) and "stultifies Thucydides' entire exposition by retrojecting a psychology resulting from his 'causes' to the time before they developed" (p.189). I cannot follow the reasoning here; apparently to avoid a charge of "ignoring" and "stultifying" Thucydides one must completely ignore his most explicit remark on the subject.

But such arguments are irrelevant to the refutation of Fornara's main thesis. That falls because its basic premise is false, *i.e.*, because in fact the proponents of the orthodox dating do *not* claim that the removal of the treasures to the Akropolis was the reason for the decrees. In the three most detailed expositions of that position, those of Meyer, Kolbe and West,¹³ no arguments on this basis are presented. Fornara rests his case on quotations from only two of the defenders of orthodoxy, and these are taken out of context. That from Meiggs and Lewis is not part of the argumentation for the date but rather a comment on the text after the date has been determined by other means.¹⁴ The other quotation is from the *ATL*, whose editors do not argue the date but do give what they consider to have been the reason for the decrees. Their statement on this is actually in the first part of the sentence of which the last half is quoted by Fornara; it reads as follows: "They [the financial decrees of Kallias] came at the time they did because a fresh financial settlement was required with the expiration of the 15 years (449/8–435/4) which the Papyrus Decree (D 13) had envisaged."¹⁵ This is certainly a far cry from a claim that centralization of the treasures was the reason for the decrees. In fact, it is in basic

¹³ See *supra* n.5.

¹⁴ See *GHI* 158; the sentence preceding that quoted by Fornara reads: "The decrees of Kallias confirm Thucydides' judgement that when Athens made her defensive alliance with Corcyra the people had already been convinced that war with the Peloponnese was imminent." I cannot agree with Meiggs and Lewis that D 1 "shows that the decision had already been taken" and that "the treasures of the other gods have only just been centralized." D 1 seems to me to set up the machinery for this centralization; see *infra*, p.472.

¹⁵ *ATL* III 320.

agreement with Fornara's own explanation of the reason for the enactment: "The precondition of the decree, the reason for its enactment: a decision to pay back money owed to the Other Gods, since 3,000 talents have been paid to Athena. The connection of the clauses of Decree A makes it clear that a prior financial decision, and that alone explains this decree."¹⁶ Although Fornara presents this conclusion as if it were a discovery of his own, it has long been recognized.¹⁷ West perhaps best sums up the orthodox position when he says: "Our analysis shows that psephisma A was an act for the repayment of money to the 'other gods' and for the establishment (or reorganization) of a unified board of treasurers to care for this money, together with the money, bullion, and dedications of gold and silver which the 'other gods' then possessed or might later acquire."¹⁸

Thus disappears Fornara's objection to 434/3 based upon the alleged reason for it given by its supporters. The debate in 433 would not have been, as he claims, over whether all the treasures should be brought for safety to the Akropolis because war and invasion were imminent, but rather over how to care for the money to be repaid the Other Gods: Would it not be better to keep it safely together on the Akropolis under a unified board of treasurers? And once such a board is created, would it not be better if they also cared for the other gold and silver of the Gods, at least such as they could bring in to the Akropolis with the sanction of divine law? Incidentally, this last condition, τὰ τῶν θεῶν χρέματα ἡόσα δυνατὸν καὶ ὄσιον, looks very much like an "escape clause."¹⁹ One can imagine how many arguments it could have engendered, and one wonders just how much of the gold and silver actually was brought to the Akropolis before the war began.

But there is more to be said about the reasons for the decrees, for we must remember that there are two of them, not just one. Fornara does not discuss side B (D 2), dismissing it in a footnote (p.191 n.20) as

¹⁶ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 192–93. That the editors of *ATL* believe that part of the decision (*i.e.*, giving Athena 3,000 talents) was taken 15 years before, while Fornara is thinking of repayment of loans, is irrelevant here. Both give as the motive "a prior financial decision."

¹⁷ See Fornara, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 192: "it is a different reason from what we might expect from a perusal of the literature on the subject"; 193: "A different picture from the traditional one therefore emerges." But see, besides the statement from the *ATL* quoted in the text above, Meyer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 107, and West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 393.

¹⁸ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 393.

¹⁹ Fornara's translation (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.4] 192), "and let these fulfill their office as treasurers of the monies of the Gods on the Acropolis in the Opisthodomos as divine law sanctions," obscures the fact that the clause beginning with ἡόσα modifies and limits χρέματα.

“too mutilated to be of value and the restorations have naturally been influenced by the assumed date.” But we do have two decrees, proposed by the same orator, passed on the same day, inscribed upon the same stone; anyone seriously searching for the reasons behind them must face the question of why there were *two* decrees, not just one. The answer seems clear; despite the fact that they were closely related because both dealt with financial reorganization, they were separate because they dealt with separate finances. D 1 clearly concerns the treasures and treasurers of the Other Gods. D 2 just as clearly concerns the treasures and treasurers of Athena.²⁰ The latter may be mutilated, but not to the extent that the general sense is not clear. Most of the supplements are certain. Enough of the text is preserved so that it is incumbent upon one who wishes to challenge or ignore the restorations to present acceptable alternative readings.²¹ There are such alternatives for the opening lines of the decree, but these affect details, not the general sense.²² From what is preserved we can see that in the first section (lines 3–5) provision is made that certain projects, which involve the golden Nikai and the Propylaea, are to be completed as previously voted. I do not see how anyone can deny that Athena’s money is involved here. Next (lines 5–12), certain new projects on the Akropolis are to be undertaken, at an expense of ten talents per year. That this money is Athena’s is made clear by the opening words of the

²⁰ This, of course, has been noted before; see West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 394–400; Meritt, “Note on the Decrees of Kallias,” *AJP* 55 (1934) 269–73; Kolbe, “Kalliasdekrete und ‘Sinking Fund’,” *SBBerl* 1933, 160.

²¹ Fornara, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 193, speaking of the Athenians having either 1200 or 200 talents to pay to the Other Gods, says: “Both figures are capable of being restored. The former has been rejected because it is incompatible with the orthodox date.” He is referring to lines 21–22 of D 2, which are normally restored [ἐπειδὴν δ’ ἀπὸ] τ[ὸ]ν διακοσίον τα[λάντο]ν ἢ ἐκ ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[εφίετο ---]. Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 68, said of this: “The figure 200 is not indeed absolutely certain: for though the current supplements are most felicitous, we must allow the formal possibility that χίλιον stood before διακοσίον and the figure is therefore 1200, not 200. It would, however, be difficult to complete the sentence with this figure: I think we may safely disregard it.” Nevertheless Mattingly, *ProcAfrCA* 7 (1964) 41, following this hint, suggested restoring [μεχ|ρὶ τὸν χιλ]ί[ο]ν διακοσίον τα[λάντο]ν ἢ ἐκ ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[εφίετο ---]. This must be the possibility of which Fornara speaks. However, although χίλιον διακοσίον may be good modern Greek, it is hardly acceptable for the fifth century B.C.; at least all examples I can find of numbers composed of two parts have them joined by καί, and the smaller number is always first. In other words, it is the *nu*, on the stone, which causes 1200 to be rejected.

²² See the text in *GHI* 156–57. It does not matter for the point at issue what is to be done to the Propylaea or whether the Akropolis is to be fortified, built upon or landscaped. In any event, it is Athena’s money that will pay.

next section, which begins with [τοῖς δ]ὲ ἄλλοις χρῆμα[σιν τοῖς] τῆς Ἀθηναίας. Lines 12–19 place stringent restrictions on the use of Athena’s funds, with the exception of the previously mentioned projects. Next we learn that the Treasurers of Athena are to receive certain monies from the Hellenotamiai, some apparently owed to the Other Gods. When this is paid, Athena’s money is to be kept on the right side of the Opisthodomos, the Other Gods’ on the left. That these last instructions are given to the Treasurers of Athena is clear, for they are mentioned in line 21 and, although there are possible alternatives in the restoration of lines 19–21,²³ there is *no* room there to restore a reference to the Treasurers of the Other Gods.

Thus it becomes clear that the unifying theme in D 2 down to line 25 is Athena’s treasures and treasurers. In line 26 there begins a new section instructing present treasurers to weigh and count that sacred treasure (gold, silver, plated and other) which is unweighed and uncounted. The text is broken at this point, but there can be no reasonable doubt but that these provisions were followed by instructions to publish the results on stone.²⁴ The presumption from the subject matter of the decree that the treasures and treasurers involved here are Athena’s is confirmed by the fact that the weighing and counting is to be done with the help of τῶν τε[ττάρου]ν ἀρχῶν και ἐδίδο[σαν τὸν λόγ]ον τὸν ἐκ Πα]ραθηναίων ἐς Παν[αθῆνα]ια. These must be the four previous boards of Athena’s treasurers, for in D 1, lines 27–29, instructions are given that the Treasurers of the Other Gods, yet to be elected, are to render their accounts in this way καθάπερ ἡοὶ τὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίας τ[α]μιεύοντες.²⁵ So we have here a provision that the present Treasurers of Athena are, with the help of their predecessors, to weigh and count the unweighed and uncounted sacred treasures.

²³ Lines 19–23 have often been interpreted as setting up a special reserve in the Opisthodomos under the control of the Treasurers of Athena (cf. W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1932] 154–55), and Mattingly maintains that they provide for the repayment of loans from Athena (*ProcAfrCA* 7 [1964] 41–44; *BCH* 92 [1968] 460 n.1). Although Meritt, I believe, has proved that the lines should be restored to designate repayment of the debts to the Other Gods (*op.cit.* [supra n.20] 269–73), supplements supporting the other views are epigraphically possible. This makes no difference for the present argument, because in any case the instructions are given to Athena’s treasurers.

²⁴ Cf. D 1, lines 20–25.

²⁵ Wade-Gery’s attempt (*op.cit.* [supra n.5] 65) to maintain that Treasurers of the Other Gods are included in these instructions is vitiated by a failure to discuss these references to the four previous boards. Even Fornara’s assumption that the board of Treasurers of the Other Gods established by Kallias was preceded by one exactly like it hardly explains this reference in D 1; see *infra*, pp. 475–78.

It so happens that we have preserved inventories, by weight and count, and beginning precisely in 434/3, of Athena's treasures in the Pronaos, Hekatompedon and Parthenon.²⁶ Wade-Gery tried to deny a connection between these inventories and the instructions in D 2.²⁷ His argument is, basically, that "*these Inventories list a portion of C [sacred ornaments and vessels] only*" (his italics). But this is just what one would expect as a result of these instructions.²⁸ What would be unweighed and uncounted would be the dedications in the newly opened temple, plus odds and ends of plated, bronze, ivory and wooden paraphernalia and dedications. These latter show up in the inventories of the Parthenon, which seems to have been a sort of store-room. All items in the Pronaos and Hekatompedon are gold and silver, undoubtedly dedications, the number of which increases rapidly over the years. Wade-Gery also stated his belief that the date the inventories began depended "not upon Kallias' arrangements, but upon the date of the opening of the Parthenon for regular use." The two reasons are not mutually exclusive, however; rather, Kallias made these arrangements because of the recent opening of the Parthenon. This is another reason for the new definition and regulation of the duties of the Treasurers of Athena in this decree. I have stressed this connection of the inventories with D 2, even though it has been used before in the argument, because I believe that a proper understanding of it is close to formal proof of the orthodox date.

The second presupposition in Fornara's argumentation is a belief that the reference to the 3,000 talents for Athena (D 1, lines 3–4) is, in effect, the overriding piece of evidence to be used in dating the decree. Of this he says: ". . . one of the few unambiguous references in the decrees is to the 3,000 talents paid Athena (A, line 3), something which on its face is impossible in 434."²⁹ On the basis of this judgement he is ready to reject the normal reading and interpretation of D 1, namely, that it establishes the board of Treasurers of the Other Gods. This is,

²⁶ IG I² 232–88. That the inventories definitely began in 433 is shown by the opisthographic arrangement of the stelai; see W. Thompson, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966) 286–90.

²⁷ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 76–77.

²⁸ These inventories are quite different from that of the Treasurers of the Other Gods authorized by D 1, lines 20–27 (IG I² 310). Cf. West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 397–98: "Scholars who believe that the provisions of paragraph *f* applied also to the treasurers of the 'other gods' should compare the *traditiones* of Athena with the one inventory of the 'other gods' which has been preserved."

²⁹ *op.cit.* [*supra* n.4) 191.

of course, one of the strongest arguments for the orthodox date, since we have an inventory of these treasurers (*IG I² 310*) closely resembling that ordered by D 1, definitely dated to 429/8, and referring to a board for the previous year. I think that no one would deny that the establishment of the board is the normal reading of the decree;³⁰ the position of the advocates of later dates has been that such an interpretation is not absolutely required by the text, which could be taken as ordering a reorganization of an existing board. They stress two points. The first is that *οἱ νῦν ταμίαι* in D 1, line 18, who appear among the officials who are to hand over the Gods' property to the new board and help them count it, could be taken as existing Treasurers of the Other Gods rather than as treasurers in local shrines or the Treasurers of Athena.³¹ But such an interpretation raises further difficulties, for these *tamiai* do not appear among the officials who are to present vouchers for repayment of the debts to the Other Gods, something hardly explicable at a later date when we know that over 800 talents in loans and interest were owed the Other Gods from borrowings during the Archidamian War.³² Recognition of this problem has led defenders of a later date to posit that the repayments to the Other Gods directed by Kallias were not those we have duly recorded in the accounts of the *logistai* but rather those of unauthorized or unrecorded loans and losses.³³ This is obviously a counsel of despair; if Treasurers of the Other Gods had been in existence they obviously would have had some of the vouchers mentioned in line 11.

The second point stressed by the advocates of a "reorganization" is that only five Treasurers of the Other Gods are listed in their inven-

³⁰ Kolbe's point (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.5] 53) that D 1, line 13, would have read *τὸς δὲ ταμίαις* rather than *ταμίαις δέ* had there been Treasurers of the Other Gods in existence at the time is a strong argument although not quite conclusive.

³¹ Cf. Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 65–66; Mattingly, *BCH* 92 (1968) 458–60; Meritt, *GRBS* 8 (1962) 130; *GHI* 161. I find most convincing the case for interpreting these treasurers as those of Athena; see West, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 399–400. W. Thompson, *ClMed* 28 (1969) 220–21, has pointed out that previous to 434/3 the Treasurers of Athena were sometimes called *ταμίαι ἐκ πόλεος* and had control of some of the treasures of the Other Gods.

³² See *GHI* 214 for a tabulation of debts from the accounts of the *logistai*, *IG I² 324+*.

³³ Wade-Gery, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 68–69; Mattingly, *ProcAfrCA* 7 (1964) 42–43. Fornara seems to have missed the point here. On p.194 n.25 he calls "unjustified" Wade-Gery's belief "that the debt in question cannot be the one recorded by the Logistae" and concludes that the demand for vouchers "suggests nothing about the provenience of the creditors or the size of the debt." But of course it does; if the *tamiai* had lent the money, they would have had the vouchers to present for cancellation.

tory for 429/8 (*IG I² 310*, lines 91–94).³⁴ Although it has been pointed out that this was a year of the plague, which could account for the reduced number, and that elsewhere fewer than ten names are listed for boards we know were supposed to have had ten members,³⁵ yet the existence of only five names here made possible a claim that Kallias was increasing a board of five to one of ten constituted like the Treasurers of Athena.³⁶ Beloch made his case stronger by arguing that there were only five on the boards for 421/0, 420/19 and 418/7 as well, citing as evidence *IG I 318*, a fragment of the accounts of the *epistatai* of the statutes of Athena and Hephaistos which lists the Treasurers of the Other Gods for those years. As the text was known then, this was a plausible interpretation. But in 1922 a new fragment of this inscription was published, and it proved that ten members of the board were listed in 421/0 and 418/7, nine in 420/19.³⁷ This new evidence was accepted as showing that any reorganization which might have taken place occurred before 421, and therefore the proponents of a later date have since suggested 422/1.³⁸ As far as I know Fornara alone³⁹ has refused to accept the explicit evidence of *IG I² 370* that by 421 the Treasurers of the Other Gods were already constituted like those of Athena,⁴⁰ which is precisely what is provided for in D 1. He is no

³⁴ Mattingly's suggestion (*BCH 92* [1968] 458–59) that there may have been seven names if that of the secretary were omitted is epigraphically possible but, as Thompson says (*op. cit.* [*supra* n.31] 220 n.16), "too remote to consider." Mattingly has now changed his mind again on this; see *BSA 65* (1970) 149 n.142.

³⁵ Cf. Thompson, *op. cit.* (*supra* n.31) 220.

³⁶ Beloch, *GrGesch² II.2.347–48*; Wade-Gery, *op. cit.* (*supra* n.5) 66–67; Mattingly, *ProcAfrCA 7* (1964) 41. For Mattingly's latest approach to this problem see *infra* pp.479–82.

³⁷ See *IG I² 370*, lines 7–17.

³⁸ Cf. Wade-Gery, *op. cit.* (*supra* n.5) 64; Mattingly, *ProcAfrCA 7* (1964) 35 n.4. When Fornara appeals to the authority of Boeckh, Beloch, Wade-Gery and Mattingly (p.191 n.20), this does not help his case for 418, since all of them were thinking of a change in the board from five to ten.

³⁹ At least in print. Beloch seems to have reacted to Kolbe's criticisms by claiming that he was not convinced and that his case still stood; see the quote from his letter in Kolbe, *op. cit.* (*supra* n.5) 68. But this is very general, and I cannot find any published rebuttal.

⁴⁰ This is shown by the fact that there are no duplications of tribal affiliation within any of the three boards. The order of listing tribal representatives was, in 421/0: v, vii, i, ?, iii, ?, vi, viii, ix, x; in 420/19: vii, i, iv, v, vi, iii, x, ii, ix; in 418/7: viii, ?, ii, iii, iv, v, ?, ?, ix, x. It would be perverse indeed to deny that the missing tribes in 421/0 were ii and iv, in 418/7, i, vi and vii. Kolbe once admitted (*op. cit.* [*supra* n.5] 56 n.1) the possibility of a duplication in 420/19 when he listed the order as vii, i, [ii or iv], v, vi, iii, x, [vii or ii], ix. However, ii is not a possibility in the third place; Lewis, *BSA 50* (1955) 12–16, has shown that the demotic *Κολωνῆθεν* is not connected with Aigeis (ii). The confusion of order in the tribal listings can

longer positing a “reorganization,” as his predecessors were, but rather is claiming that the detailed instructions in D 1 were given merely to replace one board with another just like it in duties, composition and method of election.⁴¹ This seems incredible, especially in view of the comparison of the new board with the Treasurers of Athena (lines 14, 28), not with any predecessors. Yet this is the result one arrives at if one accepts the premise that the reference to the 3,000 talents is “unambiguous” and that the payment of it “on its face is impossible in 434.”

But is the reference to the 3,000 talents unambiguous? It has at least generated some controversy, primarily because nothing is said about its being the repayment of debts, but merely that it has been carried up to the Akropolis.⁴² This phraseology is in sharp contrast to the clear references to repayment to the Other Gods⁴³ and has led to the claim that this money was a free-will offering to the goddess.⁴⁴ This cannot be proved, since the wording is sometimes used for money being repaid.⁴⁵ The phrase is actually a neutral one, but within these decrees the contrast with the terminology used for repayment to the Other Gods does imply a difference. One can hardly, then, call the reference “unambiguous.”

Nor is the reference “on its face impossible in 434.” In fact, there are too many possibilities, since we are told only that the money “has been carried up.” The use of the perfect tense here (*ἀνεπένεγκται*) certainly allows, in fact implies, that the process had continued over a period of time.⁴⁶ So we have the possibilities that the decision to pay

be paralleled in lists of the Treasurers of Athena; in SEG X 261 (IG I³ 358) they occur III, VII, VIII, IX, X, I, ?, ?.

⁴¹ See *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 194 n.26: “That a regular college, such as that set up by Callias’ proposal, already preceded it is comprehensible.” The only answer to this is to ask that each student read carefully the instructions in D 1, lines 13–30. It was difficult enough to construe these as a reconstruction of the board; a mere continuance seems to me impossible.

⁴² D 1, line 4: *ἀνεπένεγκται ἐς πόλιν*; see also D 2, line 13.

⁴³ D 1, lines 2–3: *ἀποδοῖναι ἰσοῖς θεοῖς [τ]ὰ χρήματα τὰ ὀφελόμενα*; 5–6: *ἀποδιδόναι . . . ἀπόδοσιν*; 8: *τὰ ὀφελόμενα*; 9: *ἀποδόντων*; 11: *ἀποδοῖν*; 30: *ἀποδοδομένα εἶ*; D 2, line 22: *ἀπόδοσιν*; 23: *ἀ[ποδοθ]εῖ τὰ ὀφελόμενα*.

⁴⁴ Cf. Meyer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 104–05; W. Bannier, *RhM* 75 (1926) 185–87; Kolbe, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 69.

⁴⁵ See Mattingly, *ProcAfrCA* 7 (1964) 43.

⁴⁶ Cf. Bannier, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.44) 186 n.1; he points out that, if one transaction were involved, the aorist *ἀνεπεχθῆι* would be normal.

this sum was made in 449 in connection with the new building program,⁴⁷ in 444/3 as a reaction to the criticisms of that program,⁴⁸ or even that it was contributed at one time to the goddess from the public treasury (τὸ δημόσιον), about which we know so little.⁴⁹ For the present argument it makes no difference which of these possibilities we choose; the choice depends upon other factors, not the Kallias decrees themselves.⁵⁰ For the fact remains that there are several possibilities, and so the second of the two assumptions upon which Fornara's whole case depends disappears. Without these presuppositions, we can interpret the language and evidence of the decrees in a natural way, which leads inevitably to the date of 434/3.⁵¹

Recently Mattingly has adduced what he claims to be new evidence supporting his advocacy of 422/1 for the decrees and his claim that the Treasurers of the Other Gods were reorganized at that time from a smaller board, probably of five.⁵² It is interesting to analyze his argument, especially as an example of his method. He begins with a very acute and convincing reading of two lines of a small fragment of an account from the Archidamian War known only from a copy by Mustoxydes.⁵³ The latter transcribed lines 8 and 9 as ---]TAIMOI-AABOIEΣE[--- and ---]IONTONEABOIEΣA[---. Mattingly was the first to see that merely with the substitution of Attic *lambda* for *iota* line 9 would read ---]ίον τὸν ἐγ βο<λ>ε̅c A[---, and by analogy line 8 should have been ---]<ί>αι <h>οι <ε̅>γ βο<λ>ε̅c E[---. Next he restores these officials from the *boule* as

⁴⁷ So *ATL* III 281, 327–28.

⁴⁸ So Kolbe, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 89–91.

⁴⁹ So A. Gomme, *Historia* 2 (1953–4) 12–21 (summarized in *A Historical Commentary to Thucydides* II [Oxford 1956] 26–33).

⁵⁰ I believe that the reconstruction by the editors of *ATL* is most likely, as providing the most reasonable explanation in the light of the other evidence. Fornara does not go into detail on this problem but states (190 n.19) that “a decision intending the creation of a fund of 3,000 talents by installment payments must have contemplated making such a fund ‘special’ or ‘reserve’.” The reasoning here escapes me; since Athena was to pay for most, if not all, of the building program, why should she not be recompensed for this, to some extent, from the funds of the Hellenotamiai?

⁵¹ Many other arguments have been brought to bear on the question, such as the datives in *-αιc* in D 1 and the mention of ἄδεια (D 2, line 16), but these are admittedly peripheral; cf. Fornara, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 196. For an analysis of their worth see *GHI* 160 and Thompson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.31) 219–24.

⁵² *BSA* 65 (1970) 147–49. For his previous discussions see *supra* n.5.

⁵³ *IG* I² 300; cf. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century [AFD]* (Ann Arbor 1932) 65–68, where the piece is dated between 430/29 and 427/6.

[*ταμ*] <ί>αι because “these are state accounts” and “Treasurers chosen from the Council are found even later, administering funds of Apollo Patroos.” He then concludes that οἱ ταμίαι οἱ ἐγ βολῆς “must surely be no other than the Treasurers of the Other Gods, who are known to have lent 766 talents in seven years down to 427/6 B.C. and whom one would expect to meet in the early wartime records.” He proposes a restoration for these lines, based upon IG I² 301, which involves two boards, the second paying out money received from the earlier. After tentatively suggesting a date of 428/7, he concludes as follows: “We have one invaluable gain anyway. We now *know* [my italics] that the treasurers of the Other Gods were originally chosen from the Council.” This all seems to follow inevitably as it is presented. There are no hints of any problems or alternatives in any of the steps of the argument, and I fear that anyone unacquainted with the other inscriptions involved would accept it without hesitation.

But there are problems and alternatives. First, it is not certain that *tamiai* are involved at all. In line 8 the ending is *-ται* and [ἐπιμελε]ταί immediately comes to mind; [πρεσβευ]ταί is another possibility. I realize that the *iota* at the beginning of line 9, which seems to have been the better preserved of the two, is against the *tau*'s being correct, but the possibility remains. For the mention of *tamiai*, other than those of Athena, is hardly expected in the accounts of this period. The formulae which are preserved in IG I² 300 resemble closely those of IG I² 296, of 432/1. In the latter accounts, and indeed in all that we have, it is *only* the Treasurers of Athena who lend money. Because of this the accounts were printed in IG I² under the heading *Tabulae Quaestorum Minervae*. Although Meritt pointed out that “this designation is only partly correct,” he concluded that they were “records of money borrowed by the Athenian state from the treasurers of Athena.”⁵⁴ So it would be surprising to find other treasurers mentioned in these accounts, especially in a position, following a date by prytany (line 6), where normally the purpose of the loan is expressed. But the very fragmentary nature of the transcription and doubt about the length of line make arguments on this basis hazardous.⁵⁵ Nor is

⁵⁴ AFD 57–58.

⁵⁵ In IG I² 296 one or two lines are taken up by each item; in IG I² 300 there seem to be four lines between the date by prytany in line 7 and that in line 12. But the lines may have been very long and so another date, indicating another item, could have been included here. IG I² 296 has lines of 84 letters, and Meritt deduced that IG I² 300 must have had *ca.* 100 if the *vacat* in line 5 meant a change of year. There are just too many unknowns.

Mattingly's restoration of these lines convincing, since it is based upon IG I² 301, the accounts of 409/8,⁵⁶ where the sources of each payment, either from current income or from money handed down by the previous board, are designated. This, however, is a practice which is absent in the earlier accounts, to which IG I² 300 obviously belongs.⁵⁷ Now it is admittedly possible that Mattingly is right in all his conjectures, that *tamiai* other than those of Athena are mentioned here and that the accounting procedure was different for them; but if one wishes to maintain this, it should certainly be pointed out that, in such a case, this fragment would be unique among the surviving fragments of the accounts.

Furthermore, even if *tamiai* from the *boule* are mentioned here, it does not follow that they are the Treasurers of the Other Gods. We know from their inventories (IG I² 310) that the official designation of the latter group was established by 429/8, and we also know that there were treasurers from the *boule* who were *not* the Treasurers of the Other Gods. In IG I² 79, lines 9–12,⁵⁸ each *boule* is instructed to elect from its members two treasurers of the money of Apollo Patroos at the same time they elect treasurers (or a treasurer)⁵⁹ of the Mother of the Gods. Thus designated, these cannot be the Treasurers of the Other Gods; yet if treasurers from the *boule* are mentioned in IG I² 300 they are almost certainly the officials referred to in IG I² 79. The association of the *boule* with these divinities can be explained easily and naturally by the close proximity of the Old Bouleuterion, the Metroon and the temenos of Apollo Patroos; in fact, the sanctuary of the Mother was in the Bouleuterion.⁶⁰ Unfortunately the date of this

⁵⁶ For the date see SEG X 233.

⁵⁷ See Meritt, *AFD* 58–61, for a summary of changes in the accounting procedures.

⁵⁸ This inscription is known only from a copy by Fourmont; it would repay further study of some of the details, even though the general sense is clear. Meritt has already improved upon the readings in lines 5–7; "Greek Historical Studies," *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple* (Princeton 1967) 124 n.34.

⁵⁹ Lines 11–12 are restored in the *Corpus* as [ὅταν καὶ τὸν τῆς Μῆ]|τρός χρημάτων αἰρῆται. It seems likely that, in place of *καί*, we should read *τός*, or perhaps *τόν*; a dual is also possible reading *ὅταν τό*.

⁶⁰ For a summary of the archaeological evidence from the excavations in the Agora, see *The Athenian Agora: A Guide to the Excavations and Museum*² (Athens 1962) 48–50, 59–60; for the testimonia, R. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton 1957) 50–53, 150–60. Early temples of the Mother and of Apollo Patroos were not rebuilt after the Persian sack. The Mother's was incorporated into the Bouleuterion; Apollo's sanctuary was a *temenos* (cf. IG I² 79, lines 15–16) until a temple was put up in the fourth century.

inscription cannot be determined. It could be placed at any time in the last half of the fifth century,⁶¹ but since it presupposes Treasurers of the Mother it can explain any reference to οἱ ταμίαι οἱ ἐγ βολῆς.

These, then, are the questions raised and alternatives presented by Mattingly's new interpretation of *IG I² 300*. His case is hardly one on which to base a statement that "we now know that the treasurers of the Other Gods were originally chosen from the Council." Such a conclusion is especially surprising in an article which claims to be "an attempt to apply first principles rigorously to epigraphic evidence."⁶² Mattingly not only closes but also had opened the article with an appeal to these "first principles." They are never precisely defined, but apparently what he had in mind is explained by the following statement: "What really counts in the 'three-bar sigma' controversy, for instance, is the bare text of the epigraphic documents, freed of modern supplement and interpretation."⁶³ One can agree, in general, and, in view of Mattingly's commitment to this doctrine, it seems to be time to hold him to it and to remind him that he wrote in 1963: "If the Quota Lists were inscribed year by year on the First Stele (from 453 to 439), one could hardly deny that early letter-forms such as three-barred sigma went out of public use c. 445/440."⁶⁴ For on this point "the bare text of the epigraphical documents" certainly proves him wrong. He once claimed that he was able to demonstrate that the First Stele was not what it has always been taken to be, accounts inscribed year by year,⁶⁵ but such a claim must seem incredible to anyone who has seen or studied that stone. Yet until such a demonstra-

⁶¹ Hiller in *IG I²* puts it among decrees from the years 431/0–422/1, and Mattingly says it is "even later" than *IG I² 300*, i.e., after 428/7. But the only indication of date is the use of four-barred sigma in Fourmont's copy. A very late story (Photios, s.v. μητρογύρτης) connecting the introduction of the worship of the Mother with the plague is hardly trustworthy in view of the archaeological evidence and the tradition that her statue in the Bouleuterion was made by Pheidias (Arr. *Periplus* 9; Paus. 1.3.5) or his pupil Agorakritos (Pliny, *HN* 36.17); cf. Hiller, *SBBerl* 1919, 669.

⁶² *op.cit.* (*supra* n.52) 149.

⁶³ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.52) 129.

⁶⁴ "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism," *Historia* 12 (1963) 257 n.1.

⁶⁵ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.64) 271. Here he tries to hedge by stating "that even if I could not dispose of the awkward exception [the First Stele] one inscription should not be allowed permanently to prevent free, natural use of many others." But the First Stele is hardly one inscription, and its evidence is supported by a large body of other inscriptions, particularly the financial documents.

tion appears, one can only conclude that Mattingly continues the debate primarily because he is, to use his own words, “absorbed in an elegant game of skill.”⁶⁶

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

September, 1971

⁶⁶ BSA 65 (1970) 129.