

VINCENT GABRIELSEN

IG II² 1609 AND EISPHORA PAYMENTS IN KIND?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 93–99

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

IG II² 1609 AND EISPHORA PAYMENTS IN KIND?

I.

In *Historia* 18 (1969) 303-333, J.K.Davies, *inter alia*, discusses the administrative significance of the inscription EM 224, now published as IG II² 1609. Expanding a previous suggestion by H.Fränkell,¹ he argues that the εἰρήνευκε-formula which is used several times in that record means payment of an eisphora levy in kind.² In *REA* 86 (1985) 307-317, P.Brun restates this theory using basically the same line of argument and no new evidence. While attestation of eisphora contributions in kind would laudably shed new light on an important aspect of Athenian fiscal history, the foundation on which this view rests turns out to be quite frail. I agree that the formula in question, in IG II² 1609, serves the specific purpose to mark off privately owned ship's equipment. However, in the remainder of this article, I will attempt to show that (1) εἰρήνευκε, in naval contexts, cannot be associated with the eisphora, and (2) that equipment listed under the εἰρήνευκε-formula was being deposited in the dockyards on loan only whilst it continued to remain the owner's property. First, I offer treatment of some other entries in the naval records containing the same or similar formulas, and then I will return to the meaning carried by those in IG II² 1609.

II.

Since the verb εἰσφέρειν occurs also in a number of transactions involving naval officials, it is expedient, by way of introduction, to make mention of two aspects of dockyard administration and the language used in connection with these. The first is that, usually, but not invariably, παραλαμβάνειν/παραλαβή designate the direct receipt of naval material by the board of the epimeletai ton neorion from their predecessors; the complementary terms παραδιδόναι/παράδοσις designate the direct delivery of material to their successors. This phraseology is administratively linked to the regular, annual alternation of office. Now the related terms ἀπολαμβάνειν/ἀπολαβή and ἀποδιδόναι/ἀπόδοσις are also used with receipts and deliveries, respectively, though in a slightly different administrative sense: by

¹ *AM* 48 (1923) 1-23, esp. 20. The suggestion was briefly repeated by R.Sealey, *Phoenix* 11 (1957) 95-111, esp. 97. I am greatly indebted to Mr. G.D.Woolf of Trinity College, Cambridge, who commented on a first draft of this article.

² Pp. 318-19. On pp.324-27, Davies associates the formulas of IG II²1609 with *Xen.Hell.vi.2.14: μάλα ὀξέως τὰς ναυὸς ἐπληροῦτο καὶ τοὺς τριηράρχους ἠνάγκαζε* (said of Iphikrates), and infers that Iphikrates compelled culpable trierarchs to return to stock public equipment (the ἀπέδωκε-formula) and pressed them to meet their eisphora obligations (the εἰρήνευκε-formula) (p.325).

contrast to the former set, they are predominantly employed with transfers taking place on occasions other than the regular predecessor-successor takeover.³

The second aspect is that, as regards deliveries/receipts of naval material, the administrative procedure consists of two inter-related acts: (a) recording by the officials currently serving of the fact that certain items were being delivered/received; (b) the physical replacement of these items in the dockyards. An illustration of this comes from an entry in the naval record IG II² 1631 which reads:

410 (325/4)	Τάδε ἐφείλουσιν οἱ τῶν νεωρίων ἐπι- μεληταὶ οἱ ἐπ' Ἀντικλέους ἄρχοντ- ος καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς αὐτῶν τῶν σ- κευῶν, ὧν γράψαντες εἰς τὴν στήλ- ην οὐ παρέδωκαν ὄντα ἐν τοῖς νεωρ- ίοις. ⁴
415	

Obviously, the board of the epimeletai of 325/4 and their secretary had observed the first part of their duty (i.e. inscription on the stele of the equipment which they should have delivered to their successors) but had failed to perform the second part (i.e. the actual deposition of the inscribed items in the neoria). Much the same kind of negligence was perpetrated by an individual who was in charge of a ship as *tamias* Paralou, thus serving in the dual capacity as elected official (A.P. 61.7) and trierarch, IG II² 1629:

690	Παρὰ Λυκανίου Κουνιέ σκευῶν τετρήρους κρε- μαστῶν ἐντελῶν, τῶν ξύλινων ἰστοῦ ἀπελάβομεν Ⲡ Η Ⲟ Ι Ι Ι : ἃ ἔλαβεν ἐ- πὶ τὴν Κάλλιγγα, Δημο- τέλου ἔργον, καὶ ταρρο ἀργοῦ, ὃν οὐκ ἐνεγεγρα- πτο ἔχων, ὃν εἶχεν ὧν Δημάδης εἰσεπρίατο, ἀπελάβομεν: Η Η Η Η Δ Γ·
695	

³ E.g. IG II² 1627.17, 19, 33-34, 39, 46-48, 68-69, 73-74, 138-40, 155-67.

⁴ The epimeletai of 325/4 withheld also 33 dr. 2 ob. (lines 428-29) which amount had been in the upkeep of their predecessors since 331/0 (IG 1627.234-37). Moreover, this entry refutes the view that the epimeletai ton neorion are not attested to have held office after 334/3 (IG II² 1623.3-5): cf. Davies, *op.cit.* (p.1) 316, n.25; P.J.Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1972) 119, 239-40, referring to an unpublished essay by D.M.Lewis which I have not seen; G.L.Cawkwell, *JHS* 83 (1963) 57, n.62, argues against the discontinuation of the functions of the epimeletai.

Either in 328/7 or 327/6,⁵ Lysanias had received a complete set of undressed oars, which was part of a larger stock purchased by Demades.⁶ He had failed to record this receipt, and apparently never returned the equipment itself, for in 325/4 he paid 415 dr. towards defraying its cost. I now resume treatment of the εἰσήνεγκε-formula.

The inscription IG II² 1622, col. c, lines 379-431 + col. d, lines 432-579, lists the collection of debts carried out by the officials of the neoria in the years 345/4-342/1. These debts were owed by naval officials of previous years, the earliest of which date from 378/7 (lines 406-11, 493-96). Two specific transactions are of interest here.

- (i)
- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---------|
| | Εὐθ[υ]νος Λαμπτρέυς, | |
| | ταμίασ γενόμενος | |
| | τριηροποϊκῶν ἐπὶ | |
| 390 | Ἄρχιου ἄρχοντος | (346/5) |
| | X X X Ἰ Η, | |
| | ἀπολαβῶν κώπασ | |
| | παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ νεω- | |
| | ρίου τῶν παραδοθει- | |
| 395 | κῶν, ὧν αὐτὸς εἰσή- | |
| | νεγκεν, ἀδοκίμους | |
| | χιλίασ ὀκτακοκίασ· | |

In his capacity as tamias trieropoikon Euthynos was in possession of a number of oars probably surrendered by trierarchs in 346/5. These oars had been formally delivered to the dockyards (τῶν παραδοθεικῶν), though 1,800 of them had been brought in by Euthynos in useless condition. On account of this he was made liable to pay 3,600 dr. (i.e. 2 dr. per oar) in compensation. The verb εἰσήνεγκε refers to an act inseparably connected with the official παράδοσις and designates the physical deposition of equipment in the dockyards.⁷

- (ii)
- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|
| | Εὐθύμαχος Ε - - - | |
| 445 | ταμίασ γενό[μενος] | |
| | ἐς τὰ νεώρια [ἐπὶ Θε]- | |

⁵ Lysanias' service as tamias Paralou is listed in IG II² 1628 (of 326/5), lines 8-16. The service was dated by U.Köhler to 326/5 (AM 8 (1883) 172). But since another man was tamias Paralou in that year (IG II² 1628.79-88 with lines 37-42 giving the date), Lysanias' tenure must date either in 328/7, the year in which his ship was constructed: IG II² 1628.10-12, or in 327/6.

⁶ For the meaning of ταρρὸς ἀργός see A.Böckh, *Urkunden über das Seewesen des attischen Staates* (Berlin, 1840) 113, 488. The sets of oars purchased by Demades are recorded in IG II² 1629.348-51: ταρρὸς ἐπὶ τετρήρεις, οὐς Δημάδης εἰσεπρίατο, κατειργάθησαν δὲ ἐπὶ Ἄντικλέους ἄρχοντος (325/4). The record gives fifteen sets.

⁷ H.Fränkell, *op.cit.* (n.1) 20. Böckh's interpretation of the entry is as follows: "Euthynos ... hatte Ruder angeschafft und eingebracht (εἰσήνεγκε), welche zu den nachher an die Behörde von den Vorgängern überlieferten gehörten (τῶν παραδοθεικῶν)", *Urkunden* 54. But the record says nothing about "angeschafft". Moreover, Böckh took the phrase ἀπολαβῶν κώπασ παρ' ἡμῶν to mean that the officials gave the 1,800 useless oars back to Euthynos.

(347/6) μιτοκλέου[ε ἄρχο],
 τῶν κευῶν, [ῶν]
 ἔλαβε παρὰ [τῶν]
 450 τριηράρχων [καὶ οὐκ]
 εἰσήνεγκε γρά[ψασ]
 ἐν τῇι κτήληι,
 ἀργυρίου μὲν ἀπ[ο]-
 δέδω[κ]ε : [T T X X X X Π H].
 455 κκεύη δὲ αὐτὰ ἀπέδω-
 κε τάδε·

Davies (p.318) and Brun (p.310) admit that the use of εἰσήνεγκε, in this entry, does not fit their interpretation of the formula as meaning payment of eisphora in kind. They therefore prefer to consider it as an irregularity, a flaw in the language of the epimeletai who, instead of εἰσήνεγκε, should have been using παρέδωκεν as in the comparable entry of IG II² 1631.410-15 (cited on p.94 above). However, all this is to beg the question. Like the epimeletai of 325/4 (IG II² 1631.410-15) and (in a sense) Lysanias (cf. pp.94-95 above), Euthymachos had inscribed on the stele the delivery of equipment, but had neglected to bring the material itself into the neoria.⁸ During the ongoing debt collection in 345/4-342/1 he still withheld some equipment since he paid a sum to compensate its cost,⁹ and returned hanging and wooden items from several ships (lines 456-77). If anything, therefore, the language of the epimeletai who drew up IG II² 1631 is consistent with that of their predecessors. It is more in accord with their administrative practices to view παρέδωκε and εἰσήνεγκε as closely related terms - the latter meaning specifically the physical replacement of equipment in the dockyards.

III.

So much for naval officials. Besides IG II² 1609, the εἰσήνεγκε-formula is also found in the entry IG II² 1622.444-47, concerning the debt of Euthymachos. Three complete sets of oars which he returned to the neoria are specified as follows:

Ταρρόν, ὃν Φορμίων
 Πειραι : εἰσήνεγκε,
 ταρρόν, ὃν Εὐδράων
 475 Θορίκι εἰσήνεγκε,
 ταρρόν, ὃν Ἀρχέδη-
 ος Πιθε : εἰσήνεγκε·

⁸ Cf. also Böckh, Urkunden 382. Fränkel, op.cit. (n.1) referred to a parallel usage in Xen.Oik.vii.20.

⁹ The amount 2 tal. 4,600 dr. was printed unbracketted by Böckh, Urkunden, URK. X, p.382, but the reading was not confirmed by Köhler (cf. Kirchner's note to IG II² 1622).

Böckh was probably right to identify all three individuals as trierarchs;¹⁰ two of them are securely (and one tentatively) attested to have performed trierarchies.¹¹ As in the entries discussed above, the εἰρήνευκε-formula in this entry and in IG II² 1609 generally carry the same meaning: i.e. introduction of naval material into the dockyards. But they are surely not concerned with equipment withheld by naval officials and must therefore belong to an entirely different administrative context. The question now is whether this context can be identified as an eisphora levy in kind. A clear answer is, in my opinion, furnished by the occurrence of the formula in the following (and hitherto over-looked) entry in the naval records.

IG II² 1631.350-403 records a decree of the boule of 324/3 proposed by Polyeuktos Hestaios concerning the debt of Sopolis. The background and legal sequel of the case is this. Sopolis' brother, Kephisodoros Kydathenaieus, had served as tamias of the neoria in a year before 325/4.¹² After the expiry of his tenure he failed to return to the dockyards equipment for ten triremes which he held in his possession. Either because Kephisodoros was dead or had fled by 325/4,¹³ Sopolis was made liable to return the equipment on behalf of his brother, but refused to do so. As a result, he was brought to a court by the epimeletai ton neorion of 325/4 which held him culpable for retention of public property and sentenced him to pay more than the double of the original debt.¹⁴

Owing to Sopolis' defiance of the court's order, the legal proceedings were extended by his imprisonment, loss of civic rights, and the involvement of the boule which passed the pertinent decree. The proposer, Polyeuktos, denounced (through an apographe) the whole of Sopolis' property including a number of oars described as κωπεῖς ᾠπόλιδος εἰσενηνεγμένοι εἰς τὰ νεώρια.¹⁵ In the remaining part of the decree, Polyeuktos, obviously assisting rather than attacking Sopolis, lets the lawfully granted reward¹⁶ be reckoned against Sopolis' debt in order that the latter can resume his civic rights (εἰς τὴν ἐπιτιμίαν).¹⁷ Then the epimeletai of 324/3 are ordered to put on the record the fact that

¹⁰ Urkunden 382.

¹¹ Phormion Peiraieus: IG II² 1623.245-59; 1629.647-656; Eudraon Thorikios: IG II² 1632.143-49, 246-52; Archedemos [Pitheus]: IG 1609.57: Sundwall's restoration of the demotic is followed by Kirchner, and B.Leonardos, IG II/III Suppl. II (1978) 177-242, no.138, pp.34ff. But APF p.69 suggests that [Aurides] is equally possible and equally a guess.

¹² Kirchner (PA 8373) dates the tenure to 325/4. However, since he was brought to a court in that year, his service must belong to an earlier year.

¹³ The tamias trieropoikon of either 358/7 or 357/6 had absconded with 15,000 dr. (D.xxii.17 + Schol.); for the date of this incident see P.J.Rhodes, *op.cit.* (n.4) 4 with n.7.

¹⁴ Lines 353-60: καὶ ἐτίμησαν πλέονος ἢ τοῦ διπλασίου probably means double the original debt plus a fine, Böckh, *Urkunden* 212.

¹⁵ Lines 360-65.

¹⁶ One third of the proceeds from sale: D.M.Lewis corrects D.liii. 2: τὰ τρία μέρη, on the strength of *Hesperia* 19 (1950) 237, no.14.42: τὰ τρίτα μέρη, *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies ...* V.Ehrenberg (1966) 191.

¹⁷ Lines 365-68. Cf. R.Dareste, B.Haussoullier, Th.Reinach, *Recueil des Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques*, II, fasc. II (Paris, 1898) 147-60, esp. 154-55.

Sopolis had surrendered his oars by reckoning 3 dr. for each oar against the sum owed, while their *tamias*, upon receiving the oars, is to count them and add up the sum-total of their money equivalent.¹⁸ Finally, additional provisions instruct the secretary of the eleven and all naval officials as to the further procedure, prescribe the fine to be paid in case of misconduct, and give Sopolis and his relatives the right to enter a *bouleusis* and an *eisangelia* if they become subject to unjust treatment.¹⁹ Two comments are in order here.

First, Sopolis' private ownership of oars had no connection either to his brother's tenure as *tamias* or to his ensuing defalcation. Rather, I will suggest, Sopolis belonged to the trierarchic class (even though no trierarchies of his are attested) and, like a good many other trierarchs, preferred to use his own equipment instead of that provided by the state. In 362, Apollodoros fitted out his ship entirely with his own equipment ([D.] I.7, 26, 27, 33, 34, 36, 55); so also did his colleague Hagnias in the same year (*ibid.* § 42). The speaker of [D.] li. says that, as to the equipment which the state is obliged to provide to trierarchs, he received nothing from the public but fitted out his ship at his own expense (§ 5). The speaker of [D.] xlvii claimed that in the many trierarchies he had performed before 357/6 he had never received equipment from the *neoria* but had provided his own (§ 23). To these instances we can safely add the individuals listed under the *εἰρήνευκε*-formula in IG II² 1609 and IG II² 1622 (*cf. p.* above).

Secondly, and more importantly, the oars listed as *εἰσενηνεγμένοι εἰς τὰ νεώρια* by Sopolis remained his property until they were confiscated with the rest of his holdings. It is virtually impossible, therefore, that they represented an *eisphora* payment in kind. The entire absence of such payments in the literary sources is perhaps of little significance. But indeed it is of significance to observe that during the critical shortage of equipment in 357/6 ([D.] xlvii.20) attempts were made to secure supplies not by means of such or similar measures, but by means of Chairedemos' decree which ordered owners of equipment to sell to the state and prescribed confiscation of their property as the punishment for disobedience ([D.] xlvii.44).

¹⁸ Lines 368-77.

¹⁹ Lines 377-403.

The precise year to which IG II² 1609 is to be assigned still remains a moot point.²⁰ But this has no direct bearing on the interpretation of the rubrics in col. II of that inscription which basically consist of four formulaic elements: (i) ὁ δεῖνα παρέδωκε, (ii) ὁ δεῖνα ἀπέδωκε, (iii) ὁ δεῖνα εἰσήνεγκε, and (iv) ἀπὸ τῆς + a ship's name. While the first two are part of the stock phraseology employed by the epimeletai to note the surrender of equipment (cf. pp. above), the latter two are used exclusively for identification purposes. Very probably because of shortage, in the dockyards, of equipment with which to fit out ships in commission, two supplementary measures were taken into use: (a) several items were transferred from other ships currently inactive (cf. IG II² 1607); (b) still further items were being introduced voluntarily by trierarchs who owned equipment. In either case the provenance of each item on loan had to be properly notified for due return after use. In conclusion, the assumption that an eisphora levy in kind would have been resorted to on that or any other occasion is unnecessary and decisively refuted by the existing evidence.

University of Copenhagen

Vincent Gabrielsen

²⁰ The dates thus far proposed are: 365/4: J.Sundwall, AM 35 (1910) 49-50, E.Schweigert, AJP 61 (1940) 194-8, P.Brun, op.cit. (p.1); 366/5: J.K.Davies, op.cit. (p.1); not later than 370/69, not earlier than 372/1: R.Sealey, op.cit. (n.1); 372/1-370/69, especially 372/1: H.Fränkell, op.cit. (n.1) 21-22; 370/69, possibly 371-0: G.L.Cawkwell, Historia 22 (1973) 759-61. The chief dating criteria used in one or more of the works cited are inconclusive:

(i) The association of the squadron listed in IG II² 1609.88-111 with an attempt to establish a cleruchy in 365/4 (Samos) or in 370/69 cannot be firmly established by the introductory formula: τριήρεσ ἐξέπλευσαν ἐπὶ Εὐκτῆ[μονος Λου?]τι, Εὐθίο Κοῦνι: κληρ[ο]χ[α]ρχόντων. Almost without exception ἐπὶ + official is an indication of date: i.e. "in the year in which x held office", while the fact that a squadron was dispatched under the leadership of some official is indicated by μετὰ + official (e.g. IG II² 1628.350-1, 369-7, 419-20, 436-7 with Cawkwell's comments, *ibid.* 760).

(ii) The insecurity of Schweigert's prosopographical criteria was demonstrated by R.Sealey. However, his own identification of Theoxenos Euonymos (trierarch in IG II² 1609.100) with the diaitetes in IG II² 1924.3-4): [Θεόξ]ενος [Εὐ]ωνυμέος, as Sealey admits, is equally uncertain.

(iii) The mention of Pasion's name under the formulas ἀπέδωκε and εἰσήνεγκε does not necessarily mean that he "returned" and "introduced" equipment in person (before his death in 370/69) during the year of the epimeletai who drew up II² 1609. See IG II² 1622.235-47, in which ἔλαβε refers to a year before 357/6 (IG II² 1611.370-73) and ἀπέδωκε to any one of the years 345/4-342/1 (II² 1622.379-85).

(iv) While it was unusual for a person to serve simultaneously as strategos and trierarch, such a duplication of function was not impossible: see IG II² 1623.326-33 + 1628.100-8 + 1629.707-15. The real crux is whether any of the persons listed in II² 1609 by name only (without demotic) can be securely identified as strategos. Nor is it a requisite for a man holding an office and undertaking a trierarchy at the same time to be personally in charge of his ship. A strategos whose presence was required elsewhere may well have his ship commanded by a deputy: see D.xxi.163-4, for the simultaneous hipparchia and trierarchia of Meidias.

IG II² 1609 is still without a date.