

RICHARD HAMILTON

ARCHONS' NAMES ON PANATHENAIC VASES

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 96 (1993) 237–248

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Archons' Names on Panathenaic Vases

For most of the fourth century B.C., names of eponymous archons were inscribed on the distinctively shaped and decorated black-figure vases known as Panathenaic amphorae. Remarkably, among the two dozen different archons' names appearing on over sixty vases, none certainly belongs to an archon in office during the quadrennial "Great Panathenaia" at which the vases, filled with olive oil, are thought to have been awarded as prizes. An obvious explanation is that the vases must have been offered not at the Great Panathenaia but at the annual Panathenaic games (about which we know very little), but this explanation has been universally rejected for a number of good reasons. In its place has been firmly situated the theory that, since the archon was responsible for collecting the prize oil (and could not be seated in the Areopagos Council at the end of his term until all his oil-quota had been collected), the inscriptions must mark each archon's quota, except for the archon during a Great Panathenaia whose oil had not been harvested by the time of the games.¹ "The dated vases are only of years in which the Greater Panathenaia were *not* held and it was the duty of officials in these years to lay up the stock for the year of the games and to commission the production of the vases, which dated the harvest in the same way that vintages were dated by archon stamps impressed on the handles of wine amphorae (but not in Athens)."²

Yet this theory does not explain the uneven distribution of the archon names in other years, fits poorly with the testimony of our best witness to the mechanics of the prize-giving and raises a number of difficult questions, hitherto for the most part unformulated. Moreover, there is now a probable exception to add to the possible one known for a century. It seems clear that the archon's name, like most vase inscriptions, was not a required element of decoration.³

The extremely odd fact about the archons' names is that, although we know, according to latest count, 26 names on 66 vases, none of the 26 is the name of an archon clearly belonging to the one year in four in which the Great Panathenaia was held, the year we might most expect to be named.⁴ Random distribution leads us to expect 6 or 7 in each of the four years, but the pattern is quite different. A. Mommsen in 1898 was the first to notice the odd distri-

¹ This will have been the eponymous archon, called simply "the archon" in our primary source, the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*—see P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 99.

² J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (London 1974) 169f.

³ For a comprehensive survey of inscriptions on Attic vases see H. R. Immerwahr, *Attic Script* (Oxford 1990).

⁴ The numbers are from J. Frel, *Panathenaic Prize Amphorae*, Kerameikos Book #2 (Athens 1973) 19. Frel's low proportion of names to vases is surprising. He says (16) he has ten vases from one year, 363/2, and his explanation is that the vases before being filled were stored in the Kerameikos, where most of the new dated fragments have been found, but this rests on the shaky assumption that, since oil residue (or flaking caused by oil) is sometimes found, its absence means the vase was never used (9).

bution, though he admitted that his sample was not complete and allowed that perhaps it was not representative.⁵ He discounted the possibility that the names were used to date prizes for the yearly Panathenaia since some vases show athletic contests (as opposed to horse racing or musical contests), which are known only for the Great Panathenaia, and he theorized that "the archon put his name on vases, whose content he collected in quota from the oil producers" (82). His reasoning must have been that, since the Games occur in the summer, before the year's collection of oil in the fall, that year's oil would not be used for prizes. He noted that one vase (Louvre MN 705) names an archon, Archippos, one of whose archonships was during a year of the Great Panathenaia, and concluded that in this case the oil would have been distributed at the following Great Panathenaia.

Mommsen cited only nine names on eleven vases, but the pattern has remained the same even though the number of names has tripled. D.M. Robinson in 1910 collected sixteen names on twenty-four vases (*AJA* 14 [1910] 425). E.N. Gardiner in 1912 found fifteen vases in the first Olympic year, six in the second, none in the third (the year of the Great Panathenaia) and three in the fourth (*JHS* 32 [1912] 192). By 1942, K. Peters, using Smets' catalogue, was able to count twenty names on thirty-two vases, with much the same distribution as Mommsen and Gardiner: 16-8-0-3.⁶ J.D. Beazley in the following year described the distribution as 19-10-0-4 (*AJA* 47 [1943] 461). The latest count is by J. Frel, who finds 46 vases in the first year, 15 in the second, 0 in the third and 4 in the fourth.⁷

Most critics over the years have subscribed to Mommsen's theory about oil-collection,⁸ and a few have elaborated it. Gardiner, while dismissing questions such as "how the system was worked or what proportion of the vases containing oil were signed" suggested that "interest and convenience would naturally bring it about that the oil of the first year of the Olympiad, which was somewhat over a year old, would be chiefly used. But as the oil harvest was capricious it was advisable to set aside for the games a certain amount of the oil of the previous year, which was two years old. Any further deficiency was made up with oil of the second year, which had just been stored." As for the oil from the third year, Gardiner thought that "before another festival came round this oil would be all used, or if not might be deteriorating."⁹ He does not specify a use, but D.A. Amyx has supplied one (while discount-

⁵ A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum* (Leipzig 1898) 82 n. 1.

⁶ K. Peters, *Studien zu den Panathenäischen Preisamphoren* (Berlin 1942) 6. He noted that five of the vases could be placed in one of two years.

⁷ J. Frel, "Quelques noms d'archontes sur les amphores panathénaïques," *RA* 1972 286 n. 1. Frel's distribution of names, which is more important for our purposes, is 14-8-0-4. His total here (65) does not quite match the number cited above (66). Frel gave no list; I have been able to find reference to 26 names on 53 vases and fragments (see the appendix).

⁸ See Gardiner (above) 192; Peters (n. 6) 7; J.D. Beazley, *The Development of Attic Black-Figure* (Berkeley 1986²) 89; Frel (n. 4) 19; Boardman (n. 2) 169; M. Tiverios, *A.Delt.* 29.1 (1974) 152; J. R. Brandt, *ActaA.Art.Hist.* 8 (1978) 17 (though he does not think the system was in place during the 6th C.); M.F. Vos, *Oudh.Meded.* 62 (1981) 43; M.B. Moore and M.Z.P. Philippides, *Attic Black-Figured Pottery* (Princeton 1986) 15f.

⁹ Gardiner (above) 192. "The archon was appointed at the beginning of the Greek year, a few weeks before the Panathenaia, and his first collection of oil took place in the winter after the Festival, or 3 1/2 years be-

ing the worry about rancid oil): it could have been "sold off directly to help defray (*post factum*) the expenses of the festival, including some of the prizes in events for which oil was not awarded."¹⁰

We should probably stop worrying about the oil missing from the Panathenaic year since there is the strong probability of at least one vase dated to such a year. Mommsen himself had mentioned Archippos, archon in 321 and 318 (a Panathenaic year), and N. Eschbach describes an unpublished amphora (Athens: 3rd Ephoria inv. A 6369) with the inscription "Kephisodor[os]" who, he argues on the basis of well-recognized stylistic conventions, is the archon of 366, not of 323.¹¹ If Eschbach is correct, there is no absolute ban on any archon's name, though the question of the relative scarcity of that one year is still an issue. But this exception simply removes the "fact" that caused Mommsen's theory, not the theory itself.¹² The neo-conservative position could now be that *all* archons stored their quota in eponymously labelled Panathenaics.

Yet there are several problems with this theory, the foremost being that the practice of including an archon's name seems to have become established only gradually. Eschbach has recently studied the iconography of 4th C. Panathenaics, in particular the statues which replace the previously canonical cocks on top of the columns flanking Athena. If we take Eschbach's groupings of Panathenaics by archon, we can see that the early 4th C. vases often lack the archon name, though stylistically they often clearly belong with those that have names, and have the canonical game inscription, considered by scholars the mark distinguishing Panathenaic amphorae given as prizes from other similarly shaped and decorated vases.¹³ Up to and including the archonship of Kallimedes (360/59), about a third of the Panathenaics have only the game inscription:¹⁴

E 2 (400-390) Crete: Heraklion Museum ¹⁵	game inscription only
E 3 (400-390) Thessalonika: Museum 34.267	game inscription only

fore the next Festival. Obviously this oil was no longer fresh and good enough for prize-oil. Most of the archon names refer to the last and the last but one years before the Games, i.e. oil of 1 1/2 and 1/2 years old" (Vos [n. 8] 43). This does not explain why many more names occur in the "last but one" than in the last year before the Games.

¹⁰ D.A. Amyx, *Hesperia* 27 (1958) 181 n. 42. He has been followed by Frel (n. 4) 19. This would answer Rhodes' complaint that "there is no logical reason why oil should not have been collected in the year of the Great Panathenaia" (n. 1, 674).

¹¹ N. Eschbach, *Statuen auf Panathenäischen Preisamphoren des 4. Jhs. V. Ch.* (Mainz 1986) 34. Kephisodoros is named on another Panathenaic of the later date, with different lettering and decorative style.

¹² Hence Mommsen was able to explain away the Archippos exception without difficulty.

¹³ The statues change every year but one: "Die Regel, die Säulen von Amphoren eines Jahrgangs mit ein und denselben Figuren bzw. Figurengruppe zu besetzen, wird jedoch nur in diesem Jahrgang [336/5] ausser Kraft gesetzt," Eschbach (n. 11) 109. That they do not *always* change every year is immaterial to the point here, which is that in the early 4th C. roughly contemporary vases sometimes lack archon name.

¹⁴ References to Eschbach's catalogue numbers are prefixed with an E. It seems advisable not to expand Eschbach's catalogue, to avoid choosing between the Scylla of including only precisely datable vases, all of which will by definition have the archon name, and the Charybdis of adding in vases lacking archon name that can only be dated stylistically hence loosely.

¹⁵ This may be the same as Heraklion 26554, discussed by P. Valavanis, *BCH* 114 (1990) 325ff, figs. 1-8.

E 4 (400-390) Crete: Heraklion Museum ¹⁶	game inscription only
E 5 (400-390) Polygyros: Museum 8.29	game inscription only
E 10 (392) Detroit: Institute of Arts 50.193	game inscription only
E 12 (392) Berlin: Staatliche Museen 3980	archon and game inscriptions
E 13 (373) Oxford: Ashmolean Museum 572	archon and game inscriptions
E 15 (371) Alexandria: Griechisch-Römisches Museum 18.239	archon and game inscriptions
E 16 (367) Brussels: Musée de Cinquenaire A 1703	archon and game inscriptions
E 17 (367) London: British Museum B 604	game inscription only ¹⁷
E 18 (367) New York: Metropolitan Museum 56.171.6	archon and game inscriptions
E 19 (367) London: British Museum B 603	archon and game inscriptions
E 27 (363) Athens: National Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 28 (363) Athens: National Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 29 (363) Eretria: Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 38 (360) Athens: National Museum	game inscription only
E 39 (360) Eretria: Museum	game inscription only
E 42 (360) Athens: National Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 43 (360) Athens: National Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 44 (360) Athens: National Museum	archon and game inscriptions
E 45 (360) Eretria: Museum	archon and game inscriptions.

Thereafter there are *no* Panathenaics lacking archon's name until the series ends in 310.¹⁸ The shift around 360 might reflect some politically mandated change, but it seems more likely that the change was purely stylistic.¹⁹ This is the year the Athena begins to face right, for the first time, a stylistic change that immediately becomes canonical. Just a few years before (363) Athena's mantle had become swallow-tailed, and this change too became immediately canonical (Beazley [n. 8] 90). Another change, from writing the game inscription *stoichedon* to writing it *kionedon* (with individual letters horizontal instead of vertical along the column) took place more gradually: the first examples of *kionedon* appear in 367 and both are found

¹⁶ This may be the same as Heraklion 26555, Valavanis figs. 9-12.

¹⁷ Instead of archon name, we have "Kittos made."

¹⁸ This holds true for datable vases in Eschbach's catalogue; it may not hold true for all Panathenaics of this period. Beazley (ABV 416) listed three Panathenaics in the "Nikomachos series" of the mid-4th C. without archon name, but the first (Cab. Méd. 246 [E 49]) is dated by Eschbach between 359-350 (i.e., close enough to 360 to fit the theory); the second (Cab. Méd. 247 [E 66]) may have had an inscription but is too poorly preserved for us to tell; and on the third (Leningrad, Hermitage [E 80]) the beginning of the inscription can be read (see Eschbach 153). We should note that the unplaced E 87 (Athens: 3rd Ephoria inv. A 3882), which has game inscription but no archon inscription, is dated by Eschbach to the last quarter of the 4th C., and, if it is to be dated before archon names fall out of use (310 being our last), it will be another exception. These occasional exceptions will only strengthen my claim about the non-official, stylistic nature of the archon names.

¹⁹ One might counter that the preambles of decrees are not completely standardized until after 350 or so, but the most recent student of such preambles explains this by distinguishing the festival calendar, which uses the archon's name, from the bouleutic calendar, which dates by prytany: "Obviously the bouleutic calendar was the more appropriate and the more convenient for the purpose of placing resolutions at a precise point within the chronological framework of the enacting body," A.S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Leiden 1977) 20.

until 360; thereafter *kionedon* alone is found. Ionian lettering for the game inscription, which began in the late 5th C., became canonical only in 336.²⁰

A second problem is that Mommsen's system will work best if the archon is responsible for having the vases made, which he then fills and hands over to the people in charge of the games to be awarded as prizes, but this is not the way the prizes were managed. We know, however, from the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (chapt. 60) that those tasks were performed by the athlothetai:

οὔτοι δὲ (sc. the ἀθλοθέται) δοκιμασθέντες ἄρχουσι τέτταρα ἔτη, καὶ διοικοῦσι τὴν τε πομπὴν τῶν Παναθηναίων καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς μουσικῆς καὶ τὸν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν ἵπποδρομίαν, καὶ τὸν πέπλον ποιοῦνται, καὶ τοὺς ἀμφορεῖς ποιοῦνται μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον τοῖς ἀθληταῖς ἀποδίδουσι — — — συλλέξας οὖν ὁ ἄρχων τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ γινόμενον, τοῖς ταμίαις παραδίδωσιν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναβῆναι πρότερον εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον, πρὶν ἂν ἅπαν παραδῶ τοῖς ταμίαις. οἱ δὲ ταμίαι τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον τηροῦσιν ἐν ἀκροπόλει, τοῖς δὲ Παναθηναίοις ἀπομετροῦσι τοῖς ἀθλοθέταις, οἱ δ' ἀθλοθέται τοῖς νικῶσι τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν. ἔστι γὰρ ἄθλα τοῖς μὲν τὴν μουσικὴν νικῶσιν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσᾶ, τοῖς δὲ τὴν εὐανδρίαν ἀσπίδες, τοῖς δὲ τὸν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν ἵπποδρομίαν ἔλαιον.

Thus it is the athlothetai, not the archon, who are in charge of having the vases made, as well as being the ones to hand over the prize oil to the victorious athletes. We shall return to this passage below; here it is sufficient to refer to an additional difficulty in Mommsen's theory. We would have to assume that each vase held the same amount, for only then will the athlothetai have known how many vases to commission each year. This assumption is undermined by the rather wide range in heights of vase made for the same archon. For eight archons we have more than one complete vase with known height and the height varies more than 10% within four of these eight groups:

Polyzelos (367 BC)

Brussels, Musée de Cinquantenaire A 1703, E 16	73.0 cm.	
London British Museum B 603, E 19	64.5 cm.	
New York Metropolitan Museum 56.171.6, E 18	70.5 cm.	variation 13%

Charikleides (363 BC)²¹

Athens NM 20047 (Alexandri fig. 233)	70.5 cm.	
Athens NM 20048 (Alexandri fig. 234)	70.0 cm.	variation 1%

Kallimedes (360 BC)

Athens: National Museum 20044 (Alexandri fig. 235)	72.8 cm.	
--	----------	--

²⁰ Ionian lettering is always found with the archon names. Immerwahr (n. 3) 184f lists the following examples of Attic lettering in the game inscriptions during this period: Detroit 50.193 (E 10), Berlin 3980 (E 12), Brussels A 1703 (E 16), London B 603 (E 19) and, the latest, London B 608 (E 65), dated 336/5 B.C.

²¹ The inventory numbers and measurements of the following five vases are found in O. Tzachou-Alexandri, *Mind and Body* (Athens 1989).

Athens: National Museum 20045 (Alexandri fig. 178)	73.5 cm.	
Athens: National Museum 20046 (Alexandri fig. 163)	71.6 cm.	variation 3%
Theophrastos (340 BC)		
Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum 1925.30.124, E 58	80.0 cm.	
Malibu: Getty Museum 79.AE.147 ²²	78.5 cm.	
Paris: Louvre MN 706, E 57	77.0 cm.	variation 4%
Pythodelos (336 BC)		
London: British Museum B 607, E 63	82.1 cm.	
London: British Museum B 608, E 65	82.4 cm.	
Munich: Antikensammlungen 7767, E 64	80.5 cm.	
Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale 247, E 66 ²³	68.0 cm.	
Volos: Museum Ka 4266/91, E 67 (Alexandri [n.21], fig. 138)	81.0 cm.	variation 21%
Niketes (332 BC)		
Sèvres: Museum 7230, E 70	80.0 cm.	
London: British Museum B 610, E 69	78.0 cm.	variation 3%
Euthykritos (328 BC)		
London: British Museum B 611, E 71	78.2 cm.	
Berlin: Staatliche Museen 3981, E 72	62.5 cm.	variation 25%
Hegesias (324 BC)		
Once Lemaire, E 76	64.0 cm.	
Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale 248, E 75	68.0 cm.	
Paris: Louvre MNB 3223, E 74	73.0 cm.	variation 14%

The range in height of all Panathenaics with archon names is over 50%, from 52 cm to 82.4 cm. Even with our small sample of twenty-three vases, we find that one vase with an archon's name is often 10% or 20% smaller than another with the same archon's name, although manufactured at the same time and presumably by the same factory.²⁴

One might legitimately object that height may not be an accurate predictor of capacity, but for most vases it is all we have. There are a few vases whose capacities are known, but these have been obtained over a long period of time, by different methods and on vases with wildly differing degrees of restoration. We do have one controlled set of measurements, which suggest that, though height by itself is not a tremendously accurate predictor of capacity, within archon groups it is. In 1982 Prof. Malcolm Wallace measured the capacities of a

²² I am grateful to Betsy Lewis, Assistant Registrar of the J. Paul Getty Museum for providing this measurement and several study photographs.

²³ Although this vase lacks the archon inscription, it is stylistically the same as the others (see Eschbach 109).

²⁴ Often they are *not* painted by the same hand. Thus Eschbach notes that none of the five Panathenaics in groups A and B from 336/5 is by the same hand though the two from group C may possibly be (109), that both vases from 328/7 are by different hands (142), that the very similar figures on the two Panathenaics from 324/3 are not by the same hand (145) and that the two vases of 320/19 are by two different painters (152). On the other hand three amphorae dated to 366/5 are painted by the same hand (34) and three from 360/59 (58).

number 4th C. amphorae excavated in Eretria, which have now been published. Five of them belong to one of two archons:²⁵

Charikleides (363)	NM 20047	70.5 cm.	32.9 liters
	NM 20048	70.0 cm.	31.6 liters
Kallimedes (360)	NM 20044	72.8 cm.	39.5 liters
	NM 20045	73.5 cm.	40.7 liters
	NM 20046	71.6 cm.	38.8 liters

We can see that *within* either group there is little variation in either height or capacity: the range in height in the Charikleides amphorae is 1% while the range in capacity is 4%; with the Kallimedes amphorae the ranges are 2% and 5%. This suggests that a workshop could make amphorae of virtually the same height and capacity; hence, although there may be considerable variability in the relationship between height of amphorae and capacity overall, within one archon year it seems to be small. Most important, while the variation in height *between* the two years is only 5%, the variation in capacity is 29%. So, a victor who received vases with the archon name Charikleides would have 29% less oil than one who received the same number of vases with the archon name Kallimedes.²⁶ Thus, the limited data we have on capacity suggest first that when the height within an archon year does not vary the capacity will not vary either, and, conversely, when the height within an archon year does vary, as we have seen in half the cases, we may assume that the capacity varied also. Secondly, we can see even from the few capacity measurements that the capacity of prize amphorae varied a great deal and so are unlikely to have been used for measuring an archon's quota.

The Aristotelian passage raises the further problem for Mommsen's theory that the archon hands over the oil, not to the athlothetai, but to the treasurers of Athena, and it is their job to ascertain that he has handed over all the oil before he is allowed to join the Council. Even if the vases were all the same size (which they are not), the treasurers could not be sure they all had the same capacity or that they had been adequately filled unless they emptied them out. What then would be the purpose of the archon's name? For the treasurers, none at all. They deal with only one archon a year so there could be no confusion, and even if they stored the oil in the amphorae they would not need to know which came from which archon once

²⁵ For the measuring method using polystyrene pellets, see P.M.W. Matheson and M.B. Wallace, *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 311-318. The figures given are the average of two measurements each; as none of the jars was measured with water the conversion from container-fuls of pellets to liters is only approximate (see 314-16). Prof. Wallace rechecked his conversions and found that NM 20046 should be 38.8 liters not 39.7 as published.

²⁶ There are few other published capacities. Vos (n. 8) 38f lists the following (filled to neck): London B 130, 38.8 liters (height= 61.2 cm); New York 14.130.12, 38.8 liters (62 cm); New York 16.71, 37.1 liters (63.5 cm); Berlin 1833, 39.0 liters (65 cm); Leiden PC 7, 35-36 liters (65.7-66.4 cm); Berlin 1832 38.7 liters (63 cm); London B 605, 38.1 (72.5 cm). In addition, the capacities of two vases in Karlsruhe (filled to mouth) have now been published in CVA Kiel (= Germany 60): Karlsruhe 65.45 33.5 liters (59.6 cm) and Karlsruhe 69.65 37.5 liters (62 cm). If we exclude the Leiden vase, which is so fragmentary it could not be filled with water (this fact alone may account for its anomalous capacity), we find that the five 6th and early 5th C. vases have the following ratios between height and capacity: 1.58, 1.60, 1.71, 1.67, 1.63, 1.81, 1.68. The other vase (London B 605) is almost a century later, and its higher ratio (1.90) clearly reflects the taller much slimmer shape then in vogue.

they had ascertained his delivery was complete.²⁷ For whom would the names be useful, then? The only other possibility is the victor, in case the oil was rancid or the amphora insufficiently filled, but his complaint would be directed to the athlothetai, not the archon, and the date of the oil would be irrelevant.

One more detail: according to the Aristotelian passage, the treasurers "measure out" (ἀπομετροῦσι) the oil to the athlothetai, the athlothetai to the victors. Since the athlothetai were also charged with providing the amphorae, it is most likely that they also were the officials who oversaw the filling of the amphorae with oil as well as their distribution to the victorious athletes. Here the verb ἀπομετροῦσι seems to retain its literal meaning. The same may apply to the preceding step of the procedure, when the treasurers measured out the oil to the athlothetai; of course, they used larger vessels, but hardly the underground pithoi in which the oil presumably was stored on the acropolis (see n. 27).²⁸ The entire procedure, then, began with the treasurers collecting the oil in pithoi (?) on the acropolis; and it continued by filling the oil into other, presumably transportable vessels and their distribution to the athlothetai; and it ended with the athlothetai filling it into the prize amphorai which then were given to the victors.

Given the variation in production standards within one factory in one year to be assumed from the variations in size, we can understand why the measuring would be done at one time (undoubtedly with a standard measure). That is, the measuring unit is not the archon's vase but whatever standard measure the treasurer used to "measure out" the oil.²⁹ A recently published belly amphora might possibly show the oil being transported from the Acropolis and poured into the official measuring amphora.³⁰

The games illustrated on the reverse of the 4th C. amphorae pose a further, though less decisive problem for this theory. It is reasonable to assume that a chariot victor received his

²⁷ Also storage would be a problem since the amphorae awarded as prizes at a Great Panathenaia number over 1400, to judge from a 4th C. inscription, IG ii² 2311. For calculations see Amyx (n. 10) 182 n. 50, Tiverios (n. 8) 147 n. 29 and now A.W. Johnston, *BSA* 82 (1987) 125-29. Peters (n. 6) 12 is non-committal whether the oil prizes on IG ii² 2311 are measures of oil or numbers of vases (an issue he thinks irrelevant on the grounds that most of the oil would be sold). Tiverios 149 argues strongly for the numbers being of actual vases (recognizing the consequence that the vases should all have the same capacity) but then in a footnote (n. 32) seems to allow the possibility that the numbers represent quantity: Πιστεύουμε όμως ότι στην περίπτωση ποῦ τὰ ἀγγεῖα-ἔπαθλα δὲν εἶχαν τὴν ἴδια περιεκτικότητα ἢ ἀναγραφὴ τῆς ποσότητος τοῦ λαδοῦ ... θὰ ἦταν ἀπαραίτητη σ' ἓνα "πρόγραμμα" Παναθηναϊκῶν ἀγώνων, ὅπως εἶναι αὐτὸ ποῦ μᾶς σώθηκε ἀπὸ τὸν 4ο αἰ. It seems much more likely they stored the oil in large underground pithoi. No one has offered any suggestion of a place on the Acropolis to store 1400 amphorae, though the difficulty of storing them in the Pompeion in the Kerameikos has been discussed in some detail by W. Hoepfner, *Das Pompeion und seine Nachfolgerbauten* (Berlin 1976) 122f.

²⁸ In his commentary Rhodes remarks: "the verb (sc. ἀπομετροῦσι) suggests that the oil was stored in comparatively large containers and transferred to the prize amphorae at a later stage" ([n. 1] 675) although he then goes on to reject this in favor of Mommsen's thesis.

²⁹ It is surprising to find Amyx (n. 10) 182 saying that Aristotle's account "agrees perfectly with the orderly pattern of storing it in *painted* amphoras."

³⁰ The vase, brought to my attention by Kevin Clinton, belongs to the Geroulanos collection and has been published by I. Scheibler, *JdI* 102 (1987) 69, fig.5a-d. For amphorae holding the official metretes of 39.1 liters, see M. Lang and M. Crosby, *Weights, Measures and Tokens* (Princeton 1964) 59.

prize oil in vases illustrating chariots while a wrestler received vases illustrating wrestling. If the vases are made each year that the oil is collected, the athlothetai will have a complicated task distributing the appropriate assignments for the contest illustrations. The easiest method would be to assign the contests collectively, chariots to be made the first year, footraces the second. The available evidence, however, suggests there is no pattern. If we return to the archon groupings above and study the contests illustrated we find that, though two archon groups show consistency, the other six do not. The two Euthykritos vases both show stadion runners and Eschbach identifies wrestlers on all the Kallimedes vases in his catalogue, though the Agora fragment published by Moore and Philippides clearly shows a horse. The Polyzeilos vases show runners (E 16, E 18), pankratists (E 17) and wrestlers (E 19); the Charikleides vases show wrestlers (E 27, E 28, E 29), riders (E 32), boxers (E 36) and runners (Smets cat. 107); the Theophrastos vases show boxers (E 58), runners (E 57) and an apobates (Getty 79.AE.147); the Pythodelos vases show boxers (E 63), horsemen (E 64), wrestlers (E 66), runners (E 67) and runners (E 65); the Niketes vases show runners (E 70) and pankratists (E 69); and the Hegesias vases show boxers (E 74), wrestlers (E 76) and hoplite runners (E 75).³¹ The fact that there will be identical events within one archon year assures us that the victor in each event was not awarded only one painted amphorae as some have supposed, but the range of contests depicted within archon years suggests that either there was no relationship between representation and recipient or that the vases for many events were produced in a single year. Either possibility casts further doubt on the idea that the vases held each archon's quota.

The alternative to Mommsen's theory proposed by von Brauchitsch, that the vases were awarded only at the yearly Panathenaia, not the Great Panathenaia, has never had wide acceptance, in large part because there is nothing other than the odd distribution of archon inscriptions to support it.³² Now that Eschbach has argued persuasively for names from all four years, it too must be returned to its deserved obscurity.

If the names do not reflect legislative decree, that will explain why we have no sign of a similar oil-quota system in the 5th C.³³ It will also explain why we have no sign of a change

³¹ Unless otherwise indicated, the descriptions come from Eschbach. A. Smets' catalogue was published in *AC* 5 (1936).

³² G. von Brauchitsch, *Die Panathenäischen Preisamphoren* (Leipzig 1910) 164f. Brauchitsch has been supported occasionally (see Amyx [n. 10] for a list) but, as Amyx noted, "there is in fact no scrap of direct evidence for the giving of any athletic prizes whatever at the lesser Panathenaia" (180). Also, Gardiner (p. 2) 191 noted that when Aristotle talks of the Panathenaia elsewhere he always means the Great Panathenaia and so in chapter 60 the vases should be made for the Great Panathenaia. The four-year term of the athlothetai supports this. J. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 31 has added other cogent arguments for assuming the reference is to the Great Panathenaia.

³³ Recently P.D. Valavanis, *ArchAnz* 102 (1987) 467-80, following Beazley, has made an extended argument for there being a new system of awards instituted after the restoration of democracy at the end of the fifth century. But his only evidence is the occurrence of archons' names on the amphorae. Rhodes (n. 1, 673) observes that "there is no sign of the archon's being involved in the collection of the olive oil" in Lysias 7, dated to 397. But since the property under discussion had no olive trees (7.28), the collection of oil is not at issue. We hear in 7.2 of agents in charge of selling rights and in 7.25 of two other sorts of officials,

in the system at the end of the 4th C. when the archon-names cease to be found.³⁴ Finally, it will explain why we have so few archon-names from a Panathenaic year. The Panathenaia was celebrated near the beginning of the archon year, on 28 Hekatombaion. Since the athlothetai in charge of procuring the vases were not elected, they needed to obey no civic calendar, and they would presumably not take office until the audits of their predecessors were completed, which in some cases was probably in the year following a Great Panathenaia given the large sums of money they handled.³⁵ Thus the incoming athlothetai would probably not have much to do during the archon year in which the Panathenaia was celebrated. The vases, however, will have had to be ready before the festival, undoubtedly before the beginning of the archon year, and so that fourth year was effectively lost, unless we are to suppose that the athlothetai for one Panathenaia set the contract (or whatever they did to procure the vases) for the next Panathenaia.³⁶

A final argument against a legally fixed system is that there seems to be a gradually increasing preference for the archon of the second year of a Panathenaic cycle over the other three. It is not surprising that there are few if any archon names from the fourth Panathenaic year, when the Great Panathenaia is actually celebrated, for that archon will have taken office only a few days before the celebration. Three years in the cycle remain, and if there were a fixed system we should find a fixed pattern regarding those three years, the most probable being production of the vases in the first year of the cycle. The surprising fact is that while more than two-thirds of the 53 named vases and more than half the archons are from one year, that year is not the first year after a Great Panathenaia but *two* years after. One might then suppose that the contract for production of the amphorae was given in the second year of a Panathenaic cycle, not in the first year, but the distribution suggests a more casual and gradual canonizing of that year at about the time when the inscription itself becomes canonical: before 359 the distribution is: one name in the first year of the cycle (373), three or four in the second year (392?, 380, 364, 360), four in the third (375, 371, 367, 363), perhaps one in the fourth (366?); afterwards the distribution is two or three in the first year (341, 333, 321?), eleven in the second (352, 348, 344, 340, 336, 332, 328, 324, 320, 316, 312), two in the third (347, 323), none in the fourth. Thus we go from 3 or 4 of 8 (38% or 50%) in the second year of the Panathenaic cycle before 359 and 11 of 16 (69%) in the second Panathenaic year thereafter.³⁷

"overseers" (ἐπιμελούμενοι) and "inspectors" (ἐπιγνώμονες), all of which suggests a fairly elaborate system of state control, presumably for the purpose of taxation.

³⁴ The common argument, that the athlothetai were replaced by the agonothetai at this point, has been effectively countered by B. Nagy, *AJA* 96 (1992) 64 n. 43, on the basis of inscriptional evidence for their continued financial activity after 310.

³⁵ For the amounts handled see Nagy 63f.

³⁶ It is widely and reasonably assumed that they awarded contracts for vase-production, though there is no way to tell whether the award was by year, by number or by festival. Because the epitaph of the potter Bacchios, whose name appears on several Panathenaics, speaks of his winning pottery contests, T.B.L. Webster *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens* (London 1972) 11 and Tiverios (n. 8) 144-46 believe there was a competition for the contract.

³⁷ For the dates see the appendix. For the questionable 366, see above p. 239 (also pp. 246 and 247); for the questionable 392 see p. 247 with n. 40. Prof. Wallace notes *per litteras*, "In none of the 16 Panathenaic quadrennia from 374-310 do more than two of the four possible names occur. Only in 374-370 are the names non-

Thus, it seems unlikely that the archon names were required by the state since only gradually did they become part of the canonical design and since the preference for one year of the cycle over another is never absolute. More likely the names were added to enhance the appearance of the vases.³⁸ Immerwahr ([n. 3] 183-185) lists a number of inscriptions on Panathenaic vases other than the common game or archon inscriptions. The majority occur in the late 6th C. and are usually potters' signatures, but Moore notes that they "reappear occasionally much later, in the first half of the 4th century B.C." (Moore and Philippides [n. 8] 14). Potters' names are certainly not official, and I have argued elsewhere that the same is probably true of the game inscriptions.³⁹

Appendix: Panathenaic Amphorae with Archon Names (#=fragment)

- 392/1 Philokles?:⁴⁰ Berlin 3980, E 12
 #380/79 Pytheas: Athens, Agora P 27556 (Moore and Philippides [n. 8] pl. 30)
 #375/4 Hippodamas: Istanbul L 3149, ABV 413
 373/2 Asteios: Oxford 572, ABV 412, E 13
 371/0 Phrasikleides: Alexandria 18239, ABV 412, E 15
 367/6 Polyzelos: Brussels A 1703, ABV 413, E 16
 367/6 Polyzelos: London B 603, ABV 414, E 19
 367/6 Polyzelos: San Simeon,⁴¹ ABV 413, E 18
 #366/5? Kephisodoros: Athens 3rd Ephoria A 6369, E 22
 #364/3 Timokrates, Eleusis, Smets (n. 34) cat. 105
 363/2 Charikleides: Athens, National Museum 20047 (Alexandri [n. 18] fig. 233)
 363/2 Charikleides: Athens, National Museum 20048 (Alexandri fig. 234)
 363/2 Charikleides: Athens, *Praktika* 1976 pl. 44, E 29
 363/2 Charikleides: Eleusis 2703, ABV 414, E 32
 #363/2 Charikleides: Eretria E/5-71, *AntK* 22 (1979) pl.8.1/2
 360/59 Kallimedes: Athens, National Museum 20044 (Alexandri fig. 235)
 360/59 Kallimedes: Athens, National Museum 20045 (Alexandri fig. 178)
 360/59 Kallimedes: Athens, National Museum 20046 (Alexandri fig. 163)
 #360/59 Kallimedes: Athens, Agora P 31 (Moore and Philippides pl. 31)
 #352/1 Aristodemos: Chicago, Smets cat. 111
 #348/7 Theophilos: Athens, Kerameikos PA13, E 54 (= Smets cat. 112?)

consecutive. For 358–354 no names survive. In the remaining 14 cases you have either one name or two consecutive names, suggesting that the activity which prompted the use of the name was a single activity in each quadrennium, one which took place in summer and so sometimes extended from the later part of one archon year into the earlier part of the next; this seems to suit the filling of a large order for amphoras well." Such a system would lessen the problem of storing 1400 amphorae, which would need housing for a year at most.

³⁸ To what end? Perhaps to give the potter an edge in the competition for the contract, if there was a competition (see n. 36). In both cases where there is variation in use of the archon's name within one year (367 and 360 B.C.), the variation is consistent with Eschbach's stylistic groupings.

³⁹ *Choes and Anthesteria* (Ann Arbor 1992) chapt. 6.

⁴⁰ Only the final sigma remains. Asteios is usually rejected on stylistic grounds (e.g. Beazley [n. 8] 89); Frel (n. 7) 285 notes Theodotos and Dexitheos as other possibilities. See also Valavanis (n. 33) 468 n. 7.

⁴¹ New York: Metropolitan Museum 56.171.6.

- #347/6 Themistocles: *Annali* 1877, S113⁴²
 #344/3 Lykiskos: Athens 3rd Ephoria A6367, E 55
 #344/3 Lykiskos: Leiden RO II, 149 (CVA Leiden Rijksmuseum 1 pl. 43.3)
 341/40 Nichomachos: Alexandria 18238, ABV 414, E 56
 340/39 Theophrastos: Cyrene, E 62
 340/39 Theophrastos Harvard 1925.30.124, ABV 414, E 58
 340/39 Theophrastos: Louvre MN 706, ABV 415, E 57
 340/39 Theophrastos: Malibu, Getty Museum 79.AE.147⁴³
 336/5 Pythodelos: London B 607, ABV 415, E 63
 336/5 Pythodelos: London B 608, ABV 417, E 65
 336/5 Pythodelos: Munich 7767, ABV 417, E 64
 336/5 Pythodelos: Volos Ka 4266/91, E 67
 #336/5? Pythodelos: Breccia Inscr.gr. et lat.xix, Smets cat. 123
 333/2 Nikokrates: London B 609, ABV 415, E 68
 332/1 Niketes: London B 610, ABV 417, E 69
 332/1 Niketes: Sèvres 7230, ABV 415, E 70
 328/7 Euthykritos: London B 611, ABV 415, E 71
 328/7 Euthykritos: Berlin 3981, ABV 415, E 72
 324/3 Hegesias: Cab. Méd. 248, ABV 415, E 75
 324/3 Hegesias: Once Lemaire, ABV 415, E 76
 324/3 Hegesias: Louvre MNB 3223, ABV 415, E 74
 323/2 Kephisodoros: Louvre MN 704, ABV 415, E 77
 321/0 or 318/7 Archippos: Louvre MN 705, ABV 416, E 79
 320/19 Neaichmos: Leningrad, ABV 416, E 80
 #320/19 Neaichmos: Athens, Kerameikos 184 (Frel, n. 7, fig. 4)
 #320/19 Neaichmos, Baltimore: CVA Robinson pl. 33.2, Smets cat. 136
 #320/19 Neaichmos: Leningrad 17.685/6, ABV 416, E 81
 #316/5 Demokleides: Athens, Agora P 2106 (Moore and Philippides pl. 32)
 #316/5 Demokleides: Athens, Kerameikos 219 (Frel fig. 5)
 #316/5 Demokleides: Athens, Kerameikos 104 (Frel fig. 6)
 312/1 Polemon: Athens, Smets cat. 141
 312/1 Polemon: Athens, Kerameikos 583, E 73⁴⁴

Bryn Mawr

Richard Hamilton

⁴² I do not include the fragmentary vase with the name Them(i)stocles listed in Smets' catalogue (cat. 114) and apparently the same as Agora P 1847 since Frel (n. 7) 287 says this is the 2nd C. agonothetes not the archon, though Moore and Philippides (n. 8) 139 list him as the archon.

⁴³ *Archaeological News* 10 [1981] 91.

⁴⁴ Some archon inscriptions are too fragmentary to be deciphered: Agora P 113 (Moore and Philippides #273), P 18635 (Moore and Philippides #278), P 22916 (Moore and Philippides #290), Varvakeion (Smets cat. 144); Thebes Kabeirion PA 35a, in K. Braun-T.E. Haevernick, *Bemalte Keramik und Glas aus dem Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben* (Berlin 1981) pl. 32.12. I am grateful to Kevin Clinton, Harrison Eiteljorg, Ludwig Koenen and Malcolm Wallace for help with argument, expression and detail.