

LOREN J. SAMONS II

A NOTE ON THE PARTHENON INVENTORIES AND THE DATE OF *IG I³ 52B*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 179–182

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A NOTE ON THE PARTHENON INVENTORIES AND THE DATE OF *IG* i³ 52B

Scholars have long maintained that the series of inscribed inventories of Athena's treasure in the three cellae of the Parthenon (the *hekatompedon*, *parthenon*, and *pronaos*) beginning with the year 434/3, and the supposed orders to publish such inventories believed to be implied in the so-called second financial decree of Kallias, provide evidence for the passage of the "Kallias decrees" (*IG* i³ 52A, B) in this year.¹ However, in a recent article I have argued that the portion of the putative second Kallias decree that has been taken to imply an order to publish inventories of Athena's treasure in the Parthenon (*IG* i³ 52B, lines 26–29) in fact does not refer to this treasure in the Parthenon at all. The procedures spelled out in the decree are inconsistent with those in the actual inventories as they have come down to us; the orders in these lines rather refer to a certain amount of treasure (primarily monetary) in the Opisthodomos, a subject at issue on both sides of the stone.² Here I wish to provide additional support for this conclusion, and to make two related points. 1) The published inventories for the years 434/3–433/2 in fact suggest that *no* order to publish inventories of the Parthenon treasure existed before early 432/1, and 2) those who would date the "Kallias decrees" to 434/3 should therefore reject the idea that decree B ordered the publication of these inventories, otherwise a traditional support for the date 434/3 must become a liability.

The evidence for these conclusions derives from the first inscribed inventories of Athena's treasure in the *hekatompedon* (*IG* i³ 317, 318) and *parthenon* (*IG* i³ 343, 344). As W. E. Thompson demonstrated, the inventories of these cellae for the years 434/3 and 433/2 were inscribed at the same time.³ Thompson also noted the significance of these inscriptions because of their (presumed) connection to the Kallias decrees.⁴ Yet their significance differs from that usually supposed. For since the second inventory in each case (*IG* i³ 318, 344) mentions not only the board of Treasurers of Athena for the year 433/2, but also names and describes the transfer of the treasures to the next board of Tamiai (of 432/1), it follows necessarily that the inscriptions were not recorded on stone until after the transfer of the treasure in early 432/1.⁵ Note, for example, the wording of *IG* i³ 318, lines 8–12 (the *hekatompedon* inventory for 433/2):

¹ See, for example, H. T. Wade-Gery and B. D. Meritt, "The Decrees of Kallias", *Hesperia* 16 (1947), 284–85, R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1969), p. 158, and R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 522, 601. For the possibility that only decree A should be ascribed to Kallias see L. Kallet-Marx, "The Kallias Decree, Thucydides, and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War", *CQ* 39 (1989), 94–113, and note 13 below.

² L. J. Samons II, "The 'Kallias Decrees' (*IG* i³ 52) and the Inventories of Athena's Treasure in the Parthenon", *CQ* 46 (1996), 91–102.

³ W. E. Thompson, "Notes on the Treasurers of Athena", *Hesperia* 39 (1970), 54–63, esp. 57–8. In each case the inscriptions are in the same hand, and the second inventory (for 433/2) begins in mid-line, where the earlier inventory ends. Normal practice thereafter was to begin each inventory at the left margin (Thompson, 58). See also n. 12 below.

⁴ Thompson (n. 3), 58 n. 2, where he wrote that these inventories were special "in being the first ones prepared in accordance with the Second Kallias Decree . . . lines 26–9".

⁵ On the procedure cf. J. Tréheux, *Études sur les inventaires attiques* (1965) = *Annales de l'Est. Mem.* 29: *Études d'archéologie classique* III, pp. 12 ff., Thompson (n. 3), 57–8, and D. Harris, "Freedom of Information and Accountability: the Inventory Lists of the Parthenon", in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, R. Osborne, S. Hornblower, eds. (Oxford, 1994), p. 218. In view of the clear language of the inscriptions, it does not seem to me necessary to argue that the inventories are records of the actual *paradoseis* themselves (the formal transfers of the treasure from one board of Tamiai to the next), that they were recorded after these events and that they are not normally prospective. T. Linders, "Inscriptions and Orality", *SO* 67 (1992), 27–40, recently has attempted to characterize the inscribed records of the transfers of treasure as illustrative of the "oral" nature of Greek society. Yet Linders' contention that variations in the inventories from year to year and the difficulty of reading the inscriptions testify to their status as "symbols" (32) can easily be inverted. The variations in the inventories are perhaps more likely to result from the actual process of taking an

ἡτάδε ἡοὶ ταμίαι[ι] τῶν ἡιεράων χρεμάτ[ο]υ τέ[ς] Ἀθηναία[ς] Πρ^{νν}]-
 [ονάπες Ἐρχιεὺς] καὶ χσυνάρχοντες, ἡοῖς Εὐ[θί]ας Αἴσχρο[ο]νος Ἀνα[φλ]ύσ[τι]ος ἐγρα[μμά]νν]-
 [τευε, παρέδοσαν] τοῖς ταμίαισιν, ἡοῖς Ἀπολλόδορος Κριτίο Ἀφ[ιδναῖος] ἐγραμμάτευε ὕ]
 [παραδεχσάμενο]ι παρὰ τῶν προτέρων ταμιδ[ῶ]ν, ἡοῖς Κράτες Ναύπονος [Λαμπρεὺς] ἐγραμ-
 [μάτευε, ἐν τῷ νε]ῶι τῷ ἡεκατοπέδοι . . .

The following things the Tamiai of the sacred treasure of Athena [of 433/2], Pronapes of Erchia and his colleagues for whom Euthias son of Aischron of Anaphlystos was secretary, surrendered to the Tamiai for whom Apollodoros son of Kritios of Aphidna was secretary [of 432/1], having received [them] from the earlier Tamiai, for whom Krates son of Naupon of Lamptrai was secretary [of 434/3]: in the *hekatompedon* . . .

Presumably this transfer occurred on or about Hekatombaion 28, when the Tamiai of Athena took office.⁶ Simply put, the treasurers of 433/2 will have surrendered their treasure to the succeeding Tamiai on or about Hekatombaion 28 of 432/1, after which time the record of this transaction (and the inventory of the previous year, which as Thompson demonstrated was inscribed with it) can have been cut on stone. The earliest possible date for these inscriptions is therefore Hekatombaion 28–29, 432/1. Thus even if *IG* i³ 52B was passed in late 434/3,⁷ a good deal more than one year will have elapsed between its passage and the inscription of the inventories it has been taken to order. If the so-called second Kallias decree (or any other Athenian *psephisma*) ordered the publication of these inventories, the orders were ignored during this period.

We should not, however, presume that the Athenians passed and inscribed decrees or laws they then chose to ignore.⁸ Thus the conventional date for the decree (434/3) and the orthodox hypothesis that it ordered the publication of inventories of the Parthenon treasure seem incompatible with the inventories themselves. Any order to publish inventories passed before early 432/1 should have led to the publication of the records for 434/3 (which obviously existed after the treasure's transfer circa Hekatombaion 28, 433/2, but which were not inscribed until after Hekatombaion 28, 432/1). For anyone who nevertheless continues to accept the previously assumed connection between the inventories and the Kallias decrees, the simultaneous inscription early in 432/1 of the *parthenon* and *hekatompedon* inventories of

inventory each year than from simply relying on previous records as models. Likewise, the difficulty of reading a particular document arguably testifies to the complex and “literate” nature of a society, as the perusal of any modern public record will show. Moreover, in the fourth century officials might be ordered to make copies of lists inscribed on stelai (*IG* ii² 120, lines 22–24), surely indicating that such inscriptions were more than mere symbols (I thank J. P. Sickinger for this reference). Note also that Athenian government placed great emphasis on the γραμματεὺς, or “scribe”, who served each board of officials (see our inscription above). For other criticisms of similar attempts to demonstrate the “oral” nature of Athenian culture see S. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion* (Amsterdam, 1989), p. 107 with n. 3, and especially J. P. Sickinger, “Inscriptions and Archives in Classical Athens”, *Historia* 43 (1994), 286–96.

⁶ For the duration of office of the Tamiai see W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* (Cambridge, MA, 1932), pp. 138–39 n. 2, 145–46 n. 1; cf. Tréheux (n. 5), p. 7 with n. 2.

⁷ Meiggs and Lewis (n. 1), p. 158, place the decree's passage “after the Great Panathenaia of 434 (B 27) and shortly before the elections (? in the spring) of 433 (A 14). If this date is approximately right these decrees precede Athens' acceptance of Corcyra's appeal for help against Corinth in the summer of 433.” They would also precede the actual inscription of the inventories by perhaps a good deal more than 13 months, since according to the Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 44.4), in the fourth century at any rate elections were held during the first prytany with favorable omens after the sixth prytany (i.e., somewhat after mid-year: but see P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* [Oxford, 1981], pp. 536–37 on the problem of fixing the approximate date of the elections). If the decrees were passed any time within archon-year 434/3 (which ran from Hekatombaion 1 to Skirophorion, *ultimo*) they will have preceded the transfer of 433/2 (c. Hekatombaion 28 of that year) by at least a full month, and the transfer of the following year by an additional 12 or 13 months (depending on the intercalary or regular nature of 433/2).

⁸ I do not mean to imply that the Athenians were incapable of ignoring their own legislation, but rather to assert that without strong evidence of such it is methodologically improper to assume that a *psephisma* was ignored in order to support another (unproved) hypothesis.

434/3 and 433/2 necessarily undercuts the date of 434/3 for the passage of *IG* i³ 52B, unless one of the following sets of conditions can be met:

1) The extremely fragmentary inventories of the *pronaos* (the third cella of the Parthenon) for 434/3 and 433/2 (*IG* i³ 292, 293) can be demonstrated to have been cut at different times (and not together in early 432/1 like those of the *hekatompedon* and *parthenon*), and it is shown that the orders to publish inventories presumed to have been implied in *IG* i³ 52B (or inscribed on the lost portion of the stone) should be understood to order such publication *only* for one room of the Parthenon, the *pronaos*. On this view only later (presumably after Hekatombaion 28, 432/1) will the decision have been made to publish the inventories of the other cellae of the Parthenon as well.

2) The *pronaos* inventories for 434/3 and 433/2 can be demonstrated to have been cut at different times and it can be shown that the orders presumed in *IG* i³ 52 were simply ignored for two of the Parthenon cellae for a time. Since, however, the *pronaos* inventories on this view would have been inscribed in accordance with the orders, some special hypothesis will be necessary to explain this anomaly.

3) It can be shown that the inventories of 434/3 and 433/2 for the *hekatompedon* and *parthenon* were originally inscribed on other stones (no longer extant), but for some reason were reinscribed after 28 Hekatombaion 432/1 on the present stones. Again, if the *pronaos* inventories for these years can be shown to have been inscribed at different times, and not reinscribed together later, this anomaly will require an explanation.

Alternatively some scholars may now wish to argue that *IG* i³ 52B only implies orders to *take* inventories of Athena's treasure in the Parthenon, whereas a later decree must have ordered their publication. Since, however, we may conclude that the practice of taking inventories of Athena's treasure (wherever it was located) had long been a part of the *Tamiai*'s duties, such an order to compile what were regular inventories (without an accompanying special order to *publish* the documents) will seem odd.⁹

Professor J. P. Sickinger and I examined the fragments of the *pronaos* inventories of 434/3–431/0 (*IG* i³ 292–295, with the exception of the small fragment EM 5397) as they are now reconstructed in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. This stele originally contained the inventories of these four years on its obverse, while its reverse may have been inscribed with the records of an additional quadrennium.¹⁰ While we agreed that the letter forms in *IG* i³ 292 and 293 were very similar, neither of us felt able either to identify the hands in the two inscriptions or to attribute them to different masons. Both inventories do show certain similar irregularities with regard to the length of the lowest horizontal stroke in the epsilon, and variations in the right-most hasta of the nu. This stroke ranges in both inventories from one parallel to the first vertical hasta to the clearly slanting stroke of a less-developed nu.

It did not appear likely to us, therefore, that the remaining fragments of *IG* i³ 292–293 will help determine decisively if the two inventories were inscribed simultaneously in early 432/1. However, the two inventories inscribed below the first two on our stone (*IG* i³ 294–295) provide one small indication that this is a likely scenario. Both these later inventories are inscribed in a script significantly smaller than that employed for the earlier records, with the tau, for example, averaging .009 x .009m (as opposed to .011 x .011m in *IG* i³ 292–293). The difference in size is apparent even at a casual glance. Obviously the mason who inscribed the third inventory on our stone (*IG* i³ 294) must have concluded that sufficient room did not exist on the face of the stele for four inventories equivalent in size to the

⁹ See Samons (n. 2), 97–101, for the *Tamiai*'s responsibilities for inventories; it is argued there that *IG* i³ 52B orders a special counting of a certain amount of treasure formerly unweighed and uncounted. To the argument that the orders in decree B relate to the newly opened Parthenon one may reply that the only repository mentioned in the extant portion of the decree is the *Opisthodomos* (lines 24–5), which, wherever located, was not one of the three cellae whose inventories we actually possess: see *ibid.*, 96–7 with n. 27, and 98 n. 32.

¹⁰ For the possible arrangement of inscriptions on the stone see W. E. Thompson, "*Conspectus Traditionum*", *CQ* 16 (1966), 286–90, and *IG* i³, p. 292.

first two. He, therefore, reduced the size of his lettering for *IG* i³ 294, and this reduced size was maintained for *IG* i³ 295 as well. Now since the inventories are generally reproductions of lists of the same items from year to year (plus additions),¹¹ the mason cutting the second inventory on our stone by simple measurement of the previous year's inventory could have easily determined what the mason of the next year's inventory realized – the size of the inscriptions had to be reduced if the stele was to contain four complete inventories. The fact that the mason of the second year's inventory made no such calculation, but continued on in the style of the first inventory, combined with our knowledge that the *hekatompedon* and *parthenon* inventories for these same years (434/3 – 433/2) were inscribed together early in 432/1, makes it reasonable to infer (although by no means proves) that the *pronaos* inventories of these years were also inscribed together.¹²

In the unlikely case that one of the above sets of conditions is fulfilled, and scholars prove willing to accept the improbabilities of the resulting scenario, this would only show that the style of inscription of the *hekatompedon* and *parthenon* inventories for 434/3–433/2 *does not militate against* the date of 434/3 for the Kallias decrees for those who would still accept the previously assumed relationship between these documents. But in lieu of this eventuality, or the discovery of the lost portion of *IG* i³ 52B supposedly ordering the publication of the Parthenon inventories and spelling out the procedure for calculation and publication actually seen in the inventories themselves, one must either consider the date of 434/3 for *IG* i³ 52B problematic, or abandon the view that decree B implies an order to publish the inventories of the Parthenon.¹³ Since the fact remains that the hypothetical connection between *IG* i³ 52B and the published inventories is belied by the contents and style of the documents themselves,¹⁴ it would seem preferable to accept the separation of the decree from the inventories. Thus the beginning of the inscribed series of inventories of the Parthenon treasure cannot be used as positive evidence *for* a given date for the so-called Kallias decrees.¹⁵

Boston University

Loren J. Samons II

¹¹ The *pronaos* only received a few dedications in these years (see Thompson at *IG* i³, pp. 305–6), thus the inscribed inventory did not increase appreciably in size.

¹² The stone masons cutting the *hekatompedon* and *parthenon* inventories each ended the last entry of the first year (434/3) relatively early in the line, after space 21 of 67 possible spaces in the stoichedon line (*IG* i³ 317, line 8), and space 13 of 73 possible (*IG* i³ 343, line 16), perhaps encouraging each one to continue in the same line with the next inventory (of 433/2), after a mark of punctuation in the case of *IG* i³ 318. The first *pronaos* inventory, on the other hand, ends late in the last line, after space 44 of 53 (*IG* i³ 292, line 13), perhaps encouraging this mason (if they are in the same hand) to begin the next inventory on a new line. According to Thompson (n. 3), 57, “the inventories of a Panathenaic penteteris are normally in four different hands. Presumably, a different mason was called upon each year to perform the task.”

¹³ Kallet-Marx (n. 1), 94–113, has adduced strong arguments for the temporal separation of decrees A and B and the possibility that only decree A was moved by Kallias. It should, therefore, be noted that any arguments relating to B lines 26–9 and the inventories of Athena's treasure are only relevant for the dating of *that* document. On this view the formula in B, lines 26–9, suggesting the year of a Great Panathenaia for its passage also applies only to that decree; the possibilities for its date are further restricted to years of this festival after the beginning of construction of the Propylaea (437/6; cf. B, lines 4–5). Formal possibilities therefore include 430/29, 426/5, 422/1, 418/7, 414/3. The accounts of the Logistai inscription (*IG* i³ 369) have been taken to exclude the years between 433/2 and 423/2 from consideration, since they record no repayments between those years such as those apparently ordered in *IG* i³ 52; for the date 422/1 for both decrees see H. B. Mattingly, “Athenian Finance in the Peloponnesian War”, *BCH* 92 (1968), 456–58 [450–85], and “The Mysterious 3000 Talents of the First Kallias Decree”, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 15–22; for 418/7, C. W. Fornara, “The Date of the Callias Decrees”, *GRBS* 11 (1970), 185–96; cf. also W. K. Pritchett, “Kallias: Fact or Fancy?”, *CSCA* 4 (1971), 220–25.

¹⁴ For the differences in procedures indicated in *IG* i³ 52B and the inventories themselves see Samons (n. 2), 91–101. I should have noted there that H. B. Mattingly, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 16, long ago noticed that some items remained unweighed in the inventories after 434/3, in apparent contradiction of the orders in B, lines 26–9.

¹⁵ See also Samons (n. 2), esp. pp. 97–101. I wish to thank Dr. Harry Kritzas, Director of the Epigraphical Museum, for making my visits to the museum both useful and pleasant, and Professor J. P. Sickinger, who, apart from many other good offices, gave up much of his own time to examine inscriptions with me in the museum and provided useful criticisms and suggestions for this paper.