

VINCENT GABRIELSEN

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SHIP'S EQUIPMENT IN THE ATHENIAN NAVAL
RECORDS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 98 (1993) 175–183

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SHIP'S EQUIPMENT IN THE ATHENIAN NAVAL RECORDS¹

I.

In ZPE 79,1989,93-99, I questioned the view that the formula "name of a person + εἰρήνευκεν", met in the Athenian naval records of the fourth century B.C., notes payments of an eisphora levy in kind (i.e. in ship's equipment). Furthermore, I adduced evidence showing that the verb εἰσφέρειν was employed by the epimeletai ton neorion (henceforth epimeletai) for two separate purposes: (a) to note whether ship's equipment had been physically placed ('entered') in the dockyards by naval officials responsible for its return; (b) to distinguish privately owned equipment that had been deposited in the dockyards on loan.² In a recent article, Jean Marie Schmitt explains the use of εἰσφέρειν in naval contexts differently.³ He argues that in all instances the equipment concerned belonged to the public rather than to individuals who lent it to the state; that, generally, "someone εἰρήνευκεν" designates the return of such equipment to the dockyards; and that in IG II² 1609 this formula particularly distinguishes equipment which, after having being surrendered by retiring trierarchs, was reissued by the epimeletai in great haste without carrying out the usual inspection in order to determine its condition or completeness.

The main aim of this article is to demonstrate that this explanation is untenable and directly contradicted by the naval records. At the same time a number of erroneous assumptions in Schmitt's argument make it necessary to broaden our discussion with treatment of the matters listed in certain rubrics of the records, and especially in those of IG II² 1609.

II.

1. One rubric comes from the section of IG II² 1622 (of ca. 342/1?) which records a large-scale debt collection; "those serving in the dockyards" in the years 345/4-342/1 had collected money and/or equipment from naval officials of previous years.

¹ IG II² 1604-1632.

² V.Gabrielsen, "IG II² 1609 and Eisphora Payments in kind?", ZPE 79,1989,93-99. The formula "name of a person + εἰρήνευκεν" is found in IG II² 1609; 1614.89-98; 1622.387-97, 444-77; 1631.350-403.

³ J.M.Schmitt, "Quelle est l'interprétation convenable de l'inscription IG II² 1609?", in: P.Goukowsky & C.Brixhe (edd.); *Hellènika Symmikta, histoire, archéologie, épigraphie. Études d'archéologie classique VII*, 1991,134-141, henceforth Schmitt.

Εὐθ[υ]νος Λαμπρεύς,
 ταμίαις γενόμενος
 τριηροποϊκῶν ἐπὶ
 390 Ἄρχιου ἄρχοντος (346/5)
 Χ Χ Χ Π Η,
 ἀπολαβῶν κόπας
 παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ νεω-
 ρίου τῶν παραδοθει-
 395 σῶν, ὧν αὐτὸς εἰσή-
 νενκεν, ἀδοκίμους
 χιλίας ὀκτακοσίας.

Euthynos, Schmitt claims, was in default because he had substituted old oars for new ones, i.e. at the end of his tenure, in 346/5 or later (in 343/2?), he delivered to the dockyards 1,800 old and useless oars, when he should have been delivering new ones. For that reason, it is argued, he was compelled to take back the defect oars and at the same time to pay the amount of 3,600 dr. So Euthynos was really forced to "buy back" the oars.⁴ This is an interesting scenario, but unfortunately it will not do for various reasons.⁵

(i) To my knowledge no parallel instances survive to show that trierarchs or naval officials returning useless equipment or hulls were obliged to buy these items back. Their responsibility merely consisted in paying compensation for damages, while the material stayed at the dockyards; the host of items described as ἀδόκιμα ("useless") is ample evidence to that effect.⁶ Granted, the epimeletai occasionally sold public material and handed the proceeds over to the apodektai; but such transactions carry a different significance than the one discussed here, and required the boule's authorization - always mentioned explicitly.⁷

(ii) In 323/2, it was discovered that the epimeletai of 325/4 and their secretary had written on the stele that they had delivered two 'heavy' (παχέα) sails, when they should have been

⁴ Schmitt, pp. 134-5, basically following A.Böckh, *Urkunden über das Seewesen des attischen Staates*, Berlin 1840, 54, henceforth Böckh, *Urkunden*.

⁵ Lines 392-7 explain why Euthynos was asked to pay 3,600 dr. Even though this section is composed in the bureaucratic shorthand usually employed in these documents, it gives a clear account of the chronological sequence of events (cf. IG II² 1622.445-4). Therefore, ἀπολαβῶν κόπας cannot be (as Schmitt thinks) the last but the first thing that happened. Incidentally, ἀπολαβή/ἀπολαμβάνειν usually designates transfers of naval material taking place on occasions other than the surrender (παραλαβή/παραδόσις) of such material at the end of the year (cf. ZPE 79, 1989, 93-4); ἀπολαβῶν cannot be made to mean "buy back".

⁶ See, in addition, the obligation of trierarchs (i) to repair hulls (IG II² 1612.91-9), (ii) to replace severely damaged hulls with new hulls and to demolish the old ones (IG II² 1623.14-24), and (iii) to compensate for equipment (IG II² 1631.442f., 517ff). Cf. [Dem.] 50.36: λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ (sc. Polykles) ταῦτα, ἀπεκρινάμην [sc. Apollodoros] αὐτῷ ὅτι σκευή μὲν διὰ τοῦτο οὐ λάβοιμι ἐκ τοῦ νεωρίου, ὅτι σὺ ἀδόκιμα ἐποίησας αὐτά...!

⁷ IG II² 1629.1133-62; 1631.326-43.

delivering two 'light' (λεπτά) sails - the latter being of a finer quality and hence more expensive. Therefore the officials were compelled to pay an additional 300 dr. (i.e. the balance), "according to the valuation register" (IG II² 1631.415-18). This is a true instance of material being 'switched' (intentionally or not, we cannot say), and the epimeletai of 323/2 saw to it that this fact was properly noted.

(iii) A basic assumption in Schmitt's reconstruction is that the oars which Euthynos ought to have delivered were 'new'. Even though the inscription contains no reference to 'new' oars, Schmitt shares Böckh's belief that this is evident from Euthynos' official capacity as tamias trieropoikon,⁸ i.e. treasurer of the special committee of the boule (τριηροποιοί) responsible for the annual construction of hulls and equipment. However, this view is at odds with two observations.

In the first place, when new material is introduced by the tamiai trieropoikon, the word used to single out that material is not εἰρήνευκεν but ἐποιήσατο.⁹ IG II² 1628 (of 326/5) furnishes several examples, one of which (lines 2-6) reads as follows: [nomen triremis, (...) τῶν ἐπὶ Νικήτο (332/1) / [ναυ]πηγ[ηθειῶν, ἦν ἐπ]ο[ή]σατο ταμ[ία]ς Δημοκ[ρά]τ[η]ς Εἰτεα[ί]ος (332/1), κτλ.¹⁰ If Euthynos' original obligation (recorded in IG II² 1622, lines 392-7) consisted in returning oars constructed during his tenure, his name would have appeared in a formulaic expression very similar to that cited above.

In the second place, the belief that the tamiai trieropoikon handled new equipment only is false. This is demonstrated by a rubric of IG II² 1627 in which the epimeletai of 330/29 noted the receipt, from their predecessors in office, of a list of persons withholding old and useless wooden equipment.¹¹ One such withholder was the tamias trieropoikon (of 332/1) mentioned above, Demokrates Eiteaios.

	Δημοκράτην Εἰτεαίον,	385	ἴτους: ΔΠΙ: κατὰ ψήφικ-
375	ταμίαν τριηρο[ποι]ϊκῶν,		μα βουλῆς, ὃ εἶπεν Καλλί-
	λαβόντα τοῖς ἀ[νδ]ραπόδοις		ετρα[τος] Θεορίκιος· κώπας
	εἰς οἰκοδομίαν τοῖς τὸν		δὲ θ[ρι]πηδέτους καὶ
	κρημνὸν καθαίρουσιν		ἀδοκίμους λαβόντα
	κατὰ ψήφικμα βουλῆς,	390	τοῖς ἀνδραπόδοις τα-
380	ὃ εἶπεν Καλλίστρατος		μίαν τριηροποιϊκῶν

⁸ Schmitt, p.134, n.4, and 135, n.1; cf. Böckh, Urkunden 54: "Euthynos (...) hatte Ruder angeschafft oder eingebracht, etc." However, in a very similar case concerning the delivery of a set of oars (tarros), the condition of the set is specified as follows: ταρρῶ ἀργοῦ (an "undressed tarros"), IG II² 1629.689-99.

⁹ Cf. also Ath.Pol. 46.1: ποιεῖται [sc. ἡ βουλῆ] δὲ τὰς τριήρεις, δέκα ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐ[τῆς] ἐλομένη τριηροποιοῦς.

¹⁰ Other examples are: IG II² 1628.10-14, 81-6. On Demokrates Eiteaios see 1627.374-7, 390-2; 1628.85-6, 533-4, 548-9; 1629.1010-11, 1025-26; 11631.237-8, 249-50.

¹¹ Repeated in IG II² 1628.533-51 (of which lines 527-30 preserve the heading: καὶ τὰδε παρελάβομεν / τῶν κευῶν τῶν παλαιῶν / τῶν ἀδοκίμων τῶν ξυλί/νων ἔχοντας); 1629.1010-29; 1631.237-51.

Θορίκιος, ἰ[ς]τοῦς: Γ Γ I. καὶ τοῖς ἐ[π]ὶ τὸ στάδιον ἡιρημένοις κεραίων ξύλα: Δ Δ Δ Γ II:	395	Δημοκράτην Εἰτεαίων κατὰ ψήφισμα βουλῆς, ὃ εἶπεν Καλλίστρατος Θορίκιος: Η Η Η Η Γ I.
---	-----	--

In accordance with a decree of the boule, Demokrates received "old and useless" wooden equipment from the neoria which he then issued for building purposes outside the naval sphere: (a) 56 masts and 406 useless, worm-eaten oars were handed over to the slaves working on the demolition of the κρημνός;¹² (b) timbers from 37 sail-yards and 16 masts were employed by those in charge of some work done in the stadion. Still in 323/2 Demokrates had not returned that material to the dockyards (IG II² 1631.237-51).

This entry brings out clearly three things. Firstly, all transfers of material (including those to other naval officials) were supervised by the epimeletai.¹³ Secondly, equipment issued by the epimeletai to someone though the tamias trieropoikon had to be returned by means of exactly the same procedure. Thirdly, and most importantly, the tamiai trieropoikon had in their hands also equipment that was either relatively old or, as in this case, no longer serviceable.

In the light of this evidence, the interpretation of IG II² 1622, lines 387-97, which I originally offered in ZPE 79, 1989, 95, still seems to me the most likely. During his tenure as tamias trieropoikon in 346/5, Euthynos had received oars from the dockyard officials (ἀπολαβὼν κόπας παρ' ἡμῶν)¹⁴ in the same manner as his colleague Demokrates Eiteaios did in a later year. Probably, these oars had been previously surrendered by trierarchs. At the formal delivery of this material back to the dockyards (τῶν παραδοθειῶν), it was found that Euthynos had brought in (εἰσήνεγκεν) 1,800 useless oars. For that reason he was made liable to pay 3,600 dr. (i.e. 2 dr. per oar).

2. The next rubric concerns also the recovery of a debt during the eispraxis of 345/4-342/1 (IG II² 1622).

445	Εὐθύμαχος E[- - -], ταμίας γενό[μενος] ἐς τὰ νεώρια [ἐπὶ Θε]- μιτοκλέου[ς ἄρχο,] (347/6)	455	κεύη δὲ αὐτὰ ἀπέδω- κε τάδε· (...) ταρρόν, ὃν Φορμίων
-----	---	-----	--

¹² Böckh, Urkunden 413, took κρημνός to be "die steile Einfassung des Ufers im Innern des Hafens, wo die Schiffe anlegen", but its location remains uncertain.

¹³ This disproves Schmitt's claim (p. 134, n. 4): "Cela dit, le trésorier tōn trièropoikōn avait nécessairement aussi accès au dépôt comme son collègue chargé des mouvements triérarchiques, et c'était sans doute parfois l'occasion de substitutions frauduleuses."

¹⁴ It has been suggested that these officials may not have been the regular board of epimeletai (G.L.Cawkwell, JHS 83 [1963] 57, n.2, referring to an unpublished essay by D.M.Lewis, cf. P.J.Rhodes, The Athenian Boule [Oxford, 1972], pp. 119, 239-40). The fact that the officials carrying out the eispraxis are called οἱ ἄρχοντες (i.e. ἡ ἀρχή: 1622.379-80), instead of οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ (τῶν νεωρίων), cannot exclude the possibility that the latter are meant, cf. IG II²1604.8 et passim, 1623.304, and [Dem.] 47.21-2.

	τῶν κευῶν, [ῶν]	Πειραι: εἰσήνεγκε,	
	ἔλαβε παρὰ [τῶν]	ταρρόν, ὄν Εὐδράων	
450	τριηράρχων [καὶ οὐκ]	475	Θορίκι εἰσήνεγκε,
	εἰσήνεγκε γρά[ψας]		ταρρόν ὄν Ἀρχέδημ-
	ἐν τῇι κτήλει,		ος Πίθε: εἰσήνεγκε.
	ἀργυρίου μὲν ἀπ[ο]-		
	δέδω[κ]ε: [T T X X X X Π H]		

Euthymachos, treasurer of the neoria in 347/6, ought to have delivered to the dockyards equipment surrendered to him by trierarchs. What he actually did, however, was simply to record on the stele that he returned that material (i.e. a 'paper-delivery'), while he failed to place it ([οὐκ] εἰσήνεγκε) back in stock.¹⁵ When at the eispraxis of 345/4-342/1 he was asked to clear his debt, Euthymachos returned only part of the equipment in his possession and made a payment in cash for the remaining part. Among the items he did return were three sets of oars (tarroi), each of which had been introduced by an individual.¹⁶

Schmitt (pp. 135-6) does not accept the view that these sets had been introduced on loan only at a time before Euthymachos' defalcation. Instead he argues that all three persons 'entered' their sets on behalf of Euthymachos in order to help him clear his debt. Indeed, there are numerous examples of individuals (inside or outside the trierarchic class) assisting a naval debtor by undertaking responsibility to pay part or the whole of his liability. What goes counter to Schmitt's interpretation, however, is that in every single instance the transference of a liability is stated explicitly. It suffices to cite only a few examples, the first of which comes from the rubric in IG II² 1622, lines 435-43, just preceding that listing Euthymachos' debt.¹⁷ (a) [Μ]αντ[ί]ας Θορίκιος, / ταμία[ς γενόμεν εἰς τὰ νεώ]/ρια (...) ὑπὲρ το[ύ]του ἀπέδω[κ]αν κλη[ρονόμοι], κτλ.; (b) 1622.509-12: ὑπὲρ το[ύ]του ἔθεσαν Ἀριστόμαχος Μελιτεὺς καὶ / Θάλλος Μελιτ, κτλ.; (c) 1623.65-8: τοῦτο ἀνα/δεξάμενος Φιλόμηλος / Μενεκλέους Χολαργ/ ἀποδώσειν, κτλ; (d) 1631.356-9: (...) ὅτι οὐκ ἀπεδίδου τὰ ξύλινα κεύη / ἐπὶ δέκα τριήρεις ὑπὲρ Κηφισοδώρου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κοπόλιδος ταμίου γεν/ομένου, κτλ.

3. The case with which our next rubric (IG II² 1631.350-403) is concerned is this. Kephisodoros Kydathenaios, the tamias neorion of a year before 325/4, had failed to return wooden equipment for ten triereis. Because he was dead (or had fled) by 325/4, the liability passed on to his brother Sopolis, who refused to surrender the equipment. The epimeletai of 325/4 brought Sopolis to a law court which convicted him to pay more than double the

¹⁵ See ZPE 79, 1989, 95-6, and the parallel instance in IG II² 1631.410-15.

¹⁶ See also IG II² 1614, lines 89-98, which lists two steering-oars lacking (ἐνδεῖ) from a ship. Contrary to Schmitt's view (pp. 138-9), these items had been introduced by a person on a different ship (ἐτέραις νε[ώ]ς πηδάλια II / [δ]όκιμα, ἃ [ὁ δεῖνα] / [εἰσήνε]νεκεν), which was later cannibalized in order to fully equip the vessel of this entry.

¹⁷ Other instances are found in: IG II² 1622.74-5; 245-7; 359-64; 373-8, 486-8; 517-19; 561-3; 577-9; 1624.75-80; 1628, the entire col. c, lines 339-59; 1629.544-68.

original debt. Since still in 324/3 Sopolis had failed to observe the court's decision, he was sentenced with imprisonment and loss of civic rights until his debt was cleared. At the same time (or soon after) his entire property was confiscated through an apographe brought by Polyeuktos Hestaios. The same man, who really acts in favour of Sopolis, was also the proposer of a decree of the boule (the main concern of our rubric in IG II² 1631.350-403) instructing the naval and prison authorities as to how Sopolis' debt shall be discharged (and written off) out of the confiscated property.

Part of Sopolis' liability was to be paid by forfeiting a number of oars he himself had introduced into the dockyards. The naval officials and The Eleven are instructed to reckon the monetary equivalent of these oars (valued at 3 dr. apiece) against the total amount of the debt. Schmitt (p. 136) holds that Sopolis had introduced these oars with the purpose of clearing his brother's debt.¹⁸ But this cannot be right because lines 360-5 of the record read as follows: εἰς τὰ κωπέϊς ἑσπόμενος / εἰσενηνεγμένοι εἰς τὰ νεώρια, ἢ / δὲ οὐσία ἢ ἑσπόμενος ἀπογέγ[ρα]πται δημοσία εἶναι ἅπαντα καὶ κω/πέϊς οἱ εἰσενηνεγμένοι εἰς τὰ νεώρια οἱ ἑσπόμενος.

Firstly, the chronological order of events is (a) Sopolis' introduction of oars into the dockyards, and (b) confiscation of his entire property including the oars. The assumption that Sopolis had introduced the oars with the purpose of defraying his brother's debt is irreconcilable with the fact that these oars were included in the confiscated goods. Secondly, the decree of the boule contains an order to the epimeletai of 324/3 to the effect that following the confiscation they shall "record Sopolis as having surrendered the oars" (lines 368-72), and prescribes a fine of 3,000 dr. to be paid by each of them in case they fail to inscribe that fact on the stele "when the state has received the oars" (lines 385-9). The takeover of this equipment by the state had as yet not been completed.

To sum up: at a date earlier than these proceedings, Sopolis had introduced oars on loan into the dockyards; of this material he remained the legal owner until the confiscation of his property by the state.

III.

IG II² 1609, col. II, furnishes several indications to the effect that in the year of the inscription as well as in the adjacent years there was not enough public equipment in the dockyards to fully equip ships in commission. It also contains evidence showing that ships

¹⁸ He also assumes (p. 136, n. 3) that the oars numbered 2,000 (= Kephisodoros' debt from 10 triereis x 200 oars per ship). However, (i) Kephisodoros' liability consisted of κκεύη ξύλινα from 10 triereis, not of oars only; (ii) the number of oars introduced by Sopolis is not given in the inscription - note, in particular, the instruction to the tamias neorion of 324/3 to count them (ἀριθμηόμενος τὸν τε ἀριθμὸν τῶν / κωπέων, lines 375-6); (iii) Sopolis' liability had been more than doubled; (iv) if Schmitt's view were right, Sopolis' debt would have been paid out of the oars alone and not through confiscation of his entire property, as is the case here. Of lesser importance, but nonetheless puzzling, is Schmitt's description of the oars (p. 136) as "rames non façonnées".

were fitted out, entirely or extensively, with equipment owned in private.¹⁹ This column can be divided into three sections, in accordance with the administrative matters it records.

(i) Its middle section (lines 88-111) lists eleven ships, all sent to a cleruchy, with specification of whether or not their trierarchs were given public equipment. Three ships (He[gemonia?], [Mou?]sike, and Nike) had not been supplied with public equipment (οὔτοι κευδος οὐδὲν ἔλαβον / ἔχουσιν ἐφ' ἡμῶν), either because the trierarchs had used their own sets ([Dem.] 47.21; 51.5), or because they had leased (μίθωσις) the sets owned by their predecessors ([Dem.] 50.26-8, 42). A further four ships (Doris, Hegemonia, Bagche, and Naukratis) had been fitted out with just a few items from the neoria: e.g., Apollodoros Acharneus and Timokrates Krioieus, serving on Doris, had only received two ladders, two poles and two parastatai. Again, it seems likely that the sets used by these trierarchs mainly consisted of equipment which they owned in private; we know, for instance, that Apollodoros possessed a whole set ([Dem.] 50.7, 26-7).

Finally, in five out of eleven cases the trierarchs were given 200 oars instead of the prescribed set of 170 oars (tarros). However, they were obliged, on their return home, to deliver a set of tarros (e.g., line 102: κωπέας: Η Η, ἀντὶ τούτων ταρρὸν ἀποδοῦναι δὲ αὐτός, and lines 104-5: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ταρ[ῶ κωπέ]/ας ἔλαβε Η Η, ὥστε ἀποδοῦναι ταρρὸν). This puzzling transaction can be given a simple explanation. The 200 oars cannot have consisted of a tarros (170 oars) plus a perineo (30 spares), because normally the latter is mentioned separately (cf. line 51). It seems more likely that instead of being supplied with a tarros consisting of the appropriate number of 'thranitides' (upper), 'zygiai' (middle), and 'thalamiai' (lower) oars - each group being clearly distinguishable from the other, probably by their blade shape - the trierarchs were given 200 oars of a random variety.²⁰ These they had to convert (through purchase or otherwise) to a workable set of tarros (= 62 'thranitides', 54 'zygiai', and 54 'thalamioi'), which at the end of their term was to be surrendered to the neoria. By means of this deal the state took back complete and properly composed tarroi, while the trierarchs had at their disposal 30 extra oars which they could swop or perhaps sell.

All in all, reckoned in terms of complete and serviceable sets in stock, the situation at the dockyards was less than ideal.

(ii) The same picture emerges from the initial section of col. II (lines 39-88) listing trierarchs who in the year of our inscription still had in their possession equipment from their ship. These hulls had been fitted out with sets of equipment assembled, and hence noted, in various ways: εἰρήνευκεν describes items introduced by an individual, ἀπέδωκεν items

¹⁹ For the various dates that have been proposed for this record see ZPE 79, 1989, 99, n. 20.

²⁰ IG II² 1604.56: [τῶν] θρανιτίδων τούτων ἀποφαίνει ὁ δοκιμαστῆς ζυγίας Δ, i.e. the tester discovered that among the 'thranitides' oars returned to the dockyards from a ship there were 10 'zygiai'. Cf. J.S.Morrison & J.F.Coates, *The Athenian Trireme. The History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 172-3.

returned by the previous trierarch, and "ἀπὸ τῆς + name of a trireme" items borrowed from another ship. Two examples will illustrate the point.

(a) Demomeles Paianieus and Philinos Lamptreus, syntrierarchs on Euporia, withheld (1) hypozomata introduced by Theophrastos Amphitropethen; (2) two anchors introduced by Praxiteles Batethen; (3) further hanging items delivered by someone; (4) ladders and other wooden items belonging to another ship; (5) a complete tarros probably belonging to Euporia itself; and (6) a mast from another ship (lines 62-7).

(b) Apollodoros Acharneus and Timokrates Krioieus, syntrierarchs on Soizousa, withheld (1) a complete set of wooden equipment introduced by Archestratos Alopekethen; (2) a sail introduced by Stephanos Euonymeus; (3) white screens (pararrhymata leuka) and two anchors introduced by Pasion Acharneus; (4) screens of hair (pararrhymata trichina), an hypoblema, and a katablema delivered by Phil[- - Ach]arneus; (5) ropes delivered by Pasion Acharneus; and (6) rope-tackle and a second sail introduced by another person (lines 83-8).²¹

Schmitt (pp. 137-8, 140) is of the opinion that ἀπέδωκεν designates equipment returned to the dockyards and inspected by the naval authorities - after which the trierarch was absolved from further responsibility. εἰσήνεγκεν, on the other hand, designates equipment which, although it was surrendered to the neoria, had not yet been inspected - therefore the trierarch could later be held responsible for worn out items or deficiencies. All this, we are told, was because of intense naval activity: since equipment had to be reissued in great haste there was no time for a proper inspection but only for recording that this or that item had been introduced.

But first and foremost, how come that the epimeletai and the dockyard 'tester' (δοκιμαστής: 1604.56; 1612.220) had time to inspect the ropes but not the white screens and the two anchors surrendered by Pasion Acharneus? (line 87: ἀπέδωκεν, and lines 85-6: εἰσήνεγκεν, respectively). Second, not only there is lack of proof that there was no time for an inspection, but the whole idea is disproved by at least two of the extant rubrics in which equipment 'introduced' is described as "complete": τὰ ξύ[λι]να κκεύη ἐντελῆ, ἃ Ἄρχέστρατος Ἄλωπεκ εἰσήνεγκε (line 84), and χοινία ἐντελῆ, ἃ Ἀμφιδάμας

²¹ The latter item is appended to the whole entry. Schmitt thinks (p. 138) that his reading of lines 87-8: (...) ταύ[τη]ν τὴν ναὸν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἀ[πολαβόν], / τοπεῖα, ἰκτίον, Να...ς εἰσήνεγκεν, disproves the view that εἰσήνεγκεν refers to equipment introduced on loan; for the record, it is supposed, now shows that one more trierarch besides Stephanos Euonymeus had introduced a sail on Soizousa, a thing which cannot be reconciled with the fact that officially a ship is recorded with one sail only. However, (i) there are other possible restorations of line 87, eg. ἀ[πέλαβον], or less probably ἀ[νείλκυσαν], cf. 1604.15., and the punctuation before τοπεῖα cannot be determined with certainty; (ii) that Να...ς had been trierarch on Soizousa is pure conjecture; (iii) each ship carried two sails (ἰκτίον μέγα and ἰκτίον ἀκάτειον), though the only mention of both is at Xen.Hell. 2.1.29; in the naval records they appear consistently in the singular. Nonetheless, Schmitt seems to be unaware of the fact that at times ships were furnished with some extra items, e.g. IG II² 1629, lines 1-164, 272ff. (extra hypozomata), and in the inscription currently discussed, lines 112-16 (a ship carried four anchors instead of the usual two).

Κηφικτεῦς εἰρήνευκεν (line 115). Such a description can only have been made after the epimeletai and the 'tester' had controlled the material.

(iii) The last section of the record now extant (lines 111-124) provides clear evidence to the effect that εἰρήνευκεν designates private equipment. A list of trierarchs who had received hanging equipment (κρεμαστὰ κεύη) is introduced by the statement that the receipt was authorized by a decree of the boule. Only the rubric for one ship is fully preserved (lines 112-16). The trierarch Agapaios Eleusinos received almost a complete set of hanging which consisted of items either introduced by an individual on a different ship - probably during a previous trierarchy on it (e.g., line 114, ἄγκυρα, ἣν Εὐθύδημος Κηφι εἰρήνευκεν ἐπὶ τὴν Χρυσηῖν), or introduced by someone directly into the dockyards (e.g., line 112, ὑποζώματα, ἃ Κηφικόδωρος Ὀῆθε εἰρήνευκε).

The fact that a decree of the boule was needed (also required with extraordinary deliveries of equipment, cf. 1627.49-52; 1629.272ff.) suggests that these receipts were part of a special arrangement. Because of a shortage of hanging equipment in the dockyards it was necessary to equip a squadron with privately-owned items introduced into the neoria or on a particular ship. The distinction between public and private is made clear by the way the epimeletai listed the equipment issued to Agapaios Eleusinos of our rubric. While everything else he received is noted with εἰρήνευκεν, the last items are singled out as follows (lines 115-16): "two public (δημοσία) anchors, which Chabrias had received [perhaps in his capacity as strategos]²² 'from the talent'". Thus, Agapaios' ship was fitted out almost entirely with equipment belonging to various individuals, with the exception of two anchors which belonged to the state;²³ "from the talent" (ἀπὸ τοῦ ταλ[άν]του) plausibly refers to a special fund established for the purchase of hanging equipment.

In conclusion, IG II² 1609 cannot support the theory that in reissuing naval material the epimeletai had no time to follow their usual procedure, while several of its rubrics prove this theory to be erroneous. More importantly, the inscription does furnish evidence to the effect that ships in commission could be fully equipped only by enlisting the help of those currently serving as trierarchs or of individuals who possessed their own equipment. Here as well as in IG II² 1614, 1622 and 1631, εἰρήνευκεν distinguishes such privately owned items that had been placed in the dockyards on loan.

University of Copenhagen

Vincent Gabrielsen

²² IG II² 1629.15ff. 165ff. contain examples in which equipment issued to the trierarchs of a squadron is at the same time recorded as having been issued to a person occupying a leading position in that squadron (οἰκιστής), cf. 1613.297 (οἰκισταί). Moreover, 1631.212-33 lists miscellaneous items delivered to the strategos over the Piraeus.

²³ Agapaios' ship carried four anchors, instead of the usual two. For the occasional delivery of extra items see n. 21 above, and particularly the deliveries to a squadron bound to cross the Adriatic (IG II² 1629, lines 1-164, 272ff.) - a notoriously perilous journey, cf. Lys. fr. 38, in L.Gernet and M.Bizos, *Lysias, Discours, I-II* (Bude, 2nd ed., 1955-59), and Athen. (*Deipnosophistae.*) xiii. 611d-12f.