

71 (73)

Decree concerning the Priestess of Athena Nike:

424-3 B.C.

On the reverse of the stele which bears No. 44 (q.v.); now in EM.

ll. 1-6 (to *κες*) have developed Attic letters; the remainder, by a different hand, Ionic. Stoichedon 23. Phot.: *Αρχ. Έφ.* 1897, Pl. 11; Kern 14.

IG i². 25; Meritt, *AJP* lvi (1935) 71; Wade-Gery, *Essays*, 209; Mattingly, *Hist.* x (1961) 169-71; Meritt and Wade-Gery, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 110 f.

ἔδοχσεν τῇ βολεῖ καὶ τοῖ δέ-
μοι, Αἰγείς ἐπρυτάνευε, Νεοκ-
λείδες ἐγραμμάτευε, Ἀγνόδε-
μος ἐπεστάτε, Καλλίας εἶπε· τ-
5 εἰ ἡιερέαι τῆς Ἀθηνάας τῆς Νί-
κες [Α] πεντήκοντα δραχμὰς τὰ-
ς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῇ στήλ[ηι]
ἀποδιδόναι τὸς κωλακρ[έτας],
οἱ ἂν κωλακρετῶσι τῷ Θ[αργηλ]-
10 [ἰῶ]νος μηνός, τῇ ἱερ[εῖαι τῆς Ἀ]-
[θην]αίας τῆς Νίκης[ς....8....]

In l. 6 the first hand inscribed Α, which was subsequently erased; the second hand spelt out the figure. For the punctuation in ll. 9-10 see Wilhelm, *Sitzb. Wien.* 217. 5 (1939) 63 f.

The earlier decree on the front face of the stone had specified that the priestess was to receive 50 dr. (a year). It seems that, if she was appointed in the early forties, as the earlier decree required (No. 44), her salary had not yet been paid or had been paid irregularly, or by different officials. Meritt and Wade-Gery (op. cit. 111) think it more probable that Myrrhine had been paid regularly from the beginning. 'The new decree plans something new about the cult (we can only guess what) and it begins with a recapitulation about something that will not be altered by the innovation.' This is a formally possible but rather forced interpretation. For Mattingly, who dates the earlier decree c. 427, there is no difficulty: 'As it [the temple] was being finished certain details about the priestess' salary were formally settled.' Still believing in the early forties as the context of the first decree we infer either that Myrrhine, for reasons we do not understand, had not yet been paid, or that she had been paid at a different

time of the year. We also doubt whether the original text continued substantially further; on the front face the extant text has already reached an amendment, which does not seem to be of major importance.

'It [sc. the second decree] is doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty, being a renewal of *IG* i². 24 which itself was doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty with Artaxerxes' (Wade-Gery, *Essays* 209). This may be too confident, but the conjunction of treaty and decree is probably not coincidence. Kallias, the mover, may be the grandson of the Kallias who led the Athenian peace embassy to Susa in 450 or 449 (*PA* 7826).

The date is given by the secretary Neokleides (see No. 70, and Wade-Gery, *Essays* 208 f.).

72 (64)

Loans to the Athenian State from the
Sacred Treasuries:

426-5 to 423-2 B.C.

Eighteen fragments, of which two are uninscribed, of a white marble stele, found on the Acropolis; now in EM, with the exception of h (ll. 108-23), which is lost. Reworking has removed four letter-spaces on the left and five or six on the right, and left bevelled edges.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon; some irregularities must be assumed, but their extent and reason are in dispute. The aspirate sign is always omitted in the words *ἑμέρα*, *ἕκαστος*, and *ἐνδεκα*. Phot. of *d*, *i-p*: Meritt, *Calendar*, 6-24; of *q*: *Hesp.* iv (1935) 159; of parts of *b*: Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars*, Pl. 20, and *Hesp.* xxxiv, Pl. 57; of parts of *e* and *k*: *AJP* lxxxv (1964) 40. Facs. of all fragments except *q*: Meritt, *Calendar*, Pl. i; *AFD* Pl. xii.

Textual bibliography: *IG* i². 324+, 306. Modern study starts with Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century*. Meritt, *AFD* 128-51; Broneer, *Hesp.* iv (1935) 158 f. (fragment *q*); Meritt, *CQ* xl (1946) 60-4; *SEG* x. 227+; Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, 94-105; Meritt, *Athenian Year*, 60-71; Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone* (Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Arch. iv) 270-3, 290-312. Lang, *Hesp.* xxxiii (1964) 146-67; Pritchett, *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 131-47; Lang (with Meritt), *Hesp.* xxxiv (1965) 224-47; Lang and Meritt, *CQ* xviii (1968) 84-94.

[τάδε ἐλογίσαν]το οἱ λογιστα[ὶ ἐν τοῖς τέτ]ταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἐκ Παναθηναίων
ἐς [Παναθῆναία ὄφελ]-
[όμενα· τάδε ἡο]ι ταμίαι παρέδοσ[αν Ἀνδρο]κλῆς Φλυεύς καὶ χσυν-
άρχοντες ἑλλ[ενοταμίαις....]

- [ευόσες, Σκιροφοριδὸν ὀγ]δοεὶ φθ[ίνοντος, εἰ]κοστῇ τῇς πρυτανείας ὕ
 Ἀρτέμιδος Ἀγρ[οτέρας]
 80 [TTTTX^ΠHHHH^Π, τόκος τούτο] ΔΤΤΤΤΙΙΙΙC ὕ Ἀφροδί]τες ἐν
 Κέποις ΤΤ^ΠΗ^ΠΔΔΓΙ, τόκος τούτο ΓΤ[ΤΤΤΙΙΙC]
 [...16.....XX^ΠΗ]HHΔΔΔΔ[...5..., τούτο]τόκος ΤΙΙC ὕ
 Διονύσο HHH^ΠΓΤΙ, τόκος το[ύτο IC ὕ]
 [...19....., τ]όκος το[ύτο.. Ὑποσε]ιδόνος ἐπὶ Σουνίοι
 ΤΤΤΤX^ΠΔΔΓΤΤΤΙΙC, τόκος το[ύ]-
 [το ΔΤΤΤΤΙΙC ὕ ..5... XX]XX^ΠHHΔΔ[ΔΔΓΤΤΤΤΙΙC, τ]όκος
 τούτο ΤΤΙΙC ὕ Ἀρτέμιδος Μονιχίας[...6...]
 [...17.....]ΤΙ ὕ Θεσέο[ς ^ΠHHHHΓΤΤΤΙΙC, τόκος τούτο
 ΙC ὕ ἡλυσὸ HHHHH^ΠΙ, τόκος τούτο]
 85 [IC.....14....., τ]όκος το[ύτο . ὕ ἡφαίστο] ΤΧ^ΠHHΔΔΔΔΓ
 ΤΤΤ, τόκος τούτο ΤΤΤΤΙΙC ὕ Ἀφ[ροδίτε]-
 [ς ἐν ἡππολυτείῳ..]ΤΙ, τόκος τούτο ..5... ὕ Μοσδὸν ^ΠΔΔΤ, τόκος
 τούτο IC ὕ θεὸ χσενικὸ [...5...]
 [...13....., τόκος] τούτο[ο... ὕ ἡρακλέ]ος ἐν Κυνοσάργει
^ΠΔΔΔ, τόκος τούτο C ὕ Δεμο[φόντο]-
 [ς 17.....] ὕ Ἀθε[ναίας ἐπὶ Παλλ]ενίδι ΧΧΧHHHHΔΓ
 ΤΤΤΙ, τόκος τούτο ΤΙΙC ὕ Ἀ[πόλλο]-
 [νος.....15.....τ]όκος[ς...6... ὕ Ἀρτέ]μιδος Βραυρονίας HHH
^ΠΤΤΤΙC, τόκος τούτο ΙC ὕ ...]
 90 [...34.....]C ὕ Ἀθenaίας ἐπὶ Παλλα-
 δίοι ΤΤIC, τόκος τούτο[ο ..4...]
 [...30.....HΔΔΔ]ΔΤΤΤΤΙΙC, τόκος τούτο
 C ὕ Μετρὸς ἐν Ἀγρας HH[...6...]
 [...35.....]ΤΤ, τούτο τόκος C ὕ Ἀθε-
 ναίας Ζοστερίας H[...7....]
 [...30.....HHHH]ΔΔΓΤΤΤ, τόκος τούτο IC
 νυν κεφάλαιον τὸ ἀρχ[αίον ἀνα]-
 [λόματος τὸν ἄλλον θεὸν τῇς δευ]τέρ[ας δόσε]ος ἐπὶ Γοργόινῳ ἀρχοντος
 ὕ ἈΤΤΤΤ^ΠHHHH^ΠΔΔΔΔ]-
 95 [ΓΤΤΤ νυν κεφάλαιον τόκο τούτο] τοῖ ἀργ[υρίοι ^ΠΔΔΔΤΤΤ
 κεφάλαιον ἀναλόματος τὸ ἀρχαίον]
 [ἐπὶ Γοργόινῳ ἀρχοντος ὕ ΤΤΤ]ΤΤ^Π[^ΠHHHH^ΠΔΔΔΓΤΤΤ νυν
 κεφάλαιον τόκο χσύμπαντος το[ύτοι]
 [τοῖ ἀργυρίοι ΧΧHH - -] vacat

- [τάδε ἐλογίσαντο ἡοι λογιστ]αῖ ἐν τοῖς τέτ[ταρσιν] ἔτεσιν τόκον τοῖς τῇς
 θεὸ ἡ ὡοι πρό[τεροι]
 [λογιστὰι λελογισμένα παρ]έδοσαν [ἐν τοῖς ἡε]πτά ἔτεσιν τόκον τετρα-
 κισχιλίοις ταλάντοις]
 100 [ταλάντοι τετρακισχιλίοις] πεντα[κοσίαις εἴ]κοσι δυοῖν δραχμαῖν
 τούτοις τόκος ἐγέ[νετο]
 [Η^ΠΑ^ΑΑ^ΑΑ^ΠΧ^ΠHHΔΤΤΤΙΙC] vacat
 [τόκον ἐλογίσαντο τοῖς ἄλ]λοις θεο[ῖς ἐν τοῖς τέτ]ταρσιν ἔτεσιν ἡ ὡοι
 πρότεροι λογι[σται]
 [λελογισμένα παρέδοσαν ἐ]ν τοῖς ἡεπ[τά ἔτεσιν πε]ντακοσίαις ταλάντοις
 διακοσίαις τε[αλάντ]-
 [οῖς ἡεχσέκοντα ταλάντοις] ἡεχς ταλ[άντοις χιλί]αις ἐνεκόντα δραχμαῖς
 πέντε δραχ[μαῖς]
 105 [τέτταρσι δραχμαῖς ἐν τοῖς] τέτταρσιν ἔτεσιν Α^ΑΑ^ΠΤΤΧΧHHHΔΔ
 ΔΓΤΤΤΙΙC vacat
 [τόκον ἐλογίσαντο καὶ τοῖς] Ἀθenaία[ς τῇς Νίκες] ἐν τοῖς τέτταρσιν
 ἔτεσιν ἡ ὡοι πρότ[εροι]
 [λογιστὰι λελογισμένα πα]ρέδοσαν ἐν τοῖς ἡεπτά ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι ταλάν-
 τοις δυοῖν ταλ[άντο]-
 [ιν τρισχιλίοις ἐνεκόν]τα δραχμ[αῖς] ὅκτο [δραχ]μαῖς δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν
 Τ^ΠΔΔΔΔΤΤΙΙC vacat
 [τόκον ἐλογίσαντο τοῖς τῷ] ἡερμῷ ἐν [τοῖς] τέτ[ταρσιν] ἔτεσιν ἡ ὡοι
 πρότεροι λογιστὰι λ[ελογι]-
 110 [σμένα παρέδοσαν ἐν τοῖς ἡε]πτά ἔ[τεσιν] ταλάν[τοις] τετρακοσίαις
 ἐνεκόντα δραχμαῖς [...5...]
 [- - - HHHΔΓΤ - -] vacat
 [Ἀθenaίας Νίκες ἀρχαῖον ὀφέλοσιν ἐν] ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν: Α^ΑΑ^ΠΤΤΤΧΧ
 Χ^ΠΔΔΔΔΓΤΤΤΙΙC vacat
 [Ἀθenaίαι Νίκη τόκος ἐγένετο: ^Π...] ΔΔΔΤΤC vacat
 [Ἀθenaίας Πολιάδος ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν] τὸ ἀρχαῖον [ὀφέλοσιν: Χ^ΠΧ^ΠΧ^Π
^ΠHHH^ΠΑ^ΑΑ^ΠΤΤΤΤ^ΠHH^ΠΔΔΓ]
 115 [Ἀθenaίας Πολιάδος τόκος ἐγένετο ἐν] ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν: Χ^ΠHHH^ΠΑ^ΑΑ^Π
 ΤΤΤΧΧΧ^ΠHHH^ΠΤΤΤΤ vacat
 [ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν Ἀθenaίας Νίκες καὶ] Πολιάδος: [Χ^ΠΧ^ΠΧ^ΠΧ^ΠHHH^ΠΔΔΔΤΤΤΙΙC]
 Α^ΠΑ^ΠΤΤΤΧΧΧHHH^ΠΔΔΔΤΤΤΙΙC
 [ἐν ἔνδεκα ἔτεσιν κεφάλαιον τὸ Πολιά]δος καὶ Νίκ[ες τόκο] : Χ^ΠHHH^Π
 Α^ΑΑ^ΠΤΤΤΤ[- - -]

made consequential minor changes in ll. 110-11, 119, 122. In ll. 112 and 116 the vertical stroke of Δ is three times omitted; more seriously, it appears that in l. 112 the Π is a mistake for Π , committed by the auditors themselves and transferred to the totals in l. 116 and (doubtless) in 122 (cf. Meritt, *Calendar*, 49 f.). There is a minor difficulty about the text of l. 113, where the stone is lost; Meritt and Lang now prefer Dodwell's reading $\Delta \Delta \Delta \Pi$ ||C to that of Gell printed here.

This text falls into the following sections:

I. Ll. 1-2. Heading of the whole document, which was drawn up by the *λογισταί*, for whom cf. Nos. 39, 58.

II. Ll. 2-51. Loans from Athena Polias in four successive 'conciliar' years, with interest reckoned to the close of the quadrennium.

Lines	Year	Number of loans	Total loans	Interest due
2-16	426-5	6	261 T. 5,610 $\frac{7}{12}$ dr.	11 T. 199 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.
16-24	425-4	2	130 T.	[3 T. 3,710 dr.]
25-36	424-3	4	163 T.	[2 T. 5,210+dr.]
36-48	423-2	5	192 T. 1,642 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.	1 T. 813 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.
48-51	Quadrennium	17	747 T. 1,253 dr.	18 T. 3,935+dr.

III. Ll. 51-3. Loan in 423-2 from Athena Nike, 6 T.; interest 100+dr.

IV. Ll. 54-97. Two loans in 423-2 from the Other Gods, amounting to 54 T. 5,988 dr.; interest, over 2,200 dr. The share of each individual god is recorded, together with the interest due in respect of it. The order of the gods is the same in both loans (Meritt, *Calendar*, 22).

V. Ll. 98-111. Interest due for the quadrennium, 426-5 to 423-2, on loans made during the years 433-426.

Lines	Lender	Loan	Interest
98-101	Athena Polias	4,001 T. 4,522 dr.	[195 T. 1,713 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.]
102-5	Other Gods	766 T. 1,09[9] dr.	37 T. 2,338 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.
106-8	Athena Nike	22 T. 3,098 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.	1 T. 592 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.
109-11	Hermes	1 T. 490(?) dr.	[316 (?) dr.]

VI. Ll. 112-23. Totals for eleven years, 433-2 to 423-2.

Lines	Lender	Loan	Interest
112-13	Athena Nike	28 T. 3,548 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.*	At least 5 T. 31 $\frac{5}{12}$ dr.
114-15	Athena Polias	4,748 T. 5,775 dr.	1,243 T. 3,804 dr.
116-17	Nike and Polias	4,777 T. 3,323 $\frac{1}{2}$ dr.*	1,248-1,250 T.
119-20	Other Gods	821 T. 1,08[7] dr.	?
122-3	Grand total	5,599 T. 4,900(?) dr.*	?

The asterisked items are all 450 dr. too high; see end of critical note. As the funds of Hermes were apparently administered by the treasurers of Athena and not by those of the Other Gods (*IG* i². 301. 12, 69; cf. Wade-Gery, *Num. Chron.* 1930, 37), we may suppose that the loan from Hermes was not reckoned with those from the Other Gods, but was included in the grand total.

In these accounts the following points call for notice.

1. Interest is reckoned at the rate of one drachma *per diem* for 5 T. i.e. slightly over 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. One must not, however, expect all calculations to work out completely accurately. Meritt and Pritchett have assumed various forms of fractional approximation to account for minor divergences; Miss Lang has made a promising start in showing how the calculations could have been made with an abacus, which is *a priori* most probable. The charging of interest is more probably to be attributed to normal practice or piety than interpreted as a means of restraint (against Gomme, *HCT* ii. 435). The interest is very small; before this quadrennium it seems to have been five times as high (Wade-Gery, *CR* xlv (1930) 163-5; West, *TAPA* lxi (1930) 234 f.).

2. The accounts are based on the 'conciliar' year, a year approximating to the solar year and beginning somewhere near the summer solstice. The four years of our quadrennium, it is agreed, comprised 1,464 days. Meritt long maintained that the four years could not have had precisely 366 days each. This was denied by Pritchett and Neugebauer, and Lang has also found it possible to make restorations on a basis of equal years. However, the argument of Meritt (*Athenian Year*, 202-7) that some conciliar years between 422 and 411 did not have 366 days still seems powerful. These conciliar years were divided into ten prytanies of 37 or 36 days. Pritchett and Neugebauer have, comparing Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 43. 2, maintained that the first six prytanies always had 37 days and the last four 36; Meritt and Lang have argued against this view. Two other types of year must be distinguished: the civil or 'festival' year beginning on Hekatombaion 1, lunar in character, with 12 or 13 months of 29 or 30 days; and the year which ran 'from Panathenaia to Panathenaia' (ll. 1, 54), i.e. from Hekatombaion 28 in one festival year to Hekatombaion 27 in the next; this was the term of office of the treasurers of Athena and the treasurers of the Other Gods (No. 58A, l. 28) and probably of the *hellenotamiai*. Athenian terminology is, however, loose; our quadrennium, though really comprising the conciliar years 426-422, is sometimes equated with the corresponding Panathenaic quadrennium (ll. 1, 49, 50), and the archon-years are equated with the conciliar years (e.g. ll. 5, 17, 25, 37). Less readily intelligible to us is the way in which loans appear to be attributed to the treasurers who held

office for the greater part of a conciliar year, even though they fell before the Panathenaia and should have been made by their predecessors (ll. 25-9, 55-9), but the fact seems inescapable.

3. The dates of the loans here registered are expressed in terms of the conciliar year, i.e. by the name of the tribe in prytany, its number in the year, and the day of the prytany. Only in the records of the Other Gods is the date by the festival calendar added (ll. 58, 79; cf. Notopoulos, *AJP* lxvi (1945) 411-14, who explains this as a concession to rural conservatism, and No. 81).

4. Only in a few cases is the purpose of the loan expressly indicated in this record. Hippokrates and his colleagues (l. 3) received 20 T. in the late summer of 426, possibly for an invasion of Megaris (cf. Thuc. iv. 66); the old view that it can be inferred that Hippokrates was in some sense 'chairman' of the board of generals is untenable (Dover, *JHS* lxxx (1960) 66; Lewis, *JHS* lxxxi (1961) 120). In the autumn of 425 a sum of 30 T. was paid στρατηγοῖς [is this an error for στρατηγῶν?] περὶ Πελοπόννησον Δεμοσθένει (l. 18), probably for the consolidation of the position at Pylos. Some precision, now lost, was added in ll. 28-9, 37-8; these may relate to the destination of the loan or to its source (cf. ἐχς | Ὀπισθ'οδόμο, ll. 19-20, and [παρὰ] Σαμ[ίον, l. 42, for which cf. Nos. 68, l. 21 and 77, l. 18). Other associations of loans with operations recorded by Thucydides may be guessed at (cf. Wade-Gery, *CQ* xxiv (1930) 33-9 for the year 423). We call attention to the important notes by Gomme, *HCT* ii. 433-6, iii. 487 f., 504 f., 592 f., 627 f., 630.

5. One group of payments calls for special comment. Every spring during the quadrennium the treasurers of Athena paid out 100 T. (ll. 12, 22, 33, 44). These payments should roughly coincide with the Dionysia, the time of the year when tribute came in (No. 39) and when one would expect the *hellenotamiai* to be in no need of loans. It was held by Gomme (*HCT* ii. 433 f.) that this undermined what would seem to be the obvious and natural view of Athenian war finance, that the Athenians spent all their income as it came in, and only borrowed from the gods the amount necessary to make up the deficit, i.e. that total Athenian expenditure was simply the sum of the total Athenian income (whatever that was) and the loans before us. He was led to develop a theory by which the Athenians will have spent only a previously earmarked part of the tribute directly, and paid the remainder into Athena's treasury, borrowing it again when necessary and charging themselves with interest on it. This view seems to us untenable. Our inscription has no trace of repayments, which these payments to Athena would surely have been, and one would expect these 100 T. payments to be less regular in amount and date and later in the campaigning season. We prefer the simple view,

supposing only that Athena regularly made a token 100 T. contribution to the war at the beginning of the campaigning season.

6. We learn from ll. 98-111 that in the years 433-426 the Athenians had borrowed over 4,001 T. from Athena Polias and over 766 T. from the Other Gods, besides 24 T. or so from Athena Nike and Hermes. Simple division by seven will tell us that the average annual drain on the reserve in this period ran well over three times higher than in the quadrennium 426-422, but we can go a stage further than that. Inspection of the interest figure in l. 115 shows that the weight of the borrowing must be placed before the midpoint of the seven years, and mainly in the years 432-429 (West, *TAPA* lxi (1930) 234-6; *ATL* iii. 341-4). We give *ATL*'s table of loans for 433-422, without claiming literal accuracy for it.

433-2	76 T. (Cf. No. 61)	427-6	100 T.
432-1	1,145	426-5	261
431-0	1,370 (Cf. <i>SEG</i> x. 226)	425-4	130
430-29	1,300	424-3	163
429-8	600	423-2	253
428-7	200		

Some uncertainty is introduced by the loss of the interest figure for the Other Gods. The computation assumes that the reduction of interest (see above) was precisely at the beginning of 426-5; if it was earlier, the weight of the loans must be pushed back further still. The financial worries referred to in Thuc. ii. 70. 2, iii. 19. 1 are thus amply attested.

The evidence for the drain on the reserve can be pursued with greater uncertainties into an investigation of the size of the reserve at various times, and in particular at the Peace of Nikias, which lies beyond our immediate scope. *ATL* iii. 326-48 and Gomme, *HCT* iii. 687-9 will be found the most helpful introductions to the problems.

73 (74)

Athenian Decree regulating the Offering of First-fruits at Eleusis: (?) c. 422 B.C.

Complete marble stele found near the church of S. Zacharias at Eleusis, and a small fragment of the Athenian copy (cf. lines 51-2) found in the Plaka area north of the Acropolis; both now in EM.

Developed Attic writing, stoichedon (fifty letters to the line, with occasional irregularities); the aspirate sign is omitted eight times (lines 3, 15, 18, 20, 24, 31, 32, 47). Phot. of the Athens fragment: *Jahresh.* vi (1903) 10.