



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Alan S. Henry Athenian Financial Officials after 303 B.C

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **14 • 1984**

Seite / Page **49–92**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1243/5610> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1984-14-p49-92-v5610.8

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

ALAN S. HENRY

Athenian Financial Officials After 303 B. C.*

In a recent paper¹ I attempted inter alia to examine the evidence for the sequence of officials responsible at Athens for disbursing the expenses involved in inscribing decrees during the first part of the fourth century. I was there led to the conclusion

* I make reference to the following works by the name of the author only:

OSBORNE = M. J. OSBORNE, *Naturalization in Athens*, Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, vols. I (1981), II (1982) (= Kon. Acad. Wetenschappen, Klasse der Letteren, 98 and 101).
PEČÍRKA = J. PEČÍRKA, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Prague, 1966 (= Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Phil. et Hist. Mon. XV)

and to the following by short title:

DINSMOOR, Archons = W. B. DINSMOOR, *the Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Harvard U.P. for A. S. C. S. A., 1931
DINSMOOR, List = W. B. DINSMOOR, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, Columbia U.P., 1939
DOW, Prytaneis = S. DOW, *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, Hesperia Suppl. 1 (1937)
HABICHT, Studien = C. HABICHT, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen, 1982 (= Hypomnemata vol. 73)
HABICHT, Untersuchungen = C. HABICHT, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Munich, 1979 (= Vestigia, vol. 30)
HENRY, Honours = A. S. HENRY, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*, Hildesheim, 1983 (= Subsidia Epigraphica vol. 10)
RHODES, Ath. Pol. = P. J. RHODES, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford U.P., 1981
RHODES, Boule = P. J. RHODES, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford U.P., 1972

I also employ the following abbreviations:

D = Decree (used in referring to the citizenship decrees of Osborne's collection)
H = Hesperia (references to inscriptions in the form H.6.445/6.2.1-2 = Hesperia vol. 6, pp. 445/6, number 2, lines 1-2. When citing pages of articles in Hesperia, I use the normal conventions.)
H.S. = Hesperia Supplement volume.
MT = B. D. MERRITT and J. S. TRAILL, *The Athenian Agora, XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, A. S. C. S. A., Princeton, 1974 (references to inscriptions in the form MT 78.23-24 = no. 78, lines 23-24. When citing pages, I insert the letter p.)
PM = W. K. PRITCHETT and B. D. MERRITT, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Harvard U.P. for A. S. C. S. A., 1947.

that the neat schema promoted some fifty years ago by W. B. DINSMOOR² could no longer stand. Dinsmoor, modifying an earlier five-part system elaborated by A. C. JOHNSON,³ had sought to establish the following sequence of disbursing officials:

- I. 404–386: the Treasurers (of Athena and the Other Gods)
- II. 386/5: the Apodektai
- III. 385–376: the Treasurers of the Goddess
- IV. 376–303: the Treasurer of the People

My own re-examination of the evidence, however, seemed to suggest that, although the progression of joint Sacred Treasurers, Treasurers of Athena, Treasurer of the People, was in principle correct, a much less rigidly defined sequence of paymasters actually obtained: so

- I. 403–c. 390: the joint Sacred Treasurers
- II. c. 390–?c. 364: both the Treasurers of the Goddess and the Treasurer of the People⁴
- III. 363–—: the Treasurer of the People.

In this scheme the Apodektai were regarded as being liable to be called upon at any time of financial crisis to make *direct* payments for decrees (rather than appropriations in the form of a μερισμός to the Assembly's contingent fund for decrees to be actually disbursed by the Treasurer of the People).

The purpose of this present study is to complete the analysis of the sequence of disbursing officials through a re-examination of the extant evidence from the last

S = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (references in the form S.14.58.1–2 = SEG vol. 14, number 58, lines 1–2)

In referring to inscriptions from the Corpus I omit the letters I. G.: thus ii² 1 = Inscriptiones Graecae, vol. ii² no. 1.

All dates are B. C.

¹ Chiron 12 (1982) 91–118. Readers of that article will have noticed that the undertaking on p. 112 to deal with ii² 82 is never realized. I apologize for this lapsus, but still see no compelling reason to date ii² 82 after 376 B. C. because of the presence of the Assembly's expense account for decrees. If the Treasurer of the People was operating from the early 380s, as I have argued, then it is inherently probable that the fund which he administered was instituted in that period also. Thus the tentative date indicated on my Table (p. 102), «? between c. 390 and 378», may still stand.

² AJA 36 (1932) 158–159.

³ CP 9 (1914) 417–423. JOHNSON's scheme was as follows: I. 404–c. 394: the Joint Sacred Treasurers; II. c. 394–387: the Treasurer of the People; III. 387–c. 384: the Apodektai; IV. c. 384–377: the Treasurers of the Goddess; V. 377–303: the Treasurer of the People.

⁴ I notice now that MICHAEL OSBORNE, in his discussion of the citizenship grant for Archippos and Hipparchos of Thasos, comments: «the evidence for disbursing officials in the early fourth century is meagre. . . there is in practice something of a hiatus in the evidence between the early 390s and the beginning of the 370s. With so little evidence to go on it would be dangerous to rule out the possibility of a phase of operation for ὁ ταμίαις τοῦ δήμου in the 380s» (see OSBORNE II, 55).

years of the fourth century until the end of the first. It is particularly important to be able to establish the periods of operation of the different boards and officials, since, to a very great extent, the chronological framework of Hellenistic Athens is closely linked to the sequence of paymasters.

The most recent, but brief, survey of the Athenian paymasters after the death of Alexander appears as part of P. J. RHODES' chapter on Administration (Finance) in his magisterial study of the Athenian Boule.⁵ There are, however, certain inaccuracies in that account, due chiefly, no doubt, to excessive compression of the extremely complex material. Furthermore, RHODES did not have available to him the work of B. D. MERITT and J. S. TRAILL on the Athenian councillors,⁶ which appeared in 1974 and is now already out of date as a result of more recently published material⁷ and further revisions and refinements of the Hellenistic archon list.⁸ All in all, therefore, a thorough review of the evidence is urgently called for.⁹

I. 303–301

My earlier paper concluded with the statement that «from 363 onwards the Treasurer of the People is clearly the sole disbursing official in the matter of payment for decrees,»¹⁰ and the reader may have been left with the impression that this minor¹¹ official's period of activity did not extend beyond the year 303.¹² It is, however, in

⁵ RHODES, Boule, 88–113 (especially 108–110). For earlier studies bearing on the paymasters, see, in chronological order: W. S. FERGUSON, *Klio* 5 (1905) 155–179; A. C. JOHNSON, CP 9 (1914) 417–441; id., *AJP* 36 (1915) 424–458; W. B. DINSMOOR, *Archons*, especially pp. 63–66, 111, 203–204, 250–251; S. DOW, *Prytaneis*, 11–13; W. S. FERGUSON, *AJP* 59 (1938) 229–232; W. B. DINSMOOR, *List*, 18.

⁶ The Athenian Agora, vol. XV (see abbreviations above).

⁷ See J. S. TRAILL, «Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora: Addenda to The Athenian Agora, vol. XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors,» *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 269–331.

⁸ See in particular B. D. MERITT, «Mid-Third-Century Athenian Archons,» *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 78–99, and cf. also H. HEINEN, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 20, Wiesbaden 1972; G. NACHTERGAEL, «L'Archonte athénien Polyuctos et la périodicité des sôtéria étoliennes,» *Historia* 25 (1976) 62–78; HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 113–146; id., *Studien*, 159–177.

⁹ Much important relevant evidence is also scattered throughout the pages of the various numbers of *Hesperia* or concealed in the footnotes of sundry other publications.

¹⁰ Art. cit., (note 1 above) 118.

¹¹ The Treasurer of the People had no general financial function: he merely administered the fund at his disposal viz. the contingency fund of the demos for matters related to the expenses of decrees (ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶν δήμων). It should be noted that he is not infrequently referred to simply as ὁ ταμίης, without further qualification: cf., e.g., ii² 238.17–20 (338/7); 240.23–25 (337/6); 360.I.24–27 (325/4). As we shall see later, the Treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund was also sometimes called by the same short title.

¹² The year 303 as a lower limit was simply taken over from DINSMOOR's account (*AJA* 36 [1932] 158), at a time when my concern was solely with the disbursing officers of the earlier part of the fourth century.

the *following* year, 302/1 (archon Nikokles), that the Treasurer of the People is for the last time instructed to make payments for decrees from the Assembly's expense account (H. 9. 104/5. 20. 27–30, prytany IV; ii² 505. 62–64, prytany XII).

Now, it would be convenient – and would produce the neat sort of dividing line so sought after in these analyses but so seldom achieved – if (a) it were only after this date (302/1) that other officials began to provide the funds for decrees, and (b) if the Assembly's expense account vanished from the scene at the same time as its customary administrator. Unfortunately, neither of these desiderata obtains.

For, in a decree of prytany VIII of this same year (302/1), ii² 500. 40–43, it is ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, the Single Officer of Administration,¹³ who is instructed to operate the Assembly's expense account for the inscribing of the decree. And in four other texts, all possibly datable, as we shall see below, to the spring or early summer of 302 (i.e. the latter part of the year 303/2), the same function, and with funds from the same source, is performed by the Treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund.¹⁴

¹³ This is not the place to rehearse all the arguments for the creation of the governmental department known as ἡ διοίκησις (for an early discussion of which, see A. C. JOHNSON, AJP 36 [1915] 426–431). Briefly, however, the official ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει is first certainly attested in 307/6 (ii² 463.36), where Habron, son of Lykourgos, is mentioned as holding the office and working in collaboration with the poletai to make a contract for wall-building, and the office may also be mentioned earlier than this if S. 19.119, which refers to Xenokles, son of Xeinis, of Sphettos, as κ(α)τ[ασταθεις (or, perhaps, κ(α)ι [ἡ]ρημένος) ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει τῆς πόλεως, can be dated c. 334–326. It is not improbable indeed that Lykourgos himself held the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει (cf. Hypereides fr. 118 [Kenyon]: ταχθεις δὲ ἐπὶ τῆ διοικήσει τῶν χρημάτων; and D. H. 660 Din. 11, who describes Menesaichmos as μετὰ Λυκούργου τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν δημοσίων χρημάτων παραλαβόν). RHODES (Ath. Pol. 515–516) suggests that, if this were an extraordinary position created for Lykourgos by ψήφισμα and not by νόμος, this would help to explain its absence from Ἄθ. Πολ. 43.i, where Aristotle deals with elected offices (the Treasurer of the People, the Theoric Commissioners and the Epimeletes of the Springs), for the account of Ἄθ. Πολ. is based on νόμοι. For the office ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει was doubtless an *elected* position (cf. Pollux 8.113: ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως *αιρετός* ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν προσιόντων καὶ ἀναλισκομένων) and, at least in Lykourgos' case and possibly for some time after (? until the restoration of the democracy in 307/6), one capable of repeated tenure. In later Athens the Single Officer of Administration will no doubt have been an appointed officer during periods of Macedonian control, whereas it may be safely assumed that, in the intervals of democratic rule, the mode of selection for the Plural Board will have been by lot. (See further RHODES, Boule, 105–108, 219–220 and Appendix D, 235–240.)

¹⁴ D48 (ii² 806); ii² 809; H. 8.45.12 and S. 14.58 (H. 9.348/51.45). The Stratiotic Fund is the earliest of the major state funds which begin to appear in the fourth century. Although its treasurer is not attested before 344/3 (ii² 1443.12–13, an account of the Treasurers of Athena), it is a reasonable assumption that this office will have been created at the same time as the fund itself (first securely attested in 373, and possibly to be placed even as early as the 390s: see G. L. CAWKWELL, Mnemosyne 15 [1962] 377–383). Since its treasurer was elected and since the law of Hegemon (or another) opened the way for the Treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund to share, like the Theoric Commissioners, in the work of the old financial boards which were under the control of the boule (e.g. the poletai: Ἄθ. Πολ. 47.ii), he eventually be-

In view of the bewildering confusion which thus appears to exist in the financial responsibility of these years (303/2 and 302/1) it is essential to look at the evidence of the relevant texts in some detail.

First, the four texts assigned to the latter part of 303/2:¹⁵ D48 (ii² 806) 8–11:¹⁶

εἰς δ]ὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλ[η]] stoich.35
 [{λ]ης μερίσαι τὸν τ]αμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν ν
 [. . δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν ε]ἰς τὰ κατὰ ψη(φ)ίσματα ἀνα
 [λισκομένων τῶι δῆμ]ωι. *vacat*

ii² 809.4–8:

εἰς δὲ τὴν [ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλ]η] stoich. 29
 ς δοῦναι τὸν ταμ[ίαν τῶν στρατιωτικ]
 ῶν *vv.* **F**: ν δραχμ[ὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ]
 ψηφίσματα ἀνα[[ν]α]]λισκομένων τῶι δῆ
 [μ]ωι·

H. 8. 45. 12. 5–9:

εἰς δὲ τ] stoich. 26
 ἦν ἀν[αγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δ]ο[ῦναι]
 [τ]ὸν ταμ[ίαν τῶν στρατιωτ]ικ[ῶν . . .]
 [.δ]ραχμ[ὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κ]ατὰ ψη[φί]
 [σματα ἀναλισκομένων τ]ῶι δῆ[μ]ωι].

S. 14. 58 (H. 9. 348/51. 45) 29–32: honorary decree for Adeimantos of Lampsakos:

εἰς δὲ] τὴν ἀν[αγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δ] stoich. 35
 [οῦναι τὸν ταμί]αν τῶν στ[ρατιωτικῶν . . . δρ]
 [αχμὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ] κα[τὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκ]
 [ομένων τῶι δῆμ]ωι·

KIRCHNER had dated ii² 806 and 809 «c. 230» simply because of the fact that it is the Stratiotic Treasurer who is to provide the funds,¹⁷ and EUGENE SCHWEIGERT likewise assigned H. 8.45.12 to the period c. 229 in his original publication. A year later, however, in publishing the decree in honour of Adeimantos of Lampsakos

came an extremely influential official in the sphere of financial administration. Throughout the third and second centuries we seem to witness a struggle for financial control between the officials ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει and the Stratiotic Treasurer. The latter, as we shall see, finally prevailed. (See RHODES, *Boule*, 105–108, 219–220; and *Ath. Pol.*, 513–514, 552.)

¹⁵ All four are heavily restored, but enough remains (in my opinion) to justify the restorations.

¹⁶ At the end of v. 8 and the beginning of v. 9 of his text OSBORNE assumes a dittography in order to meet the stoichedon requirements. (The cutter of this text seems to have made a number of errors: see OSBORNE ad loc.)

¹⁷ It was earlier believed that the Stratiotic Treasurer never paid for the inscribing of decrees until 229 B. C. (See Dow, *Prytaneis*, 11–13; DINSMOOR, *List*, 18).

(H. 9.348/51.45), which he dated in 302, he revised his position and argued, on the basis of letter forms as well as the reference to the Treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund disbursing monies from the Assembly's expense account, that ii² 806, 809 and H. 8.45.12 all belonged «c. 300 B. C. and perhaps in the same year as the new decree in honor of Adeimantos». OSBORNE, in his commentary on the citizenship decree for Oxythemis of Larisa,¹⁸ has convincingly placed the decree for Adeimantos in the summer of 302,¹⁹ and all four texts therefore here under discussion in the latter part of the year 303/2. If this assumption be accepted,²⁰ it now seems that the Assembly's expense account was operated several times by the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν in the spring or early summer of 303/2 and by ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, as well as ὁ ταμίας τοῦ δήμου, in 302/1. But even this is not yet the complete picture of the complex situation vis-à-vis the disbursing officials of the last years of the fourth century.

For there is another decree which seems to belong to the same period, the aforementioned citizenship decree in favour of Oxythemis of Larisa (D47 = ii² 558). Like Adeimantos, Oxythemis too was a prominent aide at the court of Demetrios. According to Demochares of Leukonoë,²¹ Bourichos, Adeimantos and Oxythemis were all granted cult honours as heroes, probably in the period 303–301, and, at least in the case of Adeimantos and Oxythemis, almost certainly after the secular honours granted to them.²² As we have seen above, the decree for Adeimantos is probably to be placed in the early summer of 302, and Oxythemis' decree may well belong to the same period.²³

¹⁸ D47 (ii² 558), for which see below. From Demochares of Leukonoë FGH (JACOBY) 75 fr. 1 (= Athenaios VI 253 a) we learn that Oxythemis, Adeimantos and Bourichos were particularly important personages at the court of Demetrios Poliorketes (Demochares actually refers to them disparagingly as τῶν κολάκων αὐτοῦ, but see OSBORNE II, 124 note 513).

¹⁹ After the meeting of the syndetion of the reconstituted League of Corinth, to which reference is made in the motivation clause of Adeimantos' decree (vv. 7–13).

²⁰ It is an assumption, of course, that the other three texts which mention the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν paying from the Assembly's expense account belong in the very same year as the decree for Adeimantos, but it is an economical hypothesis which is not unreasonable. At the very least we can say that *one* text of this year has the Stratiotic Treasurer so functioning, as do three others of a year which must be close to, if not the same as, 303/2.

²¹ See note 18 above.

²² See OSBORNE II, 124–125.

²³ For the detailed arguments for the date, see OSBORNE II, 124–126. Briefly, (i) since the citizenship grant does not include a provision specifying a judicial scrutiny, the date must be before prytany XII of 303/2, when the δοκιμασία is found as a requirement; (ii) the fact that the crown (awarded in vv. 9–11) is qualified with the expression κατὰ τὸν νόμον points to a date after 304 (see HENRY, Honours, 25–27); (iii) the apparent references to the Four Years War (the struggle for Greek freedom, τῆι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερία [v. 14], and the hope that Oxythemis will also act ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰππέων τῶν αἰχμαλώτων [vv. 33–34]) likewise suggest a date after the end of that war (summer 304). These considerations, plus the possibility – it is only that – that Oxythemis' decree is close in time to that of Adeimantos, indicate a date perhaps in the spring or early summer of 302.

Now in D47 it is again the Treasurer of the People who is to disburse the necessary funds for the stele, but, interestingly enough, *not* from the Assembly's expense account (vv. 29–31)

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης stoich. 27
 δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου ΔΔΔ δ
 ραχμᾶς ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν χρημάτων

but from some source which could be referred to as τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα. What then are these monies?

Before we attempt to give an answer to that question, we must consider one further piece of information, another text from prytany XII of the year 303/2, viz. D61 (ii² 496 + 507 [Addenda p. 661]). This citizenship decree for Solon of Bargylia is to be paid for not by the Stratiotic Treasurer nor by the Treasurer of the People, but by the Single Officer of Administration (vv. 39–41):

εἰς δὲ τὴν stoich. 28
 ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ἐ
 πὶ τῆι διοικήσει v ΔΔΔ v δραχμᾶς v
vacat

Noticeably, however, the source of the funds is not specified as the Assembly's expense account, and so we may assume that the Single Officer of Administration is to utilize some fund of his own.²⁴

Finally, there is one other text still to be taken into account viz. ii² 488.²⁵ There, according to Tod's restoration²⁶ – unchallenged, as far as I am aware – the disbursing officer is the Treasurer of the People (vv. 25–28):

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς] στή stoich. 30
 [λης δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου: Δ]Δ[Δ]
 [: δραχμᾶς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφί]σματ
 [α ἀναλισκομένων τῶι δήμῳ].

and if this (and the date) is accepted, we here have evidence for the Treasurer of the People executing his normal function at the very beginning of this complex

²⁴ It could be argued that the phrase specifying the Assembly's expense account has been accidentally omitted in the drafting (there is certainly nothing on the stone, there being a *vacat* of 0.060 m between v. 41 and the words ὁ δῆμος inscribed below). But I think this unlikely: the evidence rehearsed above rather suggests that, when the Assembly's expense account was the fund in question, it was meticulously specified.

²⁵ This is a decree in honour of an unknown college of officials who served in the year of Pherekles (i. e. 304/3: see vv. 1–2). It could, therefore, date to their year of office, but is much more likely to belong early in the following archon-year (303/2).

²⁶ BSA 9 (1902/3) 154–173.

year 303/2. ΤΟΔ's restoration is indeed highly likely, but one should not pass over in silence the fact that vv. 26–27 can also be made to yield

[λης δοῦναι τὸν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει :]Δ[Δ]
[Δ δραχμὰς κτλ.²⁷

I do not wish to press this point, simply to demonstrate that, epigraphically, the Single Officer of Administration may conceivably have been called upon to operate the Assembly's expense account at the very beginning of 303/2 (or even towards the end of 304/3).²⁸

Assuming, however, that the Treasurer of the People is correctly restored in ii² 488.26 a possible scenario for the year 303/2 might be reconstructed as follows:²⁹

- (i) at the beginning of the year the Treasurer of the People is still operating the Assembly's expense account for decrees (ii² 488)
- (ii) in the late spring or early summer the Treasurer of the People is again called upon to disburse funds for a stele (D47), but the funds are to come ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν χρημάτων
- (iii) in the latter part of the year the Stratiotic Treasurer is instructed to disburse funds for stelai from the Assembly's expense account (D48; ii² 809; H. 8.45.12; S. 14.58)
- (iv) in prytany XII the Single Officer of Administration is required to pay for a stele, but *not*, it seems, from the Assembly's expense account (D61).³⁰

OSBORNE would seek to see this mélange of paymasters against the background of

²⁷ This is, of course, only one of the possible restorations of the punctuation and the numeral. The assumption of a mark of punctuation (or an uninscribed space) before but not after the numeral is not without parallel: cf. ii² 124.13 (and see in general on punctuation and numerals, M. J. OSBORNE, ZPE 10 [1973] 262, with note 23).

²⁸ Let it not pass unnoticed either that in vv. 17–19 of this text the Single Officer of Administration is undeniably called upon, to provide funds for a sacrifice and dedication: δοῦναι δὲ αὐτοῖς | [τὸν ἐπὶ] τεῖ διοικήσει εἰς θυσ[ί]αν [καὶ] [[ἀνάθη]μα [:H: δ]ρ[αχμὰς]. This, however, has no direct bearing on the official to be restored for the payment of the stele: cf. ii² 510 and 555, both from the closing years of the fourth century, in which the crowns and statues are the responsibility of the Single Officer of Administration, but the expenses for the stelai are to be provided by the Treasurer of the People from the Assembly's expense account. (In ii² 555 the Treasurer of the People also pays, probably from the Assembly's expense account, for ἐφόδια for ambassadors, as he regularly does in the fourth century.)

²⁹ In what follows here I am much indebted to Professor OSBORNE's analysis of the situation (see OSBORNE II, 126 note 534).

³⁰ We should note that, if ii² 493 and 518 were to join (as proposed by WILHELM, AM 39 [1914] 271 ff., supported by PRITCHETT, Hesperia 9 [1940] 109 note 38, and accepted, apparently, by RHODES, Boule, 263), this would provide an example of the Treasurer of the People also providing funds from the Assembly's expense account for the payment of a stele in prytany XII of 303/2. The join, however, is rejected by OSBORNE (I, 130 and II, 133 with note 574; BSA 66 [1971] 328 note 24; and cf. A. C. JOHNSON, AJP 36 [1915] 433 note 2).

the very large output of decrees in the archonship of Leostratos.³¹ He argues that at some point in the year the Assembly's *μερισμός* for the expenses of decrees began to run short and so was supplemented by, or given a subsidy from, the Stratiotic Fund, so that, when the Treasurer of the People was instructed to pay for the erection of D47, the funds at his disposal could be described as τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα.³² Later in the year, the Stratiotic Treasurer himself took over as disbursing officer of the Assembly's expense account, presumably because the funds now being expended were *totally* provided out of the Stratiotic Fund, although theoretically disbursed from the Assembly's expense account. Then, at the very end of the year, the Single Officer of Administration was called upon to make available funds at *bis* disposal for the same purpose, all monies in the Assembly's expense account – even as augmented out of the Stratiotic Fund – having been exhausted.

Such an interpretation is, *prima facie*, very attractive, at least for the year 303/2, but, like all such neatly logical schemes, its attractiveness may only flatter to deceive. For the evidence of the *following* year, 302/1, must also be taken into account, where, as we have seen above,³³ the sequence of disbursing officers is as follows: –

- (i) prytany IV: the Treasurer of the People, from the Assembly's expense account (H. 9.104/5.20)
- (ii) prytany VIII: the Single Officer of Administration, from the Assembly's expense account (ii² 500)
- (iii) prytany XII: the Treasurer of the People, from the Assembly's expense account (ii² 505)

This sequence is certain, and does not depend on restoration. We note in particular that all payments are made from the Assembly's expense account. On the reasoning applied above to the complicated picture in 303/2, one might have been tempted to argue that, just as in 303/2 the Stratiotic Treasurer topped up the Assembly's expense account from the Stratiotic Fund, so here, in the eighth prytany, the Single Officer of Administration had done the same from *bis* funds and taken over the

³¹ For a convenient list (to which ii² 488 should probably be added), see M. B. WALBANK, *Hesperia* 49 (1980) 257 note 16. WALBANK there (pp. 255–257) publishes yet another decree of 303/2, which, as he says, «joins the already considerable list of decrees passed in the archonship of Leostratos, the bulk of them honoring friends of Demetrios Poliorketes».

³² SCHWEIGERT referred to the κοινὰ χρήματα simply as «extraordinary funds» (*Hesperia* 9 [1940] 351); PRITCHETT talks of «a temporary amalgamation of treasuries . . . within the turbulent period 304/301» (*Hesperia* 10 [1941] 271 note 12); RHODES (*Boule*, 109) goes no further than suggesting that τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα «perhaps refers to the ecclesia's expense-account». Whatever the precise significance of the phrase, κοινὰ surely implies that the Assembly's expense account – which is the only account we know of operated by the Treasurer of the People – was joined to, or supplemented by, some other fund or funds. Some financial crisis and/or re-organization is evident.

³³ See pp. 52–54.

duties of disbursing officer himself. But this would not account for the return to the scene of the Treasurer of the People in the *twelfth* prytany.

Perhaps then one should resist the temptation to re-construct a systematically ordered sequence of events and simply view these years as a period of financial crisis, which give evidence of ad hoc arrangements for the financing of decrees. This period affords other signs of administrative re-organization,³⁴ and in the sphere of finance marks the beginning of the interest of the Department of Administration and the Stratotic Treasurer in the control of the funds disbursed for the erection of stelai. They also herald the demise of the Treasurer of the People, at least in his capacity as the paymaster for decrees.

Before, however, we finally conclude that the year 302/1 is the terminus post quem non for the activities of the Treasurer of the People, we must consider two other texts, ii² 675 and ii² 525, originally assigned to the same document by WILHELM³⁵ and dated to the year of Glaukippos on the strength of the secretary's demotic (Εὐθιοῖνος Εὐθουκρίτου Μυρρ]ινοῦσιος) i.e. to the year 273/2. For in ii² 675 c. 5–6 we have a reference to the payment of ἐφόδια to certain ambassadors from the Assembly's expense account, where the disbursing officer can hardly be other than the Treasurer of the People. WILHELM had restored thus:

δοῦναι δὲ ἐφόδ stoich. 42

[ια ΔΔΔ δραχμὰς τῶν πρ]έσβε[ων ἐκάστ]ωι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ
[.15.] ἐκ τῶν εἰς τ[ὰ κατὰ] ψηφίσματα ἀναλ
[ισκομένων τῶι δῆ]μοι. *vacat*

but there can be little doubt that this should be adjusted to read along the lines

δοῦναι δὲ ἐφόδ stoich. 42

[ια τῶν αἰρεθέντων πρ]έσβε[ων ἐκάστ]ωι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ
[δῆμου *v* ΔΔ δραχμὰς] ἐκ τῶν κτλ.

as suggested by W. K. PRITCHETT in his re-examination of the joint text.³⁶ PRITCHETT, however, dated the document to the year of Koroibos (306/5), claiming – on the evidence of a squeeze, and with the support of B. D. MERITT – that the part of the letter before the nu of -νοῦσιος in the secretary's name is the right-hand stroke of *mu*, not iota. He thus concluded that the demotic should be read as Ῥα]μνοῦσιος, thus allowing the restoration of the secretary as Πάμφιλος Θεογεΐτονος

³⁴ We have already referred to the fact that some restriction on the cost of crowns was also introduced probably in 303/2 (see HENRY, Honours, 26 with note 35). Moreover, it was also towards the end of this year that the *dokimasia* of citizenship grants was reintroduced (see OSBORNE II, 136: he describes the year 303/2 as «a year, it seems, of many administrative changes»).

³⁵ AM 39 (1914) 265–266 (cf. ii² 675 Addenda p. 663).

³⁶ See AJP 58 (1937) 329–333.

‘Ραμνούσιος.³⁷ This reconstruction removes any difficulty over the presence of the Treasurer of the People in ii² 675 c. 5–6, and permits the same disbursing officer – and the same fund, the Assembly’s expense account – to remain in ii² 525.5–7, where the instructions for the inscribing of the stele are given:³⁸ thus, again accepting PRITCHETT’s readings in v. 7, since a formulation with the cost expressed *both* as a specific sum of drachmai and as τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα is plainly impossible:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγρα]φὴν τῆς στήλης stoich. 42
 [δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου ΔΔΔ δραχμᾶ]ς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τ
 [ἀ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῶι δήμῳ]ι ὃ ὅπ[ως

It would be convenient to accept PRITCHETT’s assurances and to keep this text entirely in the year 306/5, with the Treasurer of the People paying for both the ephodia³⁹ and the stele. Unfortunately, S. V. TRACY has placed ii² 675 and ii² 525, without acknowledging that they belong to the same text and the same year, amongst the work of his Cutter 4, whose period of activity he located between 273/2 and 240/39.⁴⁰ TRACY notes specifically that «the date assigned to [ii² 525] in I. G., <fin. S. IV>, should be revised downward to <med. S. III.>» and he clearly accepts 273/2 as the year of ii² 675.⁴¹ There is thus something of a dilemma, and our reaction to it will depend on three things: (i) the disputed reading of the secretary’s demotic in ii² 675; (ii) the attribution of the two texts to the work of TRACY’s Cutter 4; and, perhaps most important, (iii) the question as to whether in fact the two texts actually do belong to the same document.⁴²

Given the large number of uncertainties in this problem, and given the fact that there is no other evidence for the Treasurer of the People in the third century, I am inclined to agree with JOHNSON⁴³ that at least the reference to the Treasurer of the

³⁷ And at the same enabling frag. a (of ii² 675) to be brought into alignment with the other fragments in a stoichedon 42 line.

³⁸ DINSMOOR, Archons, 64 note 4, had urged that, with a date in the 270s, τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει should thus be restored.

³⁹ As he normally does in the fourth century: cf., e.g., ii² 116. 40–42 (361/0); 264.9–12 (352–336).

⁴⁰ GRBS 14 (1973) 191. The limits are given in terms of the archons Glaukippos (from our text ii² 675) and Athenodoros. The latter is now removed from 240/39 to 256/5 (see Hesperia 50 [1981] 79, 82–83 and 94), so that the lower limit should be replaced by the archon Thersilochos, now 248/7 (see Hesperia 50 [1981] 86 and 95). If ii² 675 is moved back to 306/5 and still assigned to TRACY’s Cutter 4, this mason will have had an extraordinarily long working life.

⁴¹ Though whether this implies rejection or ignorance of PRITCHETT’s arguments one cannot tell.

⁴² A. C. JOHNSON (AJP 36 [1915] 444 note 2: see earlier CP [1914] 430–431, where he had even doubted WILHELM’s combination of the four fragments of ii² 675) was unconvinced, and urged that ii² 525 and at least the conclusion of ii² 675 should belong to a decree of the *fourth* century.

⁴³ See note 42 above.

People disbursing funds for *ephodia* in ii² 675 c. 5 should be removed to the fourth century.⁴⁴ Whether then we associate frag. c with the rest of ii² 675 will depend on the reading of the secretary's demotic in frag. a. As for ii² 525, if it belongs at the end of the *fourth* century, we will accept WILHELM's restoration of the Treasurer of the People;⁴⁵ if, on the other hand, we are persuaded by TRACY's analysis of epigraphic «hands» to place it in the middle of the *third* century,⁴⁶ then we should probably restore the Single Officer of Administration:⁴⁷ thus

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγρα]φὴν τῆς στήλης stoich. 42
 [δοῦναι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικήσει ΔΔ δραχμὰ]ς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τ
 [ἄ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶι δήμῳ]ι ὡς ὅπ[ως

although, in principle, the Plural Board would in fact not be an impossibility around the year 250.⁴⁸

It may be appropriate to complete this section with an examination of the related question of the evidence for the continued existence of the Assembly's expense account after 302/1. RHODES states that there are only two references to payments for stelai being made from this account later than this year, both by the Plural Board of Administration.⁴⁹ The texts which he cites are ii² 657.70–73, now of the year 283/2,⁵⁰ an excellently preserved example from a decree in honour of the poet Philippides of Kephale:

εἰς stoich. 40
 δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφήν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ
 διο[ι]κήσει ΔΔ δραχμὰς [ἐκ] τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματ
 α ἀναλισκομένων τῶι δήμῳι.

⁴⁴ We may note that in ii² 653.48–50 (285/4), where no disbursing officer is actually specified in the provision for *ephodia*, the assumption must be that it was τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει who paid (cf. vv. 54–56); and in ii² 686.6–8 (265/4) it is certainly the Single Officer or the Plural Board ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει who perform the same function.

⁴⁵ With PRITCHETT's adjustment of v. 7.

⁴⁶ The reference to the Assembly's expense account as the source of the funds would, however, seem against this. But see my discussion of this account, pp. 60–63 below.

⁴⁷ DINSMOOR's case for the Plural Board (see note 38 above) depended on assigning ii² 675 (and with it ii² 525) to the year of Glaukippos. In any case, with the one doubtful exception of D81 (for which see p. 72–73 below), the infinitive employed to describe the activity of the Plural Board is always μερίσαι. If both μερίσαι and τοὺς are restored in v. 6 of ii² 525, then there will be no space left for the required numeral.

⁴⁸ See pp. 74–77 below.

⁴⁹ Boule, 109. RHODES rightly draws attention (*ibid.*, note 4) to ii² 675 + 525, but implicitly accepts without discussion PRITCHETT's attribution of the joint text to 306/5. We cannot, however, dismiss the *possibility* that ii² 525 contains a reference to the Single Officer – or, less likely, the Plural Board – disbursing funds from the Assembly's expense account in the third century.

⁵⁰ Archon Euthios: see B. D. MERITT, *Historia* 26 (1977) 173.

and ii² 672.16–17, now assigned to the year 277/6,⁵¹ with its unusual formulation:⁵²

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφήν μερίσαι[ι] τοὺς ἐπὶ τε[ῖ] διοικήσει stoich. 67
 ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ [κατὰ ψ]
 [ηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶι δ]ήμωι: Γ^ϛ:⁵³ K. 18. εὐδ
 εἶπεν·

But these are neither the only occasions nor the only officials paying for stelai from the Assembly's expense account in the third century.

For in three instances we also find the Single Officer of Administration in this capacity:

(i) D69 (ii² 648) 14–18

ε[ἰς δὲ] stoich. 35
 [τὴν ἀναγραφ]ή[ν] τῶν στηλῶν δοῦναι τὸν ἐ[πὶ τῆ]
 [ι διοικήσει]ι :ΔΔΔ:⁵⁴ εἰς ἑκατέραν ἐκ τῶν [εἰς τ]
 [ἀ κατὰ ψηφί]σματα ἀ[ν]αλισκομένων τῶι [δ]ήμωι.

OSBORNE dates this text very close to his D68 (ii² 646 +), of prytany IX of 295/4, noting that «the formulae employed are virtually identical and, more significantly, the *exetastes* and the trittyarchs play a similar role»,⁵⁵ by which he is drawing attention to the fact that in D69.7–8 and in D68.45–48 these are the officials responsible for providing the funds for *statues*.⁵⁶ We note too that, as in D68, so here the provision for the judicial scrutiny is qualified by κατὰ τὸν νόμον.

(ii) ii² 709 (+ Addenda p. 665) 1–5:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφήν τ] stoich. 29
 [ἦς στήλης] δοῦναι⁵⁷ τὸν ἐπὶ [τῆι διοική]
 [σει . . 5 . .] ⁵⁸δραχμάς ἐκ τῶν [εἰς τὰ κατὰ]
 [ψηφίσμα]τα ἀναλισκομένων[ν τῶι δήμω]
 [ι]

⁵¹ Unknown archon: see MERITT, *ibid.*

⁵² Although this text is heavily restored and distinctly unusual, there can be no doubting that here we have an example the Plural Board paying out of the Assembly's expense account.

⁵³ KIRCHNER indicates that the stone reads :Γ^ϛ:, but a stele at a cost of 5 drachmai would be unheard of.

⁵⁴ The word δραχμάς would appear to have dropped out after the numeral in the inscribing (but cf. ii² 672 just quoted above, and see p. 69 below).

⁵⁵ OSBORNE II, 153.

⁵⁶ For the *exetastes* and the trittyarchs as paymasters for stelai, see pp. 63–68 below.

⁵⁷ KIRCHNER comments ad loc.: «Insolenter δοῦναι positum est ante τὸν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, cum exspectemus μερίσαι.» However, although it is true that μερίσαι is far commoner than δοῦναι with τὸν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, δοῦναι is the verb used in two of the three instances where the Single Officer makes payments from the Assembly's expense account (ii² 648 and 709).

⁵⁸ Probably [: ΔΔΔ :].

KIRCHNER dated this text «in.s.iii», presumably on the basis of the script and the mention of the Single Officer of Administration. It would not be surprising if it were close in time to D69.

(iii) D88 (ii² 707) 8–11:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν κ[αὶ τὴν ποιή] stoich. 37
 [σιν τ]ῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ [διοικήσει]
 [ἐκ τῶν κατὰ] ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομ[ένων τὸ ἀνάλλ]
 [ῶμα *vacat*] *vacat*

Although KIRCHNER and JOHNSON⁵⁹ both felt that this text belonged near the beginning of the third century, OSBORNE is probably correct, in view of the lack of a judicial scrutiny, to seek a location during the period of activity of the Single Officer after 262.⁶⁰ Since the lower limit of TRACY'S Cutter 4, to whose work this stone apparently belongs, must now be raised to 248/7,⁶¹ D88 should tentatively be placed c. 261–250.

Furthermore, apart from these instances of the Single Officer operating the Assembly's expense account, there is also one certain example in which the funds for stelai are disbursed from this account by the exetastes and the trittyrachs viz. S. 24.119 (H. 13.242/3.7) 20–24, which must also thus fall within the limits 301–295:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀνα[γραφὴν τῆ] stoich. 29
 ς στήλης δοῦναι τοὺς τριτ[τάρχους]
 καὶ τὸν ἐξεταστὴν *v* ΔΔΔ : δ[ραχμὰς ἐκ]
 τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματ' ἀ[ναλισκομ]
 ἐνων τῶι δήμωι. *vacat*

And a second, more dubious, example has been restored by PEČÍRKA in ii² 722.11–13 (cf. S. 24.120) on the analogy of S. 24.119:⁶²

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφ] quasi-stoich. ± 50
 [ῆν μερίσαι τοὺς τριττ]υάρχους καὶ τὸν ἐξεταστὴν
 (e. g.) *v* ΔΔΔ *v* δραχμ]
 [ἄς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφί]σ[ματα ἀναλισκομένων
 τῶι δήμωι].

⁵⁹ CP 9 (1914) 433.

⁶⁰ The judicial scrutiny was also apparently dropped from the naturalization process during the overtly oligarchical period 294/3–292/1 (cf. D70). However, since the officer responsible for the publication of D88 is the prytany-secretary and not the anagrapheus, our text cannot be assigned to that period.

⁶¹ See note 40 above.

⁶² See PEČÍRKA 98–100. He refers to the «word-order» of the two texts, thus drawing attention to the fact that they are the only examples in which the trittyrachs *precede* the exetastes in the provisions in which they are named as the disbursing officials.

which will then date to the same period. One would not, however, want to place too much confidence on such a massive restoration. All one can say is that, if the traces are correctly diagnosed by ΠΕΨΙΡΚΑ, they lend themselves to a possible reconstruction along the lines of S. 24.119.⁶³

It is clear, therefore, that, even after 302/1, the Assembly's expense account still appears, if sporadically, in the record of the provisions for the payment of stelai. But whether this implies that the fund continued to exist in its own right with a separate annual μερισμός, as in the fourth century, or whether its occasional mention merely reflects a separate item for book-keeping purposes within a now centralised treasury is more difficult to decide. Certainly, the general movement in the third century would seem to be in the direction of a more centralised control of finance in the hands of the official(s) ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει and the Stratiotic Treasurer, but it would perhaps be not unreasonable to give the epigraphic record the benefit of the doubt and accept that, at least in those years in which the Assembly's expense account is named as the relevant source of monies, there was still an independent fund with an annual allocation for that purpose.⁶⁴ After 301, however, the control of that fund was no longer in the hands of the Treasurer of the People.

II. 301–295

After the death of Antigonos Monophthalmos and the defeat of Demetrios Poliorketes at Ipsos in the summer of 301, there was evidently a period of military oligarchy at Athens, and this is reflected in the re-organization of financial control. For a new board, the Inspector and the Trittyarchs (ὁ ἔξεταστής καὶ οἱ τριττύαρχοι), now appears with the responsibility for disbursing the monies for the inscribing of decrees.⁶⁵ Thus it is no longer *civilian* officials who perform this function

⁶³ Since «the number of letters in the line cannot be considered fixed» (ΠΕΨΙΡΚΑ, 99), we could entertain δοῦναι instead of μερίσαι, as in S. 24.119.

⁶⁴ Also relevant to this question may be the fact that in three decrees from the latter part of the second century (S. 15.104.V.141–142 [127/6]; ii² 1008.III.87–88 [118/17]; ii² 1011.III.62–63 [106/5]), usually described as decrees «of the Salaminians» (i.e. the clerouchs on Salamis) but all bearing the unmistakable hallmarks of decrees of the Athenian demos, the Treasurer (sc. of the Stratiotic Fund) is instructed to pay for the stones ἐκ τῶν (εἰς τὰ) κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων (ἀποτεταγμένων, S. 15.104.V.142) τῶι δήμῳι. By contrast, for the inscribing of the other, regular decrees on the same stones the fund from which the Stratiotic Treasurer is to pay is not specified. The explanation may be that, although these three decrees emanate from the initiative of the Salaminians, the Athenian demos actually enacted them and paid for them out of general pleasure at the activities (especially in the Αἰαντεία) of the epebes on Salamis. This being so, the secretary, in drafting the text for inscribing, took particular pains to specify the source of the requisite funds. (I owe this interpretation of these three texts to Mr. A. G. WOODHEAD.)

⁶⁵ See W. S. FERGUSON, *Klio* 5 (1905) 171 ff.; id., *CP* 24 (1929) 16 ff.; DINSMOOR, *Archons*, 64; T. L. SHEAR JR., *Hesperia* Suppl. 17, 52.

but *military* ones,⁶⁶ the exetastes being the paymaster of the mercenary soldiers,⁶⁷ and the trittyarchs officials connected with military and naval finance.⁶⁸

There are, in fact, very few decrees assignable to this period and even fewer which can be given a precise chronological location.⁶⁹ Indeed, the only securely dated example with the new board is ii² 641.29–32, of the year 299/8:

στοιχ. 24

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἄν
αγραφήν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸ
ν ἐξεταστὴν καὶ τοὺς τριτῶν
ρχοὺς ὡς ΔΔ ὡς δραχμάς. *vacat*

This may indeed be our earliest example, although MERITT dated another text, with an identical formulation (as restored), to the year 301/300: S.29.92 (= H.11.278.53) 12–14:

στοιχ. 30

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφ[ὴν τῆς]
[στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ἐξ]εταστὴν κα[ὶ τοῦ]
[ς τριτῶν]ρχοὺς ὡς ΔΔ ὡς δραχμ[ά]ς. *vacat*

This is a decree which honours, amongst others, Ameinias of Xypete, in connection with some unknown expedition ἐν Τορνέα[ι] (vv.7–8). Now, we know from POxy XVII.2082⁷⁰ that Ameinias, along with Charias, Peithias and Lysandros, was condemned and executed in the aftermath of the *stasis* between Charias and the later tyrant Lachares. Following FERGUSON,⁷¹ who believed that Lachares became tyrant in the spring of 300, MERITT placed the decree in 301/300 and identified the expedition with the στρατία mentioned in frag. 1 of the papyrus, judging the reference to be to the joint operations of Argos and Athens in the late summer

⁶⁶ Cf. B.D. MERITT, H. 11 (1942) 280: «The military basis for the newly won freedom is proved from the beginning by the appearance in this decree [i.e. H.11.278–53, dated by MERITT to 301/300: for which see below] of the exetastes and the trittyarchs.»

⁶⁷ Cf. ii² 1270.3 (298/7), where it is clear from the word χε]ιροτονηθεῖς that the exetastes is an *elected* official.

⁶⁸ One may note, however, that, even under this military oligarchy, the basic forms of democratic government remained in force: for the cycle of secretaries of the Boule remains unbroken between 301/300 and 295/4.

⁶⁹ No dated decrees are known from 298/7, 297/6 or the first 9 months of 296/5. P. GAUTHIER (REG 92 [1979] 348–399) has also sought to leave the year 296/5 entirely vacant, by transferring the decrees of the year of Nikias ὕστερος to 282/1. But his case is highly hypothetical, and in particular does not account for the markedly democratic phenomenon of a new conciliar «year» in the last four months of 282/1. It is also unlikely that the well-known double tenure of the generalship by Phaidros of Sphettos (ii² 682.21–24) is not to be linked with the constitutional change in the year of Nikias (see OSBORNE II, 145–150). In any case, none of the decrees of the year Nikias *hysteros* preserves the provision for the payment of the stele.

⁷⁰ See FGH (JACOBY) 257 a, F2.

⁷¹ CP 24 (1929) 1–31.

between Demetrias and Oineis,⁸⁰ but it occasions other difficulties in the body of the decree which I consider insurmountable.⁸¹ (i) TRAILL restores vv. 11–13 to read

δοῦναι δὲ τοὺς] stoich. 29
 [πρυτά]νει[ς] το[ὺς] Δημητριάδος περὶ π[ι]
 ολιτείας αὐτ[ῶν] τὴν ψῆφον κτλ.

but the article τῆς is *de rigueur* with the name of the tribe in these expressions, as it is also where the phrase περὶ τῆς πολιτείας is included; (ii) although D67 and D68 will have been passed on the very same day, (a) the formulation of the provision for the second vote is not identical in the two texts (in D68 the *name* of the prytanising tribe which has the responsibility to conduct the second vote is *not* given; (b) the terms of the grants are different (whereas there is no provision for a *dokimasia* in D67, D68 is not only subject to the judicial scrutiny (as is D69 [ii² 648]) but the scrutiny is specifically stated to be a legal requirement, κατὰ τὸν νόμον; and (c) the officials who are to pay for the stele in the case of D67 are the exetastes and trittarchs, but in the case of D68 (and D69) the Single Officer of Administration.⁸² It seems most unlikely that two decrees of the same day and of the same type will have had different paymasters.⁸³

It is impossible, therefore, to accept TRAILL's hypothesis that D67 (ii² 643 +), D68 (ii² 646) and S.29.96 (ii² 647) all belong to the same day of the same year, 295/4. If, however, we search for an alternative year for D67 within the general period 301–295, only 300/299 and 297/6 are possibilities, if, at least, we assume regularity in the secretary cycles. Of these years the latter would require that the secretary's demotic were Φλυεύς,⁸⁴ and the restoration of this in v.3 of the pre-script would necessitate the assumption of two unscribed spaces before the date by month. The former would require that the secretary came from Leontis, and if S.21.352 (ii² 585) is correctly assigned to that year, the secretary is [...12.]φάνδρου [...9.]. But, as OSBORNE notes, the grounds for attributing S.21.352 to 300/299 are no stronger than that the mover of the decree,

⁸⁰ As one is virtually forced to do for the year 298/7. But see OSBORNE II, 139 note 603, where he considers the possibility that the secretary cycles did not operate at this period.

⁸¹ See HENRY, Honours, 100 note 96, where I arrived independently at the same conclusion as OSBORNE.

⁸² In D68 and D69 the exetastes and trittarchs do make an appearance, but as disbursing officers for *statues*, not for the stelai (cf. note 89 below).

⁸³ As OSBORNE notes (II, 141) we do have evidence for different disbursing officers in the same *year*, but not on the same *day*. It is inaccurate, however, to claim 303/2 as the only year which provides evidence for more than one set of paymasters. As we have seen above, we have the same phenomenon in 302/1 (see pp. 52–54 and 57), and it also probably recurs in 271/0 (see p. 73–74 below, with note 124), as well as much later in the case of prytany decrees (see p. 89 below).

⁸⁴ Phlya being the only deme with initial phi from the tribe Kekropis, the tribe which ought to furnish the secretary for 297/6.

ples of texts where the exetastes and trittyarchs pay for stelai⁹¹ all use the expression εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης – this is the standard formulation until later in the third century⁹² – and all instruct the officials to disburse a specific sum of drachmai. τὸ γενόμε[[νον ἀνάλωμα should then probably be altered to read, *exempli gratia*, *ν ΔΔ ν δραχμ*][μάς, but the flimsiness of the whole basis of restoration – the three ill-read letters τυα – make this at best a very insecure addition to our group of texts paid for by the exetastes and trittyarchs.⁹³

III. 295–286

We have no further securely dated evidence for the officials responsible for the costs of stelai until we come to the decree in favour of Herodoros, an adherent of Demetrios, who is granted the highest honours the Athenian state can bestow (citizenship, *sitesis*, *proedria*, and a bronze statue in the Agora). This decree, D68 (= ii² 646 +) is firmly placed on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth prytany of 295/4 i. e. approximately March 294. We gather from the motivation clause that Herodoros had aided the Athenian ambassadors who had been sent to negotiate peace with Demetrios after the fall of Lachares (vv. 17–22) and that he had been instrumental in the restoration of democracy (vv. 22–25).

There is some considerable dispute about the events immediately preceding the passing of this decree, but I incline strongly to the view that the honours voted to Herodoros were not one of the first acts of the new (presumably oligarchic) government set up by Demetrios upon his entry into Athens in spring 294, but that the decree belongs in a democratic phase of government, encouraged by Demetrios, between the fall of the tyrant Lachares in spring 295 and the overt oligarchy of the years 294/3–292/1.⁹⁴

We find that the disbursing officer is once again the *civilian* Single Officer of Administration: vv. 57–58

⁹¹ ii² 641; S. 29.92 (H. 11.278.53); D67 (ii² 643 + H. 9.80/81.13); S. 24.119 (H. 13.242/3.7).

⁹² We may note that the usual combination is ἀναγραφὴν and ἀνάθεσιν (not ποίησιν and ἀνάθεσιν).

⁹³ MERITT dates the text simply «in.s.iii», with reference to the disbursing officials. But since the honorand seems to have performed some service to the navy (καὶ τὸ ναυτι π[ρ]οσ[φ]ιλεῖς [κόν, vv. 5–6), there may conceivably be some connection between the motivation of this decree and that of S. 29.92 with its reference in vv. 5–6 to τὰς ὑπηρεσ[ί]ας.

⁹⁴ In this I follow OSBORNE II, 144–153, to whose excellent discussion the reader's attention is earnestly drawn. The placing of Lachares' fall in spring 295 and a subsequent short period of democracy accords best with the evidence of the constitutional change evident in the year of Nikias *hysteros* (296/5), with the double tenure of the generalship of Phaidros of Sphettos in the same year (ii² 682.21–24), and with the testimony of Plutarch (Dem. 34.4) that Demetrios κατέστησεν ἀρχὰς αἱ μάλιστα τῷ δήμῳ προσφιλεῖς ἦσαν. (For the nature of the constitution in the year 294–287, see OSBORNE II, 151 note 653).

regular paymaster for the inscribing of decrees until the revolt of Athens and the re-establishment of democracy.⁹⁹ If D71 (ii² 721), with its restored reference to the Single Officer (vv. 23–25), belongs early in the third century (as its lettering suggests), then it falls either in the year 295/4 or in the period 291/0–286,¹⁰⁰ and a date in the first half of the third century is likewise indicated for ii² 706, possibly within the period under discussion.¹⁰¹ As for D70 (ii² 378), 294/3 seems more likely than 321/0, and if the Single Officer is correctly restored in vv. 19–21

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τ non-stoich. c. 30–34

[ἧς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικῆ]σ[ει τὸ]

[γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα·

the dating of this text to the second period of the anagrapheis is assured.¹⁰² ii² 649 (DINSMOOR, Archons, 7/8) is securely placed in prytany X of 293/2, and in all likelihood is also to be restored with the Single Officer in vv. 54–56 of DINSMOOR's text.¹⁰³

τὸ δ' ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς τὴν πόσιν το[ῦ σ] stoich. 39

[τεφάνου καὶ τῆς εἰκόνας] καὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν [σ]

[τῆλων μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ] διοικῆσει. *vacat*

⁹⁹ I follow OSBORNE (see commentary on D74, II, 155–158) and HABICHT (Untersuchungen, 48 ff.) in placing the revolt late in the year of the archon Kimon (288/7), pace SHEAR, *Hesperia* Suppl. 17.61 ff. See also ZPE 35 (1979) 181–194, where OSBORNE convincingly refers the harvesting activities of the brothers Phaidros and Kallias of Sphettos (ii² 682.35–36; S. 28.60.24–27) to the same occasion, and explains «the difficulties surrounding the city» (περιστάτων τε πόλει καιρῶν δυσκόλων, ii² 682.33) as a euphemism for the presence of Demetrios and his garrison in the Piraeus. If these arguments (inter alia) are accepted, Phaidros' activities must be connected with his brother Kallias's and the revolt placed in the summer of 287. OSBORNE further points out that the words καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην αὐτόνομον (ii² 682.38–39) surely imply the restitution of the democracy by the end of 288/7. On this view the siege and the negotiations for peace take place in 287/6. By 286/5 the democratic organs are fully operational (see the discussion of D74 [ii² 662 + 663] p. 71 below).

¹⁰⁰ See OSBORNE II, 154. Apart from the criterion of script, the decree is to be dated in terms of the presence of the Single Officer as paymaster for the stone. In the period 295/4–286, 294/3–292/1 are unavailable because the recording officer in those years was the anagrapheus, not the prytany-secretary.

¹⁰¹ See PEČIRKA, 96–98 (with note 3). OSBORNE, however, seems to place this text in the period 262–229 (OSBORNE II, 178 note 819), in which case PEČIRKA's alternative dating, shortly after 262, would apply.

¹⁰² See OSBORNE I, 150–153 and II, 153–154, who rehearses the arguments for the dating of this text.

¹⁰³ DINSMOOR (Archons, 12) notes that the space would also permit the restoration [δοῦναι τοῦς], but concludes that the Plural Board would not be appropriate in a decree of the overt oligarchy. He might also have noticed that, apart from the very doubtful D81 (ii² 710) 21–23 (for which see p. 72–73 below), the Plural Board are always instructed μερίσαι, not δοῦναι.

It would be superfluous to cite in full all the examples of the Plural Board acting as disbursing officers during this period of Athenian freedom, but a conservative list would include the following: D75 (ii² 652) 35–36 (paullo post 286/5); ii² 653.54–56 (285/4); ii² 657.70–73 (283/2);¹¹⁰ S.25.89.40–42 (282/1); S.25.90.30–32 (281/0); ii² 660.II.45–46 (281/0);¹¹¹ ii² 672.16–17 (?277/6);¹¹² MT 78.23–24 (273/2);¹¹³ S.14.64.35–36 (271/0); S.28.60.107–109 (270/69); ii² 665.33–34 (266/5); ii² 668.36–38 (266/5); ii² 686 + 687 (Addenda p.664) 66–68 (265/4).¹¹⁴

We must, however, give careful consideration to D81 (ii² 710) 21–23, restored by OSBORNE to read:

τὸ δ[ἐ ἄν]	stoich. 26
[άλωμα τὸ εἰς τήν] ἀναγραφὴν δ[οῦν]	
[{υ}ν]αι τοὺς(?) ἐπὶ τ]ῆς δι[ο]ικήσε[ω]ς[] <i>vs</i>	
<i>vacat</i>	

This is a remarkable text: the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως¹¹⁵ is unique in these provisions, although we may recall that Pollux (8.113) referred to the Single Officer of Administration in precisely this way.¹¹⁶ However that may be, it is clear that, whether we restore τοὺς or τόν in v. 23, there must have been some error of cut-

traces of any letters after the word διοικήσει. OSBORNE, however, detects the outline of tau in the twenty-sixth letterspace. (It is not clear to me why OSBORNE chooses to read τὸ ἀνάλωμα instead of the customary τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα, which his arrangement would seem to permit.)

¹¹⁰ Payment here is to be made from the Assembly's expense account (see p. 60 above).

¹¹¹ In v. 46 KIRCHNER in the Corpus text accidentally omitted the article in the phrase ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει: see PEČIRKA, 95 note 5.

¹¹² Again from the Assembly's expense account (cf. note 110, and see p. 61 above).

¹¹³ In vv. 19–20 of the same text it appears – the text is non-stoichedon – that the Plural Board cooperate with the Stratiotic Treasurer in providing funds for a sacrifice: μερίσαι τὸν ταμίαν | [τῶν στρατιωτικῶν] καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, the money to come from the Boule's expense account for decrees. RHODES (Boule, 109–110) interprets this to mean that the payment is being made by state officials from a *central* fund and that the Boule's expense account is simply one ledger within that central fund. This is not, however, an inescapable conclusion (cf. D.J. GEAGAN, *Hesperia* Suppl. 12 [1967] 116 note 179).

¹¹⁴ I accept MERITT's defence of 265/4 (rather than 268/7) for the archonship of Peithidemos. MERITT points out that the Alliance proposed on the motion of Chremonides (ii² 686 + 687) does not necessarily imply that no hostilities had gone before. The «Chremonidean War» therefore got its name only some time after hostilities had actually begun. (See *Hesperia* 50 [1981] 78 ff.)

¹¹⁵ There is no doubting the genitive, although perhaps the eta of τῆς should be dotted, since OSBORNE tells us (I, 174) that «only the top part of a right vertical is visible» in the thirteenth stoichos.

¹¹⁶ As does Diogenes Laertios (VII.10) in quoting the decree in honour of Zeno (see p. 76 below).

ting,¹¹⁷ since the infinitive is unquestionably to be read as δ[οῦναι]. OSBORNE tentatively opts for τοῦς, filling out the space at the beginning of v. 23 with a dittography of υν from the end of v. 22, since he feels that the decree belongs more likely in the period 286–262, where there were relatively numerous citizenship awards. He also draws attention to the similarity of the scrutiny clause to that of D80 (ii² 718 + 804),¹¹⁸ possibly to be dated, on the evidence of the hand and the presence of the judicial scrutiny, c. 273–262.¹¹⁹

We could, however, restore either δ[οῦν][[οῦν]αι τὸν or, perhaps better, δ[οῦν][[αι τὸν {τὸν}, there being no reason why this careless cutter should not have repeated *three* rather than two letters. This would have the great advantage of eliminating what is otherwise the *only* example of the verb δοῦναι used of the Plural Board.¹²⁰ If either of these is accepted, then the date for this text is either 295/4 or 291/0–287/6.¹²¹ OSBORNE objects that there are virtually no decrees known from the years 291/0–287/6, although he concedes S. 16.61 (291/0). He might also have noticed, however, that 295/4 or 291/0–287/6 is the date he himself supposes for D71 (ii² 721).

I suggest, therefore, that we restore the Single Officer of Administration in D81 (ii² 710), and date the decree either 295/4 or 291–286.¹²²

During the period under discussion (286–262) there is no *sure* evidence for any other official(s) than the Plural Board paying for the expenses of stelai. However, as Dinsmoor has shown,¹²³ it is likely that the Stratiotic Treasurer paid for a stone in 271/0. The text in question, S. 14.65.49–51, is a decree passed in the ninth pryt-

¹¹⁷ There are several other such errors of careless cutting earlier in the text (v. 10: delta for alpha; 12: omicron for theta; 13 and 18: upsilon for phi), and in the last word of the last line the mason has cut omicron for omega and omitted the final sigma.

¹¹⁸ See OSBORNE II, 167–168 (and cf. note 40 above).

¹¹⁹ See OSBORNE I, 172 and II, 167, TRACY GRBS 14 (1973) 190–192, and cf. note 40 above.

¹²⁰ OSBORNE (I, 174) has noticed that the verb associated with the Single Officer is either δοῦναι or μερίσαι, as is indeed so. But he has failed to realise that, apart from this one possible example if the Plural Board are accepted in D81, *all* other examples in which the Plural Board pay employ the term μερίσαι.

¹²¹ The years 294/3–292/1 are eliminated, since, during that period, it is the anagrapheus who is responsible for the publication of decrees (whereas here, vv. 19–20, it is the γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου). But I cannot understand OSBORNE's reason for rejecting 295/4: «in 295/4 the trittarchs and the *exetastes* still had some role to play». For in that year the role they played was as disbursing officials for *statues* (see D68 and 69). The later period (after 262) is ruled out, for at that time the scrutiny (vv. 15–18) was *not* an element of the naturalization procedure.

¹²² For the disbursing officer(s) of D87 (ii² 808) the citizenship decree for Bithys of Lysimacheia, which KOEHLER, KIRCHNER and BURSTEIN wish to restore as the Plural Board, see p. 78 below. I would place this decree in the mid 230s.

¹²³ Hesperia 23 (1954) 304.

any¹²⁴ in honour of the sitonai of the preceding year. DINSMOOR restored as follows:

τὸ] δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ γενόμενον ε[ἰς τήν]	stoich. 34–38
[ποίησιν τῆς στή]λης καὶ τὴν ἀν[αγρ]α[φήν] μερί[σαι]	
[τὸν ταμίαν.vacat]	vacat

since he calculated «a maximum of 14 letters» in the lacuna, «thus eliminating both the foregoing (sc. τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν) and also either [τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου] or [τὸν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει] in 17 or 18 letters». As he noted, neither the Treasurer of the People nor the Single Officer is appropriate to this period, and I suppose he excluded a fortiori the Plural Board with 19 letters.¹²⁵ His preference for the short title τὸν ταμίαν¹²⁶ is therefore determined purely on the basis of what can be fitted in the available space and there is no reason to question his assessment of its extent.¹²⁷ That being so, we have here once again evidence for the continuing activity of the Stratiotic Treasurer in relation to the expenses of decrees.

V. 261–229

As HEINEN has recently demonstrated,¹²⁸ Athens, after a long siege, finally capitulated to Antigonos in the spring of 261 i.e. in the first half of the Delian year of Tharsynon (261 B.C.), and the second half of the Athenian year of Antipatros (262/1). During the subsequent period of Macedonian military control it is only to be expected that we shall again encounter the Single Officer of Administration, the official apparently favoured by such regimes to disburse the monies for the inscribing of decrees. Indeed, it has become an article of faith that the expenses of decrees falling within this period will have been paid for by the Single Officer. But this faith has now been found to have been somewhat misplaced, for in a decree of the year of Polyuktos, published in the latest number of *Hesperia*, we have secure evi-

¹²⁴ In another text of the second prytany of the same year (archon Pytharatos), S. 14.64.35–36, the disbursing officials are manifestly the Plural Board.

¹²⁵ He also refers to «the vague term [τοὺς ταμίαις]», only to reject it as «improbable». It is indeed *impossible*.

¹²⁶ For this short title after 229, see pp. 84 and 89 below.

¹²⁷ On the other hand, his claim that we should also read τὸν ταμίαν in ii² 792.15 (249/8) is more questionable. Although he may be correct in stating that «the broken stone gives no authority for [τῶν στρατιωτικῶν]», we should note that the reading of the *full* title there gives a line of 47 letters, perfectly acceptable on a stone inscribed stoichedon 50. DINSMOOR, of course, was seeking to draw parallels between the text he was publishing (now S. 14.64) and ii² 792, both decrees honouring sitonai.

¹²⁸ Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., *Historia Einzelschriften* 20, Wiesbaden (1972), 139–140. In this he has the support of HABICHT, *Studien*, 13, and MERITT, *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 97 ff.

dence for the *Plural Board* paying for the decree.¹²⁹ As a result, an agonizing re-appraisal of the period in question must now be undertaken.

But first the new decree.¹³⁰ The stele was found, virtually in situ and still fastened to its base, on April 16, 1980. It is in very good condition, and is inscribed with a probouleumatic decree accepting a report on the sacrifices made by Timokrite, daughter of Polynikos of Aphidna, priestess of Aglauros, and honouring her with an olive crown. The concluding provision (vv. 36–38) states categorically

εἰς δὲ τ stoich. 33

ἦν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπ
ἰ τῆι διοικήσει τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα.

DONTAS duly expresses his surprise, and notes that «the formula if not the date of Polyeuktos will require further examination».¹³¹

An explanation is certainly demanded, and the solution cannot be sought in any attempt to move the archon Polyeuktos out of the period in question. Polyeuktos is firmly dated in 247/6.¹³² Nor is any suggestion of masonic or secretarial error likely to win much support. Unpleasing though it is, we must face the fact that the Plural Board was operating again in the middle of the third century, at least in the year 247/6.¹³³ We can no longer, therefore, regard the period 261–229 as a single entity, and we must examine in detail the evidence for the disbursing officers in the extant decrees from 261 onwards.¹³⁴

¹²⁹ See GEORGE S. DONTAS, «The True Aglaurion», *Hesperia* 52 (1983) 48–63. I understand that the text was given some preliminary exposure by Dontas at the Epigraphical Congress in Athens late in 1982.

¹³⁰ I am not here concerned with the *topographical* implications of the new text, profound though those are.

¹³¹ Art. cit., p. 57. (We may note that DONTAS' reference to DINSMOOR's acceptance of the Plural Board in 232/1 rests on a false assumption. The archonship of Heliodoros has long since been fixed in 229/8. There is thus no other [firm] evidence for the Plural Board in the period 261–229).

¹³² So MERITT, *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 80–82 and 87, correctly, in my opinion (pace HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 133–135 and 143). Even if HABICHT's date of 246/5 were accepted, our present problem would be basically the same. (Note that, throughout the following discussion, I follow MERITT's latest chronology: see, however, HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 113–146).

¹³³ Nor would it make any sense to suggest that the Plural Board and the Single Officer somehow co-existed at the same time. The situation here in the mid third century is quite different from that which obtained later when a Single Officer of Administration, *as one member of a board* of οἱ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, was wont to pay for *prytany* inscriptions (see pp. 86–92 below).

¹³⁴ In the account which follows I leave out of consideration for the moment the problematic texts ii² 801, D87 (ii² 808), and S. 23.67, as well as all possible occurrences of the Stratiotic Treasurer. These special problems are dealt with below, pp. 78–81.

(i) 261–256: FERGUSON had argued that during this period the Assembly passed no decrees other than those requested by the Macedonian king or his agent.¹³⁵ This claim, however, is too extreme, although it would be true to say that in those years the Assembly was mainly occupied with matters of routine administration.¹³⁶ More to the point is the fact that in none of the extant decrees now attributed with varying degrees of certainty to this period is the provision for payment of the stone preserved.¹³⁷

However, we do have a record in Diogenes Laertios (VII.10) of a decree from the very first year of Macedonian control (the archonship of Arrheneides, 261/0). This is the decree in honour of Zeno, passed at the request of the King, and in it we find that it is the Single Officer of Administration who is to disburse the necessary funds: τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς τὰς στήλας γινόμενον μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως.¹³⁸ This is sufficient to show that the expected shift from the Plural Board to the Single Officer did indeed take place upon the capitulation of Athens to Antigonos.

(ii) 255–248/7: in these years there is again adequate evidence for the activity of the Single Officer. He appears as the disbursing official in S.18.19 (ii² 775 + 803) I.26–27 (253/2 or paullo ante);¹³⁹ MT 89.21–22 and 40–41 (252/1); and H.S.17.87/89.1 (ii² 682) 90–91, probably to be dated in 251/0, if the archon Euboulos is now accepted in 254/3.¹⁴⁰

(iii) 246/5–229: here too there is firm evidence again for the Single Officer. Indeed, only two years after the archonship of Polyuektos, we find the Single Officer of Administration operating in the year of Diomedon, H.11.290/1.56 (ii² 791) 25–27 (245/4), and he appears again in ii² 788.28–30 (235/4) and ii² 768 + 802.27–29 (233/2).

This brief survey makes it clear that, within the period under discussion, the Single Officer of Administration operated both before and after the isolated – and

¹³⁵ W. S. FERGUSON, *Hellenistic Athens*, Macmillan (1911) 133.

¹³⁶ Cf. HABICHT, *Studien*, 20–21: «sie (die Volksversammlung) aus eigener Initiative in diesen Jahren schwerlich andere als Routineangelegenheiten behandelt hat: Beamtenwahlen, Ehrungen von Prytanen, Belobigungen der Epheben.»

¹³⁷ We would place here ii² 477 (260/59); ii² 700 + H.7.100/114.20 (257/6); ii² 784 (256/5).

¹³⁸ For the genitive cf. D81 (ii² 710) 23: see p. 72 above.

¹³⁹ Decree I may or may not be of the same year as decree II, which is certainly of the year of Lysiades. The two decrees have the same mover.

¹⁴⁰ See MERITT, *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 89–91. In v. 72 it is specified that Phaidros' crown is to be proclaimed at the Dionysia and the Great Panathenaia. Presumably, therefore, the decree was passed in a year preceding the quadrennial celebration of the latter. The most likely year is therefore 251/0, which comes between the archonship of Euboulos (254/3) and the Great Panathenaia of Hekatombaion 250. We may note that this re-dating removes Lewis's worry about Lyandros's serving as a bouleutes in two successive years (see JHS 100 [1980] 257–258). Lyandros will now have been on the boule in 254/3 and 252/1 (archon Philinos).

unexpected – appearance of the Plural Board in the year of Polyeuktos.¹⁴¹ The problem, therefore, is threefold: (a) when did the Plural Board replace the Single Officer; (b) why did this happen; and (c) how long did the Plural Board retain this function? We may deal with these seriatim:

(a) the answer can only be given in terms of the last known occurrence of the Single Officer, viz. H. S. 17.87/89.1 (ii² 682), which, as we have seen, is probably to be placed in 251/0. The terminus ante quem non for the Plural Board is therefore 250/49.

(b) I would suggest that there may be some connection between the «intrusion» of the Plural Board and the well-known fact that by the mid 250s Antigonos felt secure enough to «give back the Athenians their freedom» (Ἀθηναίους Ἀντιγόνοσ τὴν ἔλευθερίαν ἔδωκεν).¹⁴² This restitution of freedom is dated in Ol. 131.1 = 256/5. Up to this point Antigonos had maintained a garrison on the Mouseion, and had interfered to some extent with the government of the city.¹⁴³ It seems that now, however, he removed the garrison and allowed the city to organise its own internal affairs,¹⁴⁴ except that he continued the management of Athenian finances through the Single Officer, at least until 251/0. But at some point between 250 and the year of Polyeuktos he made the further concession of allowing the Athenians to control their finances through the agency of the «democratic» Plural Board.

(c) again we can only really answer with reference to the next occurrence of the Single Officer, viz. H. 11.290/1.56 (ii² 791) of 245/4. Perhaps, however, we may adduce the evidence of the break in the secretary-cycles manifest at the end of the archonship of Hieron (246/5), as well as the emergency measures as reflected in the *epidosis* of 245/4 (ii² 791),¹⁴⁵ to suggest that it was indeed in the year 245/4 that the Single Officer took over control from the Plural Board once again.

The absolute limits, therefore, for the Plural Board within the period 261–229 would be 250/49–246/5 inclusive. Unless and until further evidence comes to light, texts with the Single Officer as disbursing official, attributable on other grounds to a date near the middle of the century, should not be placed in those years.

¹⁴¹ Unfortunately, two other texts from the same year, ii² 679 + 584 and ii² 680 do not preserve the disbursing official(s).

¹⁴² Eusebios, Chron. Can. II, p. 120 (ed. SCHOENE), p. 201 (ed. KARST).

¹⁴³ For the interpretation of the evidence of Apollodoros (FGH [JACOBY] 244 F44): καὶ Ἀπολλόδο[δω]ρος δὲ τὸ κα[θηρω]θησθαι [τίθησι τ]ὴν πόλιν [ἐπ' Ἀντιπ]έτρου [ἱ]οῦ πρὸ Ἀρρενιδ[ου], καὶ φρουρά[ν εἰς] τὸ Μουσεῖον [τότε] εἰσήχθ[αι ὑπ'] Ἀντιγόνο[υ], [καὶ τὰς] ἀρχὰς [ἀνηρῆσθ]αι καὶ πᾶν ἐν[ὶ] βουλευ[εῖν] ἐφ[ε]ῖσθαι, see HABICHT, Studien, 15 ff.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Pausanias 3.66.

¹⁴⁵ For a detailed discussion of this decree soliciting donations «for the safety of the city and the guarding of the land», see HABICHT, Studien, 26–33 (and cf. FERGUSON, Hellenistic Athens, 203–204). Although the stele is to be paid for by the Single Officer of Administration (vv. 25–27), the superscript carries the name of the Stratiotic Treasurer, Eurykleides, son of Mikion, of Kephisia, the official given the responsibility for receiving the donations.

I return now to three texts which demand individual consideration:

(1) D87 (ii² 808), the citizenship decree for Bithys of Lysimacheia. In this text either the Single Officer or the Plural Board could in theory be restored, and our choice will be determined by the period to which the decree is assigned. STANLEY BURSTEIN has recently entered this debate,¹⁴⁶ and urged vigorously that, for reasons related to the form of the expressions for the referral of the matter to the next meeting of the assembly¹⁴⁷ and for the payment of the stele,¹⁴⁸ the decree should be placed in the year 285 or shortly thereafter. He identifies our honorand with a certain Bithys mentioned by Athenaios (6.246 e) as a minister of Lysimachos.

The weakness of BURSTEIN's case has, however, been firmly exposed by OSBORNE¹⁴⁹ – he notes, for example, that BURSTEIN's Bithys could only have been born after 309/8 (the foundation date of Lysimacheia), and hence would be remarkably young to be serving as a trusted emissary of Lysimachos in the mid 280s – and there can be little doubt that the man honoured here is the general of Demetrius II mentioned by Plutarch (Aratos 34.1) as having defeated Aratos at Phylakia.¹⁵⁰ The decree should thus be placed in the mid 230s, and the expenses formula restored as follows:¹⁵¹

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἄν]	stoich. 40
αγραφήν τῆς στήλ[ης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικῆ υν]	
σει υ Δ υ δραχμάς υυυ [vacat]	

(2) S. 23.67: this fragmentary text is dated in the archonship of Philoneos, now 244/3. It is not without reason that WOODHEAD described it as «titulus difficillimus».

In vv. 22 ff. we clearly have the usual instructions for inscribing and locating the stele. We would then expect the expenses formula to follow immediately, and there does indeed seem to be a clear reference to τὸ γενόμενον ἀ[νάλωμα. Beyond that, however, all is obscure.

¹⁴⁶ CSCA 12 (1979) 39–50.

¹⁴⁷ Restored as εἰς τὴν [πρώτην, rather than as εἰς τὴν [ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησί]αν (vv. 13–14).

¹⁴⁸ Specified as a fixed price rather than the vague τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα (v. 29).

¹⁴⁹ OSBORNE II, 172–177: cf. AS 5 (1974) 97–104.

¹⁵⁰ In any case, the absence of provision for a judicial scrutiny in the naturalization process excludes the period 286–262. BURSTEIN's assumption of an accidental omission of this clause is unconvincing.

¹⁵¹ With the Single Officer restored there are 2 stoichoi unaccounted for at the end of v. 28. Similar uninscribed spaces must be assumed in vv. 17, 19 and 23, but no single criterion to account for all of these is evident. OSBORNE suggests that either the cutter erred through ditography – ΤΟΝΕΠΙΤΕΙΔΙΟΙΟΙΚΗ, the eye mistaking the middle iota of ΙΟΙΟΙ for the initial iota, or he deliberately divided the word διοικῆσει so as not to begin v. 29 with a single iota followed by a vacant space. Since the cutter has clearly *chosen* to employ vacant spaces in vv. 17, 19 and 23, the latter explanation seems preferable.

In the original publication¹⁵² PRITCHETT and MERITT, assuming a stoichedon 43 line, restored thus (vv. 23–25):

[καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Δι[ός· δοῦναι δὲ τὸν ταμί]
[αν ἐκ τοῦ νό]μου τὸ γενόμενον ἀ[νάλωμα *vacat*]
vacat

They noted, however, that «the restorations here proposed are doubtful», and later MERITT returned to the text,¹⁵³ producing a revised version in stoichedon 48:

[καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Δι[ός· μερίσαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψη]
[φρίσματα δῆ]μου τὸ γενόμενον ἀ[νάλωμα τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει].
vacat

Most recently, he revised the text again,¹⁵⁴ with a line of stoichedon 55, and it is this version which appears in S. 23.67:

[καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Δι[ός· ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀναλισκομένων χρημάτων]
[ν ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆ]μου τὸ γενόμενον ἀ[νάλωμα μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει].

The difficulty throughout has, of course, been the letters MOY before τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα. PRITCHETT and MERITT's original ἐκ τοῦ νόμου is perhaps not impossible, given the formulation which we find in ii² 240 (Tod 181) 23–25 (337/6):

εἰς [δ]ὲ τὴν ἀναγρ[αφὴν τῆς σ] stoich. 27
[τῆ]λης [δó]τῳ ὁ ταμίαις τριά[κοντα δρ]
[αχμ]ά[ς] κατὰ τὸν νόμον. *vacat*

and we might also compare the unique ii² 354.29–31 (328/7):

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγρ[αφὴν] stoich. 34
τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δῆμ[ου : Δ]
[Δ]Δ: δραχμὰς ὄθεν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσι[ν].

but, with a stoichedon 55 line, the restoration μερίσαι δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει ἐκ τοῦ νόμου would leave two letter-spaces unaccounted for.¹⁵⁵ Perhaps then we should look for some reference to the Assembly's expense account,¹⁵⁶ as indeed MERITT has done in his latest version. χρημάτων, however, never appears with ἀναλισκομένων in the formulation for the expenses of inscribing decrees,¹⁵⁷ and

¹⁵² PM, 22–23.

¹⁵³ Hesperia 17 (1948) 7–12.

¹⁵⁴ The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan, Cornell U.P. (1966) 31–42.

¹⁵⁵ Between the sigma of Δι[ός and the mu of]μου there are 36 spaces to be filled.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. pp. 60–63 above.

¹⁵⁷ MT 77.31–32, which refers to τῶν ἀναλισκομένων] χρημάτων ὑ[πὸ τῆς βουλῆς, is not a provision for the expenses of inscribing the stele.

τῶι δῆμῳι of the regular formulation is rather a dative of advantage than a dative of agent. A more satisfactory restoration might therefore be (retaining MERITT's stochedon 55 line):

[καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν τῶι τεμένει τοῦ Δι[ός· μερίσαι δ' ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσι]
[ματα τοῦ δῆ]μου τὸ γενόμενον ἀ[νάλωμα τὸν ἐπὶ τετ διοικήσει. *vacat*]

Although this particular form of wording is nowhere paralleled, it seems marginally less objectionable than solutions heretofore promoted. Some anomaly certainly exists in the provision for the payment of the expenses of this stone.

(3) ii² 801: this text is generally dated, on the basis of the lettering, around the middle of the third century.¹⁵⁸ KOEHLER and KIRCHNER restored the Single Officer of Administration in the last line, thus:

non-stoich. 50–57

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς]

[στήλης μερίσαι]ι τὸ[ν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα]

but there is, of course, no compelling reason for this, since the space available at the end of the last line could accommodate either the Single Officer or the Plural Board. If we restore the latter, τοῦς ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει, then we should place the text either before 262 or in the period 250/49–246/5.¹⁵⁹

Further, it is not inconceivable that this stone was paid for by the Stratiotic Treasurer. For, as we have already seen, it can be demonstrated conclusively that the ταμίαις τῶν στρατιωτικῶν appears as disbursing officer for stelai long before the year 229.¹⁶⁰ Apart from the scattered examples which we have noted in passing,¹⁶¹ there are several instances of his paying for stelai in the period under discussion. The clearest examples are H. 6.445/6.2.12–13 (255/4), a decree in honour of sitophylakes:¹⁶²

stoich. 50

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης μ]

[ερ]ίσαι τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν τὸ γενόμε[νον ἀνάλωμα. *vacat*]

¹⁵⁸ See PEČIRKA, 112.

¹⁵⁹ See p. 77 above.

¹⁶⁰ This fact has often been forgotten (e.g. by Dow, Prytaneis, 11–13; DINSMOOR, List, 18; and now RHODES, Boule 109), although WILHELM drew it to our attention long ago (AU II.13–14), and PRITCHETT and MERITT repeated the warning (PM, 43, note 41).

¹⁶¹ For the appearance of the Stratiotic Treasurer as the paymaster for stelai in the closing years of the fourth century, see pp. 52–58; in 291/0, see p. 71; in 271/0, during the period of the Plural Board, see pp. 73–74.

¹⁶² It is noticeable how often the Stratiotic Treasurer is called upon to pay for stelai carrying decrees in honour of officials connected with the corn-supply: cf. S. 14.65 (271/0), sitonai; H. 6.445/6.2 (255/4), sitophylakes; ii² 792 (? 248/7), sitonai. However, it does not seem possible to establish precise spheres of responsibility for the various officials who disburse funds for decrees.

is in fact only one example¹⁶⁹ in which the Plural Board function as the *sole* officials responsible for providing the funds for inscription viz. D92 (S. 26.96). This citizenship decree was dated c. 220 by its first editor, STEPHEN TRACY,¹⁷⁰ on the basis of the hand and the formula for the citizenship grant:¹⁷¹ vv. 11–13

τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα]	non-stoich. c. 35–40
τὸ εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν κ[αὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στή]	
λης μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τ[ῆι διοικήσει vacat]	
vacat	

but because of its affinity to D91 (q.v.) OSBORNE would be prepared to date it as early as c. 224. Indeed, it may well be that it belongs even earlier, at the very beginning of this new phase of democratic procedures.

Elsewhere, the Plural Board are always instructed to operate *in conjunction with the Stratiotic Treasurer*.¹⁷² The bulk of the examples appear to belong before the end of the third century, but there is at least one instance from well into the second.¹⁷³

The combination presents itself in the very first year of freedom, ii² 844.I.30–32 (229/8):

τὸ δὲ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα	non-stoich. 42–50
εἰς τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς εἰκόνοσ καὶ τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν	
ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τεῖ ¹⁷⁴ διοικήσει.	

and the same double responsibility, Stratiotic Treasurer plus Plural Board, *always in that order*, is surely instanced in S. 25.108.20–22 (c. 220); ii² 892.17–20 (188/7); and ii² 926.15–17 (? c. in. s. ii), and is to be restored in ii² 786.34–37 (? c. 225).

The priority of the Stratiotic Treasurer is thus established, even when he oper-

¹⁶⁹ RHODES (Boule, 109) incorrectly gives the impression that from 229 to 169 the Plural Board is a regular alternative to the Stratiotic Treasurer.

¹⁷⁰ H.45.283/5.1.

¹⁷¹ The decree belongs to OSBORNE'S «Type I» group, which he places c. 229–202/1. It is very similar to D91 (ii² 851: cf. S. 28.71). Both texts are to be associated with a transitional period during which the new form of statement of the citizenship grant is employed, although the fully developed formulation and sequence of items of the later awards have not yet become established.

¹⁷² RHODES (Boule, 109) has neglected to note that DOW (Prytaneis, 13) speaks of «the Treasurer of Military Funds, the plural board, or both» (my italics).

¹⁷³ We may observe that, as early as 273/2, the Stratiotic Treasurer (as restored, correctly, in my opinion) and the Plural Board are instructed to collaborate in providing funds for the expenses of one of the prytaneis' sacrifices: MT 78.19–20: ὅτι δ' ἂν διαχειροτονοῦντι τῶι δῆμῳι δόξει, μερίσαι τ[ὸν ταμίαν] | [τῶν στρατιωτικῶν] καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει. These funds are to come from the Boule's expense account for decrees: πόρον δ' ὑπάρχειν ἐ[κ τῶν εἰς τὰ] | [ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκ]ομένων ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς (vv. 20–21). For the procedure implied here, see RHODES, Boule, 110 (and cf. B. D. MERITT, AJP 56 [1935] 318–319).

¹⁷⁴ For the reading of the article, see IG ii² Addenda, p. 668.

ates in conjunction with the Plural Board. This priority is also highlighted by the fact that he can be referred to simply as «the Treasurer» without further qualification:¹⁷⁵ D95 (S.28.75) 33–35, the «citizenship» decree in favour of the people of Chrysaorean Antioch of c. 203:¹⁷⁶

τὸ δὲ γινόμενον ἀνάλωμα εἰς τὴν ποιή
σιν τῆς στήλης καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν μερίσαι τὸν ταμίαν καὶ τοὺς
[ἐ]πι τεῖ διοικήσει. *vacat*

Before leaving this survey of decrees paid for by the Stratiotic Treasurer plus the Plural Board of Administration special mention should also be made of ii² 884.25–26 (c. 200), the decree in honour of Heris of Byzantium and his colleagues. For here we would appear to have reference to a financial board entitled οἱ ταμίαι:

κ[αὶ μερίσαι τ]ὸ γ[ε]ν[ό]μ[ε]ν[ο]ν
[μ]ε[ν]ο[ν] ἀνάλωμα τοὺς τα[μ]ί[α]ς [τ]ῶν -----

However, as DINSMOOR realised,¹⁷⁷ what we have here is evidence of masonic carelessness,¹⁷⁸ certainly due to a confusion between τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει and τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. And since the Plural Board never precedes the Stratiotic Treasurer in these formulations, we may safely assume that the responsible officials to be restored here are τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικήσει, in that order.

Thus far, we have looked only at examples of decrees paid for by the Plural Board alone or by that Board in collaboration with the Stratiotic Treasurer. But the extant evidence makes it abundantly clear that it is the *Stratiotic Treasurer himself* who is now the predominant disbursing officer. He is called upon time and time again from the end of the third century until the beginning of the first, when our record begins to fail: cf., e.g., S. 25.106.47–50 (226/5)

τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα non-stoich.
μα τὸ γινόμενον εἰς τὴν ἀνάθε[σ]τ[ι]ν καὶ τὴν ἀνα
γραφὴν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ταμί [-----]
αν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. *vacat*

and ii¹ 1011.I.30–31 (106/5)

¹⁷⁵ See also below for the evidence for the abbreviated title when the Stratiotic Treasurer operates alone without the Plural Board.

¹⁷⁶ For the date, see ROBERT L. POUNDER, *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 54 ff. (and cf. OSBORNE II, 184).

¹⁷⁷ Archons, 251.

¹⁷⁸ For the confusion in the cutting of the invitation to the prytaneion (vv. 15–17), see my paper in *Antichthon* 15 (1981) 109.

non-stoich.

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ ποίησιν τῆς στήλης [μερί]σαι τὸν ταμί
[αν] τῶν στρατιωτικῶν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα.¹⁷⁹

Further indication of the standing of the Stratiotic Treasurer is provided by the fact that, not only can he be referred to simply as τὸν ταμίαν without further qualification:¹⁸⁰ cf., e.g., ii² 845.I.21–22 (? 204/3)¹⁸¹

non-stoich. 41–44

τὸ δὲ [ἀνάλ]ωμα τὸ γεν[όμενον εἰς τὴν στήλην μερί]
[σαι τὸν τα]μίαν. *vacat*

but, on occasion, his *name* may also be added to the formula.¹⁸² Thus, the unusual D107 (ii² 853) 13–17 (148/7–135/4):¹⁸³

τὸν δὲ ταμίαν] non-stoich. c. 36–41
[τ]ῶν στρατ[ιωτι]κῶν Σμικυθίω[να---c. 13–18-----]
[c. 3]ασθαι τ[ὸ εἰς] τὴν πολιτογρ[αφίαν ἀνάλωμα καὶ]
[εἰς] τὴν ἀναγ[ραφή]ν καὶ τὴν ἀνά[θρεσιν τῆς στήλης καὶ]
[ἀ]νενεγκεῖν [ἐν τοῖ]ς λόγους

¹⁷⁹ Cf. also the following sure instances: D93 (ii² 854) 8–9 (c. 224–202); S. 26.98.48–49 (204/3); D98 (ii² 893 b, c) 14–16 (c. 202/1 or soon after); ii² 891.19–21 (188/7); 896 I.20–21 and II.55–56 (186/5); 900.25–26 (184/3); D100 (ii² 954+) 23–24 (? 181/0 or 166/5); S. 24.135 (ii² 937) 53–54 (c. 170); S. 25.118.42–45 (169/8); ii² 947.7–8 (? c. 166/5); 949.21–23 (165/4); S. 18.22 (ii² 950) 22–23 (165/4); ii² 907.17–19 (m. s. ii); D116 (ii² 987) 4–6 (c. 150); ii² 983.11–12 (c. m. s. ii); S. 15.104.II.99–100 (127/6); ii² 1006.I.49 and II.98–99 (122/1); 1008.II.73–74 (118/17); 1011.I.30–31 and II.52 (106/5); 1028.I.57 (101/100); 1054.31 (? ante 100); 1037.10–11 (in. s. i).

¹⁸⁰ OSBORNE restores D118 (ii² 924 + Addenda p. 668) 11–13 (c. 190–140) thus:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν] non-stoich. c. 38–43
[τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν τ]αμί[αν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν τὸ]
[γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα. *vacat*]

arguing that «there is no reason not to give the official his usual designation» (OSBORNE I, 235–236). But nor is there any reason not to allow him the well-instanced abbreviated title and restore (with WILHELM, see I. G. ii² Addenda p. 668) [τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν τ]αμί[αν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα]. In these instances where the stone is broken at this point, one can never be certain whether to add τῶν στρατιωτικῶν or not (cf., e.g., ii² 984.25–27 [c. m. s. ii] and 985.13–15 [m. s. ii]).

¹⁸¹ Cf. also ii² 908.20–22 (181–170) and 909.24–26 (c. 170). RHODES (Boule, 109 note 8) is also surely right in identifying τὸν ταμίαν of ii² 863.7–9 (f. s. iii) with the Stratiotic Treasurer, and not, as HARTEL and FELLNER wished, with the Treasurer of the Boule.

¹⁸² The earliest named Stratiotic Treasurer in an expenses formula known to me is in Ag. I 7496 (ined.) v. 23: [τ]ὸν ταμίαν τῶν στ[ρατι]ωτικῶν Φιλίωνα, of the year 181/0. (This new decree will be published by STEPHEN TRACY, to whom I am indebted for the information. Inter alia, it proves, incidentally, that the archon Hippias followed Timesianax, and so is confirmed in the year 181/0).

and ii² 1009.I.25–27 (116/115)

non-stoich. c.62–70

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀ[ν]
[ἀθε]σιν τῆς [στήλης τὸ γενό]μενον ἀνάλωμα μερίσαι τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρα[τιω]
[τικῶν] Δ[ῆμον Βερενικίδ]ην

and *ibid.* II.55–57

εἰς δὲ [τὴν κατασ]κευὴν καὶ τὴν [ἀνάθεσιν]

[τῆς στήλης μερίσαι] τὸν ταμίαν τ[ῶν] στρατιωτικῶν Δῆμον [Βερ]ενικίδην
τὸ γε[νόμενον ἀνά]

[λωμα·

The Stratiotic Treasurer is similarly named in the fragmentary ii² 1055.21–22 (c.100), τὸν ταμί][αν τ]ῶν στρατιωτικῶν Λεύκιον, and in ii² 1041.6–7 (? 44/3) we probably have a named treasurer with the abbreviated title:

τὸ δὲ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα εἰς τὴν στή]λην καὶ τὴν non-stoich.

ἐπιγραφὴν μερίσαι τὸν ταμίαν Θε

[--

Apart, however, from these examples of funds for decrees disbursed by the Plural Board, the Plural Board plus the Stratiotic Treasurer, and the Stratiotic Treasurer alone, we also, unexpectedly,¹⁸⁴ encounter two¹⁸⁵ instances of the *Single Officer of Administration* viz. the late citizenship decree D120 (= ii 398) 15–17 (c.212/11–174/3)¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ See OSBORNE I, 222 for a discussion of the restorations here; and for v.17 cf. ii² 1023.21–23 (f. s.ii) and H. 51.63.5, a new fragment of MT 248.1–2 (c. 128), as well as v.26 of Ag. I 7496 (see note 182 above).

¹⁸⁴ Unexpectedly, that is, in decrees other than *prytany* decrees. As we shall see below, the Single Officer of Administration is the regular disbursing official with respect to *prytany* decrees.

¹⁸⁵ KIRCHNER also restored the Single Officer in ii² 922.15–16:

τὸ δὲ γενόμενον]

non-stoich. 38–50

[εἰς αὐτὴν ἀνάλωμα μερίσαι τὸν [ἐπὶ τε] διοικήσει].

whereas OSBORNE in his D106 version (vv. 16–17, with a different lay-out of the text; dated c. 190–165) prefers to follow WILHELM's restoration of the Stratiotic Treasurer:

τὸ δὲ γενό]

[μενον εἰ]ς αὐτὴν ἀνάλωμα μερίσαι τὸν [ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν].

There is, of course, no way of being absolutely sure. One can only say that the high proportion of occurrences of the Stratiotic Treasurer in this period makes his appearance here the more likely.

¹⁸⁶ The date is given in terms of TRACY's «ii² 913 Cutter» (see *Hesperia* 47 [1978] 255–257). It should be noted, however, that HABICHT (*Studien*, 177) places Euandros between 202/1 and 197/6. The earliest example of this Cutter's work may now be from the archonship of Sostratos, 210/9.

εἰς] δὲ τὴν ἀναγρα φ non-stoich. c. 36–39
 [φὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στήλης] μερίσαι τὸν ἐπ[ι]
 [τῆι διοικήσει τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλω]μα. vacat

and the ephobic decree S. 15.104.III (ii² 991) 113–114 (128/7)¹⁸⁷

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ ἀνάθεσιν τῆς non-stoich. c. 82
 στήλης μερί]σαι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ δ[ι]
 [οικήσει τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα. vacat] vacat

Dow had already alluded to these two texts and dismissed them as «unintelligible and probably unimportant exceptions».¹⁸⁸ Unintelligible they may well be, but unimportant is another matter. Rather, at the very least, we must accept that an official to whom the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει was applicable persisted, either as a one-man office or as a member of a board, until almost as far as our records go. It would be an economical hypothesis to assume that he is the same official as the one so often entrusted with providing the funds for *prytany* decrees; and the evidence, flimsy as it is, would therefore indicate that he could, on occasion, be called upon to disburse funds for other types of decree as well.¹⁸⁹

B. Prytany Decrees:

In contrast to the decrees reviewed in section A above, it is the *Single Officer of Administration* who continues to be the officer chiefly, but not exclusively, responsible for disbursing funds for the inscribing of prytany decrees in the last quarter of the third century and the first quarter of the second. The situation, however, is by no means straightforward, and it may well be worthwhile first to retrace our steps a little and to present an up-to-date account of the paymasters for prytany decrees from the end of the *fourth* century onwards.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ We may note that, in decree II.99–100 (and probably also I. 42–43) of the year 127/6, the disbursing official is the Stratiotic Treasurer. (For decree V.141–142, where the Stratiotic Treasurer pays from the Assembly's expense account, see note 64 above).

¹⁸⁸ Prytaneis, 12. OSBORNE (I, 239) finds the appearance of the Single Officer of Administration «surprising». (His reference to RHODES, Boule, 107, should read 109).

¹⁸⁹ For the sake of completion we may note the vague references to disbursing officials contained in H.S. 4.145.23 (181/0), a decree of the boule honouring a committee of three bouleutai appointed to supervise various items of equipment in the Skias:]τοὺς εἰρημένους τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα; and in S. 26.121.17–18 (c. 10/9–3/2), the decree on the restoration of sanctuaries in Attica: τὸ δὲ] ἀνάλ[ωμ]α εἰς τε τὰ θύματα [καὶ τὰς στήλας μ]ερίσαι τῶι ταμ[ί]αι τῆς ἱερᾶς διατάξεως τοὺς καθεσταμέ|[νους] ---.

¹⁹⁰ Dow's relatively simple schema – the Single Officer of Administration pays for all prytany decrees dated 262–229; then the Stratiotic Treasurer shoulders the burden of payment (see Prytaneis, 12) – was greatly modified by MERRITT and TRAILL (MT, p. 16), but even that schema must now be adjusted in the light of additional evidence and alterations to the archon list.

(1) *end of fourth century:*

By reason of TRAILL's redating of H. S. 1.no.1 (= MT 58) to 305/4,¹⁹¹ MERITT and TRAILL concluded that the practice of inscribing honorary decrees for prytaneis began only with the re-establishment of the democracy in 307/6.¹⁹² Whatever the date of MT 58, that conclusion is now invalidated by the publication by TRAILL himself of a prytany decree dated through a complex of prosopographical indications to c. 333.¹⁹³ Both these documents (MT 58 and S. 28.52) show the *Treasurer of the People* paying for the decree from the Assembly's expense account, and thus comply with the general practice of other decrees of the same period.

(2) 286–262:

There are only four prytany decrees with adequately preserved expenses formulae which fall within this period of Athenian nationalism: MT 71.22–24 (283/2); MT 76.19–20 (279/8); MT 77.34–36 (280–275); and MT 78.23–24 (273/2). All show – or, in accordance with the stoichedon pattern, can be restored to show – the *Plural Board of Administration*.

(3) 261–229:

Here the evidence is slight and less certain, but there is nothing to suggest that anyone other than the *Single Officer of Administration* paid in this period. Cf., e.g., MT 89.21–22 and 40–41 (252/1).¹⁹⁴

(4) *after 229:*

The situation is complex, and any scheme is likely to continue to require further adjustments as new evidence becomes available. Nevertheless, the broad outlines are clear: the basic progression is from a period when the Single Officer of Administration is the principal paymaster to one in which the Stratiotic Treasurer takes over this function, the shift of responsibility occurring somewhere in the 170s. Even after this, however, there are sporadic appearances of the Single Officer. Nor is the Plural Board entirely absent from the scene.

The detailed picture is as follows:¹⁹⁵

(a) 229 until the end of the third century: the Single Officer of Administration is the sole disbursing officer: cf., e.g., MT 120.29–30 (228/7); MT 127.5–7 (223/2); MT 128.20–21 (223/2); MT 130.19–21 and 57–58 (220/19); MT 147.50–52 (203/2); MT 137.10–12 (c. 211/10–202/1), except in one single instance, MT 135.22–23 (214/13), where the Plural Board clearly acts as paymasters for the decree.

¹⁹¹ See *Hesperia* 38 (1969) 424 (note on line 77).

¹⁹² MT, p. 2. They also concluded (*ibid.*, p. 16) that in the post-Sullan type of prytany decree no paymaster was indicated. As we shall see below, this conclusion is also now invalid.

¹⁹³ H. 47.274/5.5 = S. 28.52.

¹⁹⁴ The Single Officer is restored in MT 88.1–2 (post 255); MT 104.14–16 (c. 250) and MT 115.37–38 (235/4), but none of these texts is cut stoichedon.

¹⁹⁵ Unless indicated otherwise, I cite only examples where there can be no dispute about the identity of the disbursing officials.

(b) 199–183: secure evidence is very limited for this period. In fact, the only *sure* example is an instance of the Plural Board paying in the year 192/1, MT 187.52–54, whereas the Single Officer is *restored* in 4 places,¹⁹⁶ although one could not completely rule out the Plural Board in any of these. In one further instance, MT 178.1–4 (c. 185),¹⁹⁷ the text has been restored to yield the combination of the Stratiotic Treasurer and the Plural Board:¹⁹⁸

	εἰς δὲ τὴν]	non-stoich.
[ποίησιν καὶ τ]ῆν ἀνάθεσιν [τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸ		
[γενόμενον] ἀνάλωμα τ[ὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτι		
[κῶν καὶ τοῦς] ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικ[ήσει -----]		

It would not occasion surprise if this were correct – the assumed lacuna appears to demand a lengthy formulation for the paymaster(s) – but at least some doubt must remain about this extremely fragmentary text.¹⁹⁹

(c) after 183: The Stratiotic Treasurer is recorded for the first time as paymaster for prytany decrees in 182/1 (MT 184.16–18) and 181/0 (MT 168.13–15),²⁰⁰ but there are still instances of the Single Officer of Administration paying from about the same period (MT 170.15–16 and 43–44 [c. 180/79];²⁰¹ MT 191.10–11 [paullo ante 178/7]; MT 194.14–15 and 41–42 [178/7]). From then on, however, with two important exceptions, it is the Stratiotic Treasurer who is called upon to disburse the necessary funds (MT 212.58–60 [169/8]; MT 215.18–20 [167/6]; MT 217.16–18 [? 173/2–165/4];²⁰² MT 216.20–21 [166/5]; MT 221.12–14 [164/3]; MT 225.22–24 an 63–65 [155/4]; MT 226.15–16 [c. 155]; MT 236.3–4

¹⁹⁶ MT 158.7–9 (in.s.ii); MT 171.26–28 (190/89); MT 174.21–22 (188/7); MT 179.34–36 (185/4). Cf. also MT 175.12–13 (c. 188/7) and MT 181.9–11 (184/3).

¹⁹⁷ The text is dated by MERITT (H. 33.180/1.31) with reference to the lettering («omega and pi, for example, being quite similar to those of ii² 897 [185/4]»).

¹⁹⁸ The paymasters are restored by MERITT on the analogy of ii² 892 (188/7).

¹⁹⁹ Dow found no evidence to suggest that the Plural Board and the Stratiotic Treasurer ever collaborated in paying for decrees for prytaneis (see Prytaneis, 12).

²⁰⁰ MT 168, dated by MERITT and TRAILL in 193/2 (archon Hippias) is certainly to be placed in 181/0 (see note 182 above, and cf. the useful remarks of OSBORNE II, 187 note 871). MT 196, dated by Dow (Prytaneis, 125 no. 66: «the style should keep the date as early as payment by the Treasurer of Military Funds will allow») «paullo post 178/7», should now presumably be dated «paullo post 182/1». MERITT and TRAILL do not seem to have noticed that, even by their own calculations on p. 16, the date of this latter text should have been amended.

²⁰¹ «The date must be shortly after No. 168, in which Euthymachos was ὑπογραμματεὺς (so MERITT and TRAILL ad loc.).

²⁰² Dating in terms of the herald Philokles only, since the terminus post quem for the Stratiotic Treasurer is not 169/8 (even on MERITT and TRAILL's own scheme): see MT, p. 179 and cf. note 200 above. (The years 169/8, 168/7 and 166/5 are, however, excluded because of the treasurer of the Boule.)

[c. 150]; MT 261.22–24 and 63–65 [c. 148/7–135/4];²⁰³ MT 243.20–21 and 59–60 [135/4]; MT 254.22–23 [104/3]; MT 258.3–4 [c. 100]; MT 261.22–24 and 63–65 [95/4]; S. 28.92.5–6 [c. 50]; S. 28.95.22–23 [c. 30].)

The two aforementioned exceptions are MT 206 (173/2) and MT 240 (140/39), described by MERITT and TRAILL as «paradoxical cases». The paradox consists in the fact that, in each case, *both* the Stratiotic Treasurer *and* the Single Officer of Administration are recorded as paymasters for texts honouring the same prytaneis and to be inscribed on the same stele: in the case of MT 240.22–23 it is the Stratiotic Treasurer who is to pay for the decree of the demos, while in vv. 54–55 the Single Officer is to pay for the decree of the boule; in MT 206.23–25 it is the Single Officer who pays for the decree of the demos,²⁰⁴ the Stratiotic Treasurer for the decree of the boule (vv. 64–65). But this so-called paradox need not trouble us overmuch: all that these two texts do is to confirm – what we already know – that the Stratiotic Treasurer and the Single Officer of Administration could, and did, operate at the same period.²⁰⁵

In conclusion, we may note also that the Stratiotic Treasurer may appear in prytany decrees with his *abbreviated title*. This is clearly so in MT 205.15–16 (c. 176/5–174/3):²⁰⁶

εις δὲ τῆ[ν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στήλης]

[μερ]ῖσαι τὸν ταμίαν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμ[α]. *vacat*

and considerations of arrangement and space suggest that the same abbreviation has been correctly restored in MT 204.15–17 (c. 176/5–174/3):²⁰⁷

εις δὲ τὴν ἀνα] non-stoich. c. 43

[γραφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στή]λης [μερίσαι τὸν ταμί]

[αν τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα] *vacat*

and in MT 214.16–17 (168/7):

non-stoich. c. 55

εις δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν κ]αὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι

[τὸν ταμίαν τὸ γενόμενον] ἀνάλωμα. *vacat*

²⁰³ For the date of MT 261, see TRACY, *Hesperia* 47 (1978) p. 263: «Meritt and Traill . . . retain the date 95/4 – a date which is approximately half a century too late». TRACY includes this text within the work of his «Cutter of Agora I 6006».

²⁰⁴ At least as restored. It is clear from the stone that it is an official ἐπὶ τετ διουκῆσει who is involved, and on balance one would expect the Single Officer not the Plural Board.

²⁰⁵ We have already seen (see pp. 85–86 above) that scattered examples of the activity of the Single Officer of Administration exist in documents other than prytany decrees at this very late date.

²⁰⁶ The terminus ante quem for this text is 173/2 (not 169/8), when Philokles of Trinemeia is first instanced as Herald (MT 206.59–60).

²⁰⁷ The text belongs to the same year as MT 205 (for which see the preceding note).

It is also my opinion²⁰⁸ that, in the last instance of the appearance of the Stratiotic Treasurer as paymaster for a prytany decree, S.28.95.22–24 (c. 30), his *name* is given:

non-stoich. c. 45–56

τὸ δὲ γενόμε[ενον ἀνάλωμα μερίσαι τὸν]
 ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν *vacat* Παντακ[λήης -----]
vacat ²⁰⁹ Ἐνβίος Ἐνβίου Προσπάλιος εἶπεν [*]

TRAILL restores the nominative Παντακ[λήης, but it is hard to imagine what other official might appear at this point of the decree. We should read rather Παντακ[λέα, probably with demotic, and associate this text with the parallel instances in non-prytany decrees considered above.²⁰⁹ The unscripted space and the decorative asterisk are probably intended to draw attention to the name, not to separate it from the preceding provision.

It is clear, therefore, that in the case of *all* decrees of the period after 229, it is the Stratiotic Treasurer who eventually dominates the scene as the principal disbursing officer of funds for decrees. As regards the Single Officer of Administration and the Plural Board of Administration, the apparent paradox of their simultaneous co-existence in this period is probably best accounted for thus: after the recovery of freedom in 229 the full democratic board was reinstated; naturally, it was normally the *full* board which was named in making provision for the inscribing of decrees, but, in the case of *prytany* decrees,²¹⁰ it was customary to give this responsibility to that member of the full board who represented the tribe being honoured²¹¹ and to refer to him as ὁ ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει.²¹² Occasionally, however, for reasons beyond our present state of knowledge, the full Plural Board also functioned in the case of *prytany* decrees and, conversely, this new-style «Single Officer» might be entrusted with the inscribing of *other* types of decrees as well.

Conclusion

The survey presented above has shown that, after a period of confusion and/or reorganization in 303/2 and 302/1, when the Treasurer of the People, the Stratiotic

²⁰⁸ Pace TRAILL (Hesperia 47 [1978] 294, note on v. 23): «The office of Pantakles cannot be identified. The unscripted space and the normal formula make it unlikely that he is the treasurer of the war funds.»

²⁰⁹ See pp. 84–85 above.

²¹⁰ As DOW suggests (Prytaneis, 13) prytany decrees may have been given separate treatment as «a numerous and . . . well-defined class».

²¹¹ This was FERGUSON'S suggestion, in a letter to DOW (see Prytaneis, 13 note 1).

²¹² DOW argues that the title would have been acceptable to Athenian nationalists, since there is no reason to believe that the office of the old-style Macedonian Single Officer had been a particularly odious one.

Treasurer and the Single Officer of Administration all act as paymasters for the expenses of inscribing decrees, the Treasurer of the People departs the scene. Thereafter, the evidence suggests the following sequence of paymasters

- I. from 301 to 295: the exetastes and trittyrachs
- II. 295 to 286: the Single Officer of Administration (plus one instance of the Stratiotic Treasurer in 291/0)
- III. 286–262: the Plural Board of Administration (plus one instance of the Stratiotic Treasurer in 271/0)
- IV. 261–229: apart from sporadic appearances by the Stratiotic Treasurer,
 - (a) 261–250: the Single Officer of Administration
 - (b) ?250–246/5: the Plural Board (certainly in 247/6)
 - (c) 245/4–229: the Single Officer of Administration
- V. after 229:
 - (a) non-prytany decrees: may be paid for by the Plural Board of Administration, the Stratiotic Treasurer plus the Plural Board, or even, very occasionally by the newstyle Single Officer of Administration; but the predominant official is the Stratiotic Treasurer himself.
 - (b) prytany decrees: to begin with usually paid for by the new-style Single Officer of Administration, occasionally by the full Plural Board and, perhaps, by the Stratiotic Treasurer plus the Plural Board; but after c.170 the predominant paymaster is the Stratiotic Treasurer, with an occasional appearance of the Single Officer.

Texts specially cited and/or emended

I. Texts with I. G. reference

<i>I. G. ii</i> ²	<i>Hesperia</i>	<i>SEG</i>	<i>Osborne</i>	<i>MT</i>	<i>Page</i>
240	—	—	—	—	79
354	—	—	—	—	79
378	4.173/4.38	21.353	D70	—	70
488	—	—	—	—	55–56
496 + 507	—	—	D61	—	55
525 + 675	—	—	—	—	58–60
558	—	—	D47	—	55
641	—	—	—	—	64
643	9.80/1.13	25.85	D67	—	65–67
646	—	—	D68	—	68–69
648	—	—	D69	—	61, 69
649 (DINSMOOR, Archons 7/8)	—	—	—	—	70
657	—	—	—	—	60

663	-	-	D74	-	71
672	-	-	-	-	61, 69
675 + 525	-	-	-	-	58-60
707	-	-	D88	-	62
709	-	-	-	-	61-62
710	-	-	D81	-	72-73
722	-	24.120	-	-	62-63
789	-	-	-	-	81
792	-	-	-	-	81, note 127
801	-	-	-	-	80
806	-	-	D48	-	53
808	-	-	D87	-	78
809	-	-	-	-	53
810	-	-	-	-	81
844.I	-	-	-	-	82
845.I	-	-	-	-	84
853	-	-	D107	-	84
884	-	-	-	-	83
918	S.1.139/41.77	-	-	214	89
922	-	-	D106	-	85, note 185
924	-	-	D118	-	84, note 180
991	24.228/32	15.104.III	-	-	86
1009.I,II	-	-	-	-	85
1011.I	-	-	-	-	83-84
1041	-	-	-	-	85
[ii 398	-	-	D120	-	85-86

II. Texts with no I. G. reference

<i>Hesperia</i>	<i>SEG</i>	<i>Osborne</i>	<i>MT</i>	<i>Page</i>
4.525/9.39	25.106	-	-	83
6.445/6.2	-	-	-	80
8.45.12	-	-	-	53
9.118/22.24	-	-	205	89
9.348/51.45	14.58	-	-	53
11.278.53	29.92	-	-	64-65
13.242/3.7	24.119	-	-	62
17.7/12	23.67	-	-	78-80
23.299/301.183	14.65	-	-	73-74
29.7/8.9	19.72	-	-	67-68
30.215/16.10	21.389	-	-	81
33.180/1.31	21.437	-	178	88
37.268/9.4	25.84	-	-	69
45.283.1	26.96	D92	-	82
47.49/50	28.75	D95	-	83
47.292/5.20	28.95	-	-	90
52.52	-	-	-	75
Suppl. 1.127/9.70	-	-	204	89