



<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

Polis/acropolis, Paymasters and the Ten Talent Fund

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **12 • 1982**

Seite / Page **91–118**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1299/5648> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1982-12-p91-118-v5648.2

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

Polis/acropolis, Paymasters and the Ten Talent Fund*

In order to trace the development of various formulaic expressions in Attic decrees at the beginning of the fourth century it is essential to establish a chronological framework. Unfortunately, there are very few dated inscriptions between 400 and 370, and the dates assigned to many documents are often calculated with reference to the very formulae whose development we wish to trace. The risk of riding on the roundabout of circular argument is thus very grave.

Two phenomena in particular are central to this enquiry: (i) the shift from the expression ἐμ πόλει to ἐν ἀκροπόλει; and (ii) the sequence of officers responsible for the expenses of inscribing decrees. The *locus classicus* for a discussion of these two interrelated factors is a parergon in a paper of DINSMOOR's, now some fifty years old.¹ In less than four pages of compressed and dangerously persuasive writing DIN-

* This paper is a prolegomenon to a wider study of the formulaic language of Attic decrees.

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

DINSMOOR = W. B. DINSMOOR, *The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens*, *AJA* 36, 1932, 143–172.

JOHNSON = A. C. JOHNSON, *Notes on Attic Inscriptions*, *CPh* 9, 1914, 417–441.

PEČÍRKA = J. PEČÍRKA, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Prague (*Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Phil. et Hist. Mon.* XV) 1966.

TOD = M. N. TOD, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, vol. 2, Oxford 1948.

I also employ the following abbreviation apart from those in general use:

ML = R. MEIGGS and D. M. LEWIS, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1969.

All dates are B.C.

¹ *AJA* 36, 1932, 157–160, reviewing the earlier position arrived at by JOHNSON, *CPh* 9, 1914, 417–423. DINSMOOR's point of departure was *IG XII* 1, 977 (TOD 110), a copy of an Athenian decree found on the island of Karpathos, recording *inter alia* honours for the Eteo-karpathian κοινόν for a cypress-trunk given for the rebuilding of the temple of Athena the Guardian of Athens. Despite the provision that the Athenian copy is to be inscribed ἐν στήλῃ [λ] | [ιθίνῃ ἐμ πόλῃ (vv. 34–35), DINSMOOR attempted to place the text just after 377. TOD accepted the more orthodox date c. 393, relating the gift to repairs carried out in the 390s as a result of a fire in 406/5. [I understand that this text will appear as *I*³ 1454, assigned to the *fifth* century, but I have not seen the evidence for this dating.]

moor argued (i) for a transitional period of twelve years (c. 386–374) for the replacement of ἐμ πόλει by ἐν ἀκροπόλει, and (ii) for four distinct periods, each with different disbursing officers, in the fourth century.² This schema has ever since found general acceptance.³ I suggest, however, that a close examination of DINSMOOR's arguments and evidence will reveal (i) that there is no justification for the claim that ἐμ πόλει was employed as late as 375, and (ii) that the various responsible paymasters do not fall into such neat and tidy compartments.

In the nineteenth century FOUCART⁴ had claimed that ἐμ πόλει was replaced by ἐν ἀκροπόλει immediately after the Peace of Antalcidas: hence KIRCHNER's <ante 387/6> in the Corpus for texts showing ἐμ πόλει. DINSMOOR, however, in his attempt to lower this *terminus post quem non*, first points to II² 32, which he describes as <a decree of 385/4 B. C. containing this expression.> What DINSMOOR neglects to record is that the phrase is *entirely restored*, in a very fragmentary text indeed: (vv. 6–9)

[Ἀρχωνίδην----- πρόξενον] stoich. 27
 [ν καὶ εὐεργέτην] Ἀθηναίων ἀναγράφαι
 ἐν πόλει ἐστὶ λίθινον τὸν
 γραμματεῖα τῆς βουλῆς.

I do not deny the plausibility of the restoration. Even granting that, however, there is another much more important consideration. II² 32 almost certainly orders the publication (or re-publication) in 385/4 of an award *previously* made before the end of the fifth century, at a time when ἐν τῷ πόλει ὅσων Ἀθηναίων [ἰκράτ]δου (vv. 10–11) was appropriate to Athenian circumstances.⁵ That being so, the language of the award as far as the beginning of the rider (v. 19) probably reflects, or even repeats verbatim, the original *fifth* century wording. The use of the expression ἐν πόλει – if indeed it does occur – is therefore of no relevance to the problem before us.⁶

DINSMOOR also directs our attention to II² 245,⁷ a fragmentary text where we can have little faith in what is again a total restoration: (vv. 2–4)

τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸδε γράψαι stoich. 35
 αἱ τὸν γραμματεῖα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ καὶ θεῖναι
 ἐν πόλει τὸς δὲ ταμίαι τῆς [θ]εοδότης . .]

² I.e. down to 303 B. C.

³ In his brief (but very useful) discussion P. J. RHODES, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford 1972, 103 note 7, while urging general acceptance of DINSMOOR's sequence, expresses doubts about the apodektai and the Ten Talent Fund.

⁴ BCH 12, 1888, 153–179.

⁵ See RHODES, *op. cit.*, 83 (with notes 1, 2 and 6) and 84.

⁶ See A. WILHELM, *Attische Urkunden V*, Wien-Leipzig 1942, 99–100.

⁷ This text also appears under II² 178, which should be deleted from the Corpus.

KIRCHNER notes: 'Wilh. lapidem, quem non vidi, propter litteraturam, medio s. IV utique antiquiorem esse censet. Ex supplementis v. 4 sane initio s. IV adsignandus est.'⁸ This does not advance us very far. DINSMOOR, however, is prepared to accept JOHNSON's arguments for a date 'shortly after 383/2 B. C., when many Thebans and other Boeotians took refuge at Athens after the Spartans had captured Thebes.'⁹ Although there may be some substance in this historical argument, it would, however, be unwise to place too much weight on a phrase which does not actually appear on the preserved portion of the stone. It is certainly not conclusive evidence for ἐμ πόλει as late as 382.

In a recently published text¹⁰ (unknown, of course, to DINSMOOR) of the year 379/8 PRITCHETT has offered a reconstructed decree which purports to order its setting up ἐν πόλει. I quote vv. 6–21 in full in order to demonstrate the general unsatisfactoriness of the restorations:

- stoich. 34
- περὶ ὧν οἱ στρ[ατηγοὶ] λέ[γοσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἅ]
 [νῆρ ἀγαθὸς ἐγένε]το Εὐρυφῶν [περὶ τὸς πρέσ]
 [βεσ τῶν Ἀθηναίων] ν τοὺς τῇ συμ[μαχίαι, καὶ ε]
 [ῦ ποεῖ ὅτι δύνατ]αι, ἐψηφίσθαι [τῇ βολῇ τὸ]
 10 [ς προέδρος οἱ ἄν] τυγχάνωσι προ[εδρεύοντε]
 [ς ἐς τὴν πρώτην ἐ]κκλησίαν προ[σαγαγεῖν Εὐ]
 [ρυφῶντα καὶ χρη]ματίσαι πρῶτ[ον μετὰ τὰ ἰε]
 [ρά, γνώμην δὲ ξυμ]βάλλεσθαι τ[ῆς βολῆς ἐς τὸ]
 [ν δῆμον ὅτι δοκε]ῖ τῇ βολῇ [ἐπαινέσαι δὲ α]
 15 [ὑτόν, ἐπειδὴ Εὐρ]υφῶν τὸς τ[ε πρέσβεις εὐ ποε]
 [ῖ καὶ τὴν πόλιν τ]ῇν Ἀθηναίων, ἀναγράψαι δὲ
 [αὐτόν ἐστῆληι λι]θίνῃι κ[αὶ στήσαι ἐν πόλει]
 [ἰ ὅπου ἂν δοκῇ αὐ]τῷ· κα[ὶ πρόξενον τὸ δῆμο]
 [τὸ Ἀθηναίων ἀναγ]ράψαι [Εὐρυφῶντα τὸν γρα]
 20 [μματέα τῆς βολῆς] ἐπ' εὐ[εργεσίαι ἐς τὸν δῆμ]
 [ον· καλέσαι δὲ καὶ] Εὐρυ[φῶντα! !.....]

We need only note (i) δὲ in v. 14 is impossible, since ἐπαινέσαι must be construed with the preceding δοκεῖ; (ii) ἀναγράψαι αὐτόν (as opposed to τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα *vel. sim.*) is attested only in cases where the publication formula and proxeny award are combined in one and the same formulation (as they are *not* here); (iii) a proxeny award beginning καὶ πρόξενον is totally unparalleled. These faults suffice to throw

⁸ On the basis of its lettering KIRCHNER dated II² 178 'ante 353/2' (by implication, therefore, not earlier than 378/7). DAVID LEWIS, however, informs me *per epistolam* that the most visible letter on his squeeze of II² 245 is an omega with a narrow loop, as, e.g., on II² 20. Lettering alone, therefore, could support a date in the 380s or even earlier.

⁹ See JOHNSON, 419 and 439. The argument is based on vv. 9–11 of the inscription: εἶναι [δὲ πᾶσι] | [τοῖς φεύγοσι τῶν] Βοιωτῶν τὴν [ἄ]τέλ[ει]α[ν τὸ μ] | [ετοικίου].

¹⁰ EM 13 230: see CSCA 5, 1972, 165–169. (I quote only lines 6–21).

doubt on the overall reconstruction of the decree.¹¹ There is therefore no reason whatsoever to feel constrained on this <evidence> to downdate ἐν πόλει to 379/8.

As for the later expression ἐν ἀκροπόλει, DINSMOOR first points out that what had been considered to be the earliest dated example (II² 19, 394/3) <has now been *more accurately restored* (my italics) with ἐν πόλει.>¹² While this may indeed be so, it is evident that we are still operating in the rather unreal sphere of restoration. <Evidence> of such a nature must be treated with extreme caution, and should not be allowed to form the basis of an attempt to establish firm termini for formulaic usage.

If then we allow the stones to speak for themselves, we find in II² 30 b. 2

στησά]τω ἐν ἀκροπό[λει

Since, however, the context is totally lacking, the restoration στησά]τω must remain doubtful, and we cannot even be sure that what we have at this point is a publication formula as such. Nevertheless, one may accept DINSMOOR's claim that this is one of <the earliest dated examples of ἐν ἀκροπόλει>, that is to say 386/5.¹³

His other <earliest dated example> is II² 31 (Tod 117), certainly also dated in 386/5, but where once again there is doubt about the reading at the crucial point: (vv. 12–14)

κ]α[ι στησ]αι [ἐ]ς στήλην ἀναγρ[άψαντ] stoich. 30
α τὸν γραμ[μ]ατέ[α] τῆς βολῆς τὰ ἐψ[ηφισμ]
ένα (ἐν ἀ)[κ]ρ[οπό]λ[ει]

Because of the rho, however, we may accept the hypothesis of a haplography of ENA. Nevertheless, it should again be noted how flimsy the evidence is.

Before we can conclude, however, that 386/5 is the *terminus ante quem non* for the expression ἐν ἀκροπόλει, we must pause to consider one further document: II² 9, a decree plausibly restored to order the re-erection of a stele destroyed under The Thirty, and for that reason dated <paullo post 403/2> by KIRCHNER. The text is as follows:

... π[.....²⁰..... ἐπει] stoich. 28
[δ]ῆ δὲ καθ[ι]ρήθη ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα]
αὐτοῖς ἢ σ[τήλη ἢ πρότερον ἀνακειμ]
ἐνη αὐτοῖς, ἀναγράψαι τὴν στήλην τ]

¹¹ I am also uneasy about the vague location of the stone: ὅπου ἂν δοκῇ αὐτῷ would be unparalleled at this period (and in any case would more naturally be expressed with anaphoric αὐτῷ immediately after ἂν).

¹² DINSMOOR is referring to WILHELM's text in II² 19b. Addenda p. 656. In WILHELM's later discussion of this text (Attische Urkunden V, Wien-Leipzig 1942, 96–103) he retains the restoration ἐν πόλει.

¹³ The date is based on an out of context reference in v. b. 5 to μηνὸς τῷ μετὰ Θεό[δοτον ἄρχοντα]. (See also note 27 below).

- 5 ὃν γραμμα[τέα τῆς βολῆς καὶ στήσαι]
 ἐν ἀκροπ[όλει¹⁷.....]
 τῷ δήμῳ [.....²⁰.....]

... I A A

This was WILHELM's first version.¹⁴ Later, however, in an attempt to associate II² 9 with II² 10, WILHELM restored vv. 6–8 thus:¹⁵

ἐν ἀκροπ[όλει. ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ]
 τῷ δήμῳ, [Ἰπποθωντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε,]
 [Λυσ]ιάδ[ης ἐγραμμάτευε, -----]

But D. M. LEWIS¹⁶ has argued convincingly against this association and restoration on the following grounds: i) the stone is lost, so that we have no way of confirming KOEHLER's reading of the letter traces in v. 8; ii) even if we do accept IAD there, several other names besides Λυσιάδης could be made to fit; iii) WILHELM's text implies *three* decrees on the original stone (the pre-Euclidean decree; the decree ordering its re-inscription, partly preserved in vv. 1–6, and which WILHELM dates between 403 and 401; and the third decree of 401/400 [vv. 6–8], of unknown content); iv) we must assume either that the stone remained uninscribed until the third decree was passed (despite the decision taken in the second decree) or that the cutter of the third decree decided to begin in the middle of a line; v) the only reason for dating vv. 1–6 between 403 and 401 is the restored prescript of this hypothetical third decree; vi) if that *were* the date, it would be an instance of ἐν ἀκροπόλει some 15 years earlier than the next dated example; vii) WILHELM's implied chronology is very tight, but, if we accept 404/3 (the archonship of Pythodoros, instead of 401/400, the archonship of Xenainetos) for the date of II² 10 and hence of our supposed third decree, the chronological sequence of the three decrees becomes a virtual impossibility: the demos would have had rather too much on its hands at this time to indulge in so much decree-making so early after its return.

We may, therefore, conclude with LEWIS that there were only *two* decrees, the decree providing for the re-inscription of a pre-Euclidean decree, which will itself have followed later on the stone (vv. 6 ff.). For the latter LEWIS, very tentatively, suggests the year 410/9, by restoring

τῷ δήμῳ, [Λεωντὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Σιβ]
 [υρτ]ιάδ[ης ἐγράμματαυε -----]¹⁷

There is, of course, no need to find a precise home for the original decree, nor is there any need for us to assume that we must date the later decree close to 403/2.

¹⁴ Arch. epigr. Mitt. Oest. 17, 1894, 38.

¹⁵ Österr. Jahreshfte 21–22, 1922–1924, 164. See SEG III 69.

¹⁶ ABSA 49, 1954, 35–36. (I summarize LEWIS' arguments here; for details the reader should consult the original article.)

¹⁷ He compares I² 106, but this must be in error for I² 108.

For, as we have already seen, we have evidence for a decision being taken to re-inscribe a pre-Euclidean decree as late as 385/4.¹⁸ We may therefore agree with DINSMOOR¹⁹ that II² 9 may well be later than 387. It certainly cannot be cited as secure evidence for ἐν ἀκροπόλει at the very end of the fifth century.

Our survey so far, therefore, has confirmed DINSMOOR's claim that the year 386/5 marks the earliest dated examples of ἐν ἀκροπόλει, but we have found no firm evidence to suggest that ἐμ πόλει occurs after 387/6.

Now, it is also part of DINSMOOR's thesis that 'the new phrase could not have marked an abrupt change, as would have been the case with administrative matters such as a different board or a different fund. There was certainly a period of transition.'²⁰ Prima facie, this seems a very reasonable point to make, and presumably no-one would expect to find ἐμ πόλει suddenly vanish completely and for ever. I wonder, however, if the reasoning implied by DINSMOOR's claim is not open to challenge – the implication, that is, that the Athenians would not have taken a conscious decision (at some meeting of the Assembly, no doubt) to adopt the expression ἐν ἀκροπόλει in place of the earlier ἐμ πόλει. For, after all, not many years before, the Athenians had taken an official decision henceforth to employ the Ionic alphabet for official publications. Matters of form as well as substance were, therefore, susceptible to actual debate and decision by the Athenian people.

The term 'polis' was clearly open to misunderstanding – probably not by the Athenians themselves²¹ but certainly by those foreigners for whom the Athenians so often legislated. Consider also how the Athenians were accustomed to refer to themselves in official parlance: there were basically three forms:

- i) 'Αθηναῖτοι:²² e.g. II² 1. 43 (403/2): ἄνδρες ἄγαθοὶ περὶ 'Αθηναίους
 - ii) ὁ δῆμος ὁ 'Αθηναίων:²³ e.g. *ibid.* 65: ἀγ]αθοὶ ἐσιν περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν 'Αθηναίων
 - iii) ἡ πόλις ἡ 'Αθηναίων: e.g. ML 80. 10–11 (411): εὖ ποεῖ ὅτι δύνατ] | αι τὴν πόλιν τὴν 'Αθηναίων
- ABSA 65 (1970) 157 vv. 6–7 (394/3):²⁴ εὖ] | εργέται τῆς πόλεως τῆς 'Αθη[ναίων, followed at vv. 9–10 by ἐν] πόλῃ²⁵

¹⁸ II² 32.

¹⁹ 157 note 12. But, as we shall see, it could be a year or two earlier.

²⁰ 157–158.

²¹ Londoners, or even the British in general, have little problem in coping with the term 'the City', but, at first encounter, it may slightly mystify the financially uninitiated. Moreover, the ancient Greeks did not have the convenience of a distinction based on upper- and lower-case letters.

²² Never with the article.

²³ By far the form most frequently encountered.

²⁴ OSBORNE's revised text of II² 17.

²⁵ Obviously ἐν ἀκρο] | πόλῃ is theoretically possible here, but the overall context makes the longer form unlikely.

Π² 82. 10–11 (? before 378/7):²⁶ ἀγαθός ἐς] τὴμ πόλιν τὴν Ἀθ[η] | [ναίων,
followed at v. 15 by ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

The inconvenience (or worse) of employing πόλις in its widest and narrowest senses in one and the same context must have been evident even to the least style-conscious Athenian. I can see no reason, therefore, why an official decision should not have been taken at some particular time to eliminate this awkwardness by referring henceforth to the acropolis as ἡ ἀκρόπολις.²⁷ This is not, of course, to say that the idea will not have occurred (and even been put into practice) even *before* the official decision: clearly a debate on the matter is likely to have been preceded by sporadic and spontaneous experimentation by enterprising drafters of decrees. Nor should we expect every drafter from then on to use the new expression without fail. What I am claiming is that we may have some grounds for believing in an official dividing line (say 386) between the old and new expressions. If we can accept that, then we can apply it as a chronological criterion, *at least in those cases where there is no other evidence to the contrary*.

However, as we have seen, DINSMOOR argued for a transitional period of 12 years (c. 386–374), attempting to justify that assumption by adducing the complementary evidence of the sequence of disbursing officers responsible for providing the funds for inscribing decrees.²⁸ It is to these officials that we too now must turn.²⁹

JOHNSON had attempted to define five periods for the fourth-century paymasters down to 303 B.C.:³⁰

- I. 404–c. 394: the Treasurers (of Athena and the Other Gods), i.e. the joint board
- 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 again

²⁶ For present purposes I accept KIRCHNER's date.

²⁷ ἀκρόπολις does, of course, appear in other contexts even in the *fifth* century: e.g. ML 58.B5 and 11 (Kallias Decrees).

²⁸ For a synopsis of arrangements for public expenditure, see RHODES, *op. cit.*, 102 ff. Briefly, until 411 (or perhaps shortly before: see PRITCHETT BCH 88, 1964, 474 with note 3) there was a separate δημόσιον from which the kolakretai paid for specifically domestic as opposed to imperial expenses. After this date the imperial and domestic funds were merged, and the Hellenotamiai provided the money for domestic items such as stelai and crowns. After 404 the tamiai appear to have taken over these functions.

²⁹ In this exceedingly complex and uncertain debate the reader may find that the information set out in Table 1 will enable him to see at a glance just what is, and is not, on the stones. (For the degree of (im)probability of any given restoration, however, it will be necessary to consult the texts themselves.) For convenience of reference the inscriptions are listed simply in the order in which they appear in the Corpus.

³⁰ 417–423.

TABLE 1

IP	ἐν πόλει/ἀκροπόλει	Disbursing Officer(s)	Amount	Source	Date		Other Relevant Information or Comments
					DINSMOOR	HENRY	
1.67-68 (TOD 97)	-	οἱ ταμίαι	[τὸ ἀργύριον]	-	403/2	403/2	At. v. 60 οἱ δὲ ταμίαι provide funds for monetary award
2 b (Add. p. 655)	[ἐμ πόλει]	[οἱ δὲ ταμίαι]	[τὸ ἀργ[ύριον][v]	-	403/2	403/2	The payment is for a crown
3 b	-	οἱ δὲ [ταμίαι]	[τὸ ἀργύριον]	-	c. 403/2	c. 403/2	Dated with reference to [poletai]
4 (+ Add. p. 655)	[ἐμ πόλει]	[οἱ ταμίαι]	[τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον]	-	c. 403/2	c. 403/2	Dated with reference to poletai
5	[ἐμ πόλει]	τ[ῆς] ταμίας	[τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον]	-	-	c. 400	See ABSA 49, 1954, 34-35. Expenses formula is extremely uncertain.
9	ἐν ἀκροτ[όλει]	-	-	-	I. 386-376 II. before 403/2 399/8 394/3	I. not before c. 390 II. before 403/2 399/8 394/3	See ABSA 49, 1954, 35-36.
13 a 17	[ἐν πόλῃ] [ἐν] πόλῃ	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	See ABSA 65, 1970, 157.

II ²	ἐν πόλει/ἀκροπόλει	Disbursing Officer(s)	Amount	Source	Date		Other Relevant Information or Comments
					DINSMOOR	HENRY	
19 (+ Add. p. 656)	[ἐν πόλει]	—	—	—	394/3	394/3	
21	—	[τὸ]ν ταμίαν [τ]ὸ [δήμο]	τὸ [δ]᾽ [ἀργύριον]	? [ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφισμάτων ἀναλίσσ]κομένων	376 or later	? 390/89	Reference to Assembly's expense account may be illusory.
22 b	ἐν [ἀκροπόλει]	τὸς ταμίαις τῶν τῆς θεᾶς	[τριά]κον[τ]α δραχμ[ά]ς	[ἐκ τῶν δέκα τάλαντων]	385–376	? 390/89	
24 b	[ἐμ πό]ληι	[τὸν τ]αμίαν τῆς βολήης (sic)	εἴκο[σι] δραχμ[ά]ς	—	c. 377/6	? shortly before 387/6	See SEG XV. 85. Note [ἐ]ς ἀναγράφην.
25	ἐν ἀκ[ροπόλει]	τὸν τ[αμίαν]	[εἴκοσι δρ]αχμ[ά]ς	—	c. 377/6	? shortly before 387/6	See SEG XV. 86. OSBORNE (D9) dates c. 388.
29 (Top 116)	ἐν ἀκροπόλει[ι]	τὸς ἀποδέκτας	τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ εἰρημένον	ἐκ τῶν καταβαλλομένων χρημ[ά]των	386/5	387/6 or 386/5	The payment is for a monetary award.
30 b	ἐν ἀκροπόλει	—	—	—	386/5	386/5	Context totally lacking
31 (Top 117)	ἐν ἀκ[ροπό]λ[ει]	τὸς [ἀπ]οδέκτα[ς]	[τριάκο]ν[τ]α δραχμ[ά]ς	—	386/5	386/5	
32	[ἐν πόλει]	—	—	—	385/4	385/4	Publication of a previous award

Π ²	ἐν πόλει/ἀκροπόλει	Disbursing Officer(s)	Amount	Source	Date		Other Relevant Information or Comments
					DINSMOOR	HENRY	
33	—	KIRCHNER/WILHELM: δό[τω ὁ ταμίης τῷ δήμῳ] - JOHNSON: δό[ναι τὸς ἀποδέκτας]	?[ΔΔ δρα]χμάς	—	386/5	? c. 402	? Read δό[ναι τὸς ταμίης v ΔΔΔ v δρα]χμάς See SEG XV. 87 and XXVI. 70
34	ἐν ἀκροπόλει	—	—	—	384/3	384/3	
39	[ἐν ἀκροπόλει]	[τὸς δὲ ταμίης]	τὸ ἀνάλωμα	—	379/8	379/8	One could also read [τὸν δὲ ταμίαν]
40 (+ Add. p. 657)	[ἐν ἀκροπόλει]	KIRCHNER: [τὸς ἀποδέκτας] WILHELM: [τὸς ταμίης]	KIRCHNER: [τριά]κοντα δραχμάς WILHELM: [τετταρά]κοντα	—	378/7	378/7	μείσις[αι] is inappropriate for treasurers
43 (Top 123)	—	τὸς ταμίης τῆς θεᾶς	τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον/ ἐξήκοντα δραχμάς	ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλ[άν]των	378/7	378/7	Note <i>both</i> τὸ ἀργύριον <i>and</i> specific sum
44	ἐν ἀκροπόλ[ει]	—	—	—	378/7	378/7	
51	[ἐν πόλει]	[τὸς δὲ τα]μίης	[ε]ἴκοσ[ι] δραχμάς]	—	? before 387/6	before 387/6	Note [ἐς ἀναγραφὴν]. DINSMOOR also considers 385—377
52	[ἐμ πόλει]	—	—	—	?	? before 387/6	

Π ²	ἐν πόλει/ἀκροπόλει	Disbursing Officer(s)	Amount	Source	Date		Other Relevant Information or Comments
					DINSMOOR	HENRY	
53	ἐμ πόλει	τὸ[ν] ταμίαν	ΔΔ δραχμᾶς	—	after 376	shortly before 387/6	See PEČIRKA 26–28. Note reference to polemarch's court
54	[ἐμ πόλ]ει	—	—	—	?	? before 387/6	
56	[ἐμ πόλει]	[τὸν ταμίαν τ]ὸ δῆμο	[τριάκοντα δραχμ]ᾶς	—	after 376	? before 387/6	Note εἰς δὲ ἀναγ[ραφήν]
57	ἐμ πόλει	τοὺς δὲ ταμίαις	τὸ ἀνάλωμα	—	? before 387/6	before 387/6	DINSMOOR also considers 385–377
70	ε[ἰς] ἀκρόπ[ολιν]	—	—	—	?	? between c. 390 and 378	Date on basis of acropolis + script
76	ἐν ἀκροπόλ[ει]	ο[ἱ] τα[μίαι] τῶν τῆ[ς] θεᾶς	[τὸ] δὲ ἀργύριον/ εἴκο[σι] δραχμᾶς	—	? 378/7	? c. 378/7	Note <i>both</i> τὸ ἀργύριον <i>and</i> specific sum
79	ἐν [ἀκροπόλ]ει	[τὸν] ταμίαν]	—	—	?	? not before 379/8	One could also read [τὸς] ταμίαις]
80	ἐν ἀκροπ[ολει]	—	—	—	?	? c. 380–370	See PEČIRKA 29–30
81	ἐ[ν] ἀκροπόλ[ει]	KIRCHNER: ?δ[ὸν]αι τοὺς ταμίαις JOHNSON: δ[ὸν]αι τὸς ἀποδέκτα]ς	εἴκοσι δραχμ[ᾶς]	—	? 386/5	? between c. 390 and 378	δ[ὸν]αι is inappropriate for apodektai. Date on basis of acropolis + script

Π ²	ἐν πόλει/ἀκροπόλει	Disbursing Officer(s)	Amount	Source	Date		Other Relevant Information or Comments
					DINSMOOR	HENRY	
82	ἐν ἀκροπόλει	τὸν ταμίαν τὸ δήμ[ου]	[ΔΔ δ]ραχμάς	[ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων]	after 376	? between c. 390 and 378	Date on basis of acropolis + script
84	ἐ[ν ἀκροπ]όλει	not indicated cf. SEG XXI. 230	τὸ δ[έ] ἀργύρι[ον]/ τ[ρι]άκ[οντα] δραχμ[ά]ς	ἐκ τῶν [δέκ]α ταλάντων	378–376	? c. 378/7	Note <i>both</i> τὸ ἀργύριον <i>and</i> specific sum
95	[ἐν ἀκροπόλει]	–	–	–	377/6	377/6	
98	[ἐν ἀκροπόλει]	–	–	–	375/4	? 372	See SEG XXI. 237
141 (ToD 139)	ἐν ἀκροπόλει	τοὺς ταμίας	ΔΔΔ δραχμάς	ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλάντων	shortly before 376	? 364	See AJAH 1, 1976, 182 + 189
173	–	τοὺς ταμ[ί]ας τῶν τῆς 98δ	[ΔΔΔ δραχμάς]	[ἐκ τῶν δ]έκα τ[αλάντων]	378–376	? 376/5	
197	ἐν [ἀκροπόλει]	[τὸν ταμίαν τὸ δήμ]ιο	ΔΔ δραχμάς	ἐ[κ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσμ]ατα ἀναλισκομ[ένων]	after 376	? before 353/2	See CSCA 5, 1972, 175–176. See also II ² part IV. p. 37 for date
245 (= 178)	[ἐμ πόλει]	[τὸς δέ ταμίας] τῆς [98δ]	[... δραχμάς]	–	shortly after 383/2	? shortly after 383/2	

DINSMOOR wants to carry 'this simplification still further':³¹

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.

Any kind of 'simplification' in the financial labyrinth at the beginning of the fourth century would indeed be welcome, but we must beware in case the simplification is a mere illusion. Let us therefore consider the evidence.³²

I. οἱ ταμίαι, the joint Treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods:

According to DINSMOOR (following JOHNSON) the joint treasurers assume the function of providing the money to pay for decrees 'in decrees of 403/2 and shortly thereafter', and he cites as evidence II² 1, 2, 3 and 4. In fact there is only one certain example viz. II² 1 (403/2), vv. 67–68: οἱ δὲ ταμίαι παρασχόντων | [τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ἀναγραφὴν].³³ We may, however, accept the *restoration* in II² 2 b. 8–10: οἱ δὲ | [ἐ] | ταμίαι | [παρασχόντων τὸ] | [ἀργύριον, although DINSMOOR is wrong to quote this as an instance of the tamiai providing money for publication expenses. The context, fragmentary though it is, shows that the tamiai are providing the funds for a golden crown. The year is the same as II² 1, 403/2.

In II² 3 b. 5–6 the only trace of the tamiai is the plural article οἱ δὲ[, following an almost totally restored reference to the poletai letting the contract, which is the basis for the date c. 403/2 in the Corpus. For the evidence for the activities of the poletai in relation to contracts for inscribing decrees virtually ceases in 405/4.³⁴

KOEHLER's restoration of II² 4. 3–4, τὸ | [δὲ ἀρ]γύριον δὸν[αι τὸς ταμίας τῆς θεᾶς], was, as DINSMOOR says, 'plainly in error', because that board did not exist at this date (c. 403/2 again, because of the mention of the poletai in v. 3). WILHELM's restoration of 'the treasurers' without further qualification, in a line of 33 letters,³⁵ is therefore probably correct; but I would prefer δὸν[αι τὸς ταμίας] to δόν[των οἱ ταμίαι], in order to continue the accusative and infinitive construction evident in the rest of the fragment.

³¹ 158–159.

³² I make no apology for turning DINSMOOR's two pages of compressed justification into many pages of detailed discussion. It is only by looking very closely indeed at the evidence of the stones themselves that we shall be able to judge whether DINSMOOR's schema can stand or not.

³³ TOD 97 prefers KIRCHNER's SI G reading, ἐς τὴν στήλην. (Note also that at v. 60 we find οἱ δὲ ταμίαι δόντων τὸ ἀργύριον in connection with a gift of money.)

³⁴ RHODES' claim (op. cit. 96 with note 6) that the poletai were responsible for such contracts down to 405/4 only is too precise (he himself dates II² 3 'c. 400?' on p. 259): see STROUD, *Hesperia* 43, 1974, 183–4, with note 107. The implication of vv. 47–49 of the text there published by STROUD is that the poletai were still exercising this function as late as 375, but were no longer normally referred to in the publication formulae of decrees.

³⁵ See II² 4 Addenda p. 655.

the public, but allocate (μερίζειν) the sums which they receive to other officials entitled to spend public monies. On occasion, however, the system seems to have permitted a direct instruction to the apodektai (by-passing the tamiai, for example), and in these cases the apodektai are cited as the responsible *disbursing* officers. JOHNSON had argued for a period 387–c. 384 to contain all examples of this activity of the apodektai in *spending* money;⁴¹ DINSMOOR went even further, and attempted to narrow it down to the single year 386/5.⁴² Ever since this theory has found a measure of general acceptance, although RHODES⁴³ considers it more likely that the apodektai could make a payment *in any emergency*.

The one securely dated text is II² 31 (Tod 117), 14–17 (386/5):

ἐς δ]ὲ τὴν ἀναγραφ[ήν τῆς] stoich. 30
 [σ]τή[λης μερίσαι] τὸς [ἀπ]οδέκτα[ς τριάκ]
 [ο]ν[τα] δ[ραχμὰς] τῶι γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆ
 [ς·

The restorations seem safe: μερίσαι is restored not just because it fits the available space, but also because it is the appropriate verb for the activity of apodektai: they *allocate* funds. The date is the archonship of Mystichides.

DINSMOOR would date all the ‘similar undated decrees’ to the same year. Of these II² 29 (Tod 116) refers to the events of 387/6, but DINSMOOR reasons that the honours might just as well have been granted in the following year (i.e. 386/5). This could well be so, but both DINSMOOR and RHODES⁴⁴ are wrong in quoting this as an example of the apodektai being responsible for the costs of *publication*. From vv. 18–22

μερίσαι δὲ τ
 ὁ ἀργύριον τὸ εἰρημένον τὸς ἀποδέ
 κτας ἐκ τῶν καταβαλλομένων χρημὰ
 [τ]ων ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἐκ τῶν νόμων μερ[ίσω]
 [σι]⁴⁵

it is quite clear that the provision relates to a gift of money mentioned somewhere in the missing portion of the decree.

⁴¹ The argument here is concerned only with the activities of the apodektai in providing funds *for the erection of stelai*. I take no account of their parallel activities in other areas e.g. cf. II² 212. 42–44 (347/6), where the apodektai make a temporary advance from the stratotic fund for the purpose of paying for crowns.

⁴² The year of II² 31, ‘the disturbed year in which the boards of treasurers were reorganized’ (158).

⁴³ Op. cit., 103 note 7 (cf. 101, with notes 1 and 2).

⁴⁴ Op. cit., 100.

⁴⁵ Which Tod paraphrases: ‘directing the payment of the aforesaid sum by the apodektai out of the funds at their disposal after all legal charges have been made’. I presume that by ‘legal charges’ he means other allocations to various funds as prescribed by law.

JOHNSON⁴⁶ had also wished to restore the apodektai in the publication formulae of II² 33: v. 2 δ[οῖναι τὸς ἀποδέκτας], and II² 81: vv. 11–12 δ[όναι τὸς ἀποδέκτ]ι[α]ς, and in this he has DINSMOOR's enthusiastic support.⁴⁷ But RHODES rightly points out that the verb δ[όναι] makes it more likely that in these cases a treasurer or treasurers paid.⁴⁸ KIRCHNER preferred δ[οῖναι τὸς ταμίας τῷ δήμῳ] in II² 33, dating c. 385, and δ[οῖναι τὸς ταμί?]ι[α]ς in II² 81 (ante 378/7). POUILLOUX, however, has sought to place II² 33, c. 402,⁴⁹ and I suggest that the text could be restored (exempli gratia)

δ[οῖναι τὸς ταμίας νΔΔΔν δρ].⁵⁰

II² 81 is somewhat more difficult, but one may note that the syntax of the rest of the publication formula might lead us to expect an imperative, rather than an infinitive. That being so, one might venture

δ[όντων οἱ ταμίαι τ]ι[α]ς εἴκοσι δραχμ[ά]ς·

but it is with hesitation that I offer this solution since, although the article (τάς) can be given point (<the usual 20 drachmai>), I know of no parallel in similar formulations where a specific sum is provided.

Still to consider is II² 40. 21–23, where, *pace* DINSMOOR,⁵¹ KIRCHNER was almost certainly correct in restoring

ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς ἀναγρα]φῆς τῶν στηλῶν μερίσ
[αι τὸς ἀποδέκτας τριά]κοντα δραχμὰς ἑκατέ
[ρας, καὶ ἀναγραψάτω ὁ γ]ραμματε[ὺς] τῆς [β]ολῆ[ς]. stoich. 35

In the *Addenda* p. 657 WILHELM's later text reads

ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς ἀναγρα]φῆς τῶν στηλῶν μερίσ
[αι τὸς ταμίας τετταρά]κοντα δραχμὰς ἑκατέ
[ρας τῆς στήλης ΔΔ τῷ γ]ραμματεῖ ν τῆς βολῆς.

but μερίσαι is virtually conclusive against any restoration with treasurers.

On the basis of KIRCHNER's text JOHNSON had wished to push the date of II² 40 back to 386/5,⁵² while WILHELM's treasurers allowed DINSMOOR to retain the date 378/7, where, by dint of the historical circumstances, this decree seems securely located. The solution, however, is clear: one must accept *both* the apodektai *and* a date

⁴⁶ 419 and 422.

⁴⁷ 158 note 4: <In II², 33 and 81, Johnson has *with practical certainty* (my italics) restored τὸς ἀποδέκτας.>

⁴⁸ Op. cit., 101 note 1.

⁴⁹ Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I, Paris 1954, 199 and 203. Cf. SEG XV 87 and XXVI 70.

⁵⁰ WILHELM's δ[όντων οἱ ταμίαι εἴκοσι δρ] is one letter too long (AU V [cf. note 12] 3–4).

⁵¹ 158 note 4 and 158–159 note 6.

⁵² 419–420, and 422.

in 378/7, and assume that the financial situation again required a direct payment by the apodektai. This ruins DINSMOOR's tidy scheme but is preferable to forcing the evidence into a mould it will not fit.

III. οἱ ταμίαι (τῶν) τῆς θεᾶς

DINSMOOR states that 'the treasurers of the Goddess, necessarily belonging to the period of reorganization after 385 B.C., appear as disbursing officers in dated inscriptions of 379/8 and 378/7.'⁵³ The texts in question are II² 39 and 43. In the former the formula is almost entirely restored: vv. 6–7

τὸς δὲ ταμίαι|[ς δόνα]ι τὸ ἀνάλωμα.

although the date is certain from the postscript (v.8) which names the archon Nikon. Theoretically, however, one could also restore τὸν δὲ ταμίαι|[ς,⁵⁴ so that, although dated, this document is not 'evidence' for one board or official rather than another.⁵⁵

In the other text, II² 43 (TOD 123), the charter of the Second Athenian Confederacy, we find the only indubitable instance of the treasurers of the goddess in a precisely dated decree: vv. 66–69

τὸ δὲ ἀρ[γύ]ριον δόναι εἰς τὴν ἄν
αγραφήν τῆς στ[ήλη]ς ἐξήκοντα δραχμὰς
ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλ[άν]των τὸς ταμίαις τῆς θε
ᾶς.

stoich. 31

We also have here clear evidence for the Ten Talent Fund.⁵⁶

DINSMOOR makes the further assumption that 'in the absence of any other disbursing officers in datable decrees between 385 and 376, we may assume that six other decrees wherein the treasurers of Athena functioned belong to these eight years'.⁵⁷ I propose now to examine this claim in detail:

II² 22 b. 8–10:

⁵³ 158, with note 5. It should be emphasised that the situation is further complicated by the fact that on occasion (? through carelessness) the *joint* board could be described as ταμίαι τῶν τῆς θεᾶς (e.g. II² 1391. 5 [398/7]). DINSMOOR's postulate that the appearance of ταμίαι τῶν τῆς θεᾶς necessarily implies a date 385/4 or later is therefore untenable.

⁵⁴ Cf. A. LAMBRECHTS, *Text en Uitzicht van de Atheense Proxeniendeclreten tot 323 v. C.*, Brussels 1958, 113 n. 3.

⁵⁵ With the restoration of the plural board DINSMOOR assumes (*ibid.*) that the words τῆς θεᾶς have been omitted 'apparently through carelessness of the scribes (*sic*)'.

⁵⁶ See my discussion of this Fund below.

⁵⁷ 158. (Between 385/4 and 377/6 there are actually *nine* years on my count). The texts are II² 22, 40 (already dealt with above, with reference to the apodektai, who should be restored in this document), 76, 141, 173 and 245 (= 178).

ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀνά] stoich. 31
 [γρα]φὴν δόναι τ[ὸς ταμίας τῶν τῆς θεᾶς τρ]
 [ιά]κον[τ]α δραχμ[ὰς ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλάντων].

DINSMOOR concedes that the name of the disbursing board is restored, but one will agree with him that ‘it fits the space’ and is indeed likely in a line of this width. But note how DINSMOOR continues: ‘*mention* (my italics) of the treasurers of the Goddess and of the ten-talent fund show (*sic*) that it cannot be as early as about 390/89’.⁵⁸ We should not lose sight of the fact that the Ten Talent Fund is also entirely restored, and, regardless of the period to which we assign this Fund, it is methodologically dangerous to adduce it as supporting evidence when there is nothing save the spatial consideration to suggest its presence.

II² 76. 20–22: this is a well-preserved proxeny decree for one Philinos of Byzantium:

τὸ δὲ ἀργύριο stoich. 20
 ν δόντων ο[ἱ τα]μίαι τῶν τῆ
 [ς] θεᾶς εἴκο[σι δρ]αχμάς. *vacat*.

The document is dated ‘before 378/7’ by KIRCHNER, but because the honorand is also mentioned in II² 41 of the year 378/7, DINSMOOR argues that II² 76 is therefore ‘probably of the same year’.⁵⁹ That may be going a little too far, but we may agree that there may be some proximity between the two documents.

Before leaving this text it may be worth observing a peculiarity of the expenses formulation: in most decrees we find *either* the vague term τὸ ἀργύριον *or* a particular sum specified. Here we find *both*. The only other examples are II² 43 (378/7) and II² 84 (? before 378/7), and perhaps also in II² 33 (? c. 402). Leaving aside this last alleged instance, where there is no necessity whatsoever to accept the proposed restoration, one could conclude, cautiously, that this particular type of foundation was current for a short time around the year 378/7.⁶⁰

II² 141 (Tod 139) 15–18:

ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀ stoich. 27
 ναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τοὺς
 ταμίας τῷ γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς Δ
 ΔΔ δραχμάς ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλάντων.

The date of this well-preserved decree honouring Straton, King of Sidon, is much disputed. On the basis of Athenaeus XII, 41, p. 531, BOECKH and KOEHLER had as-

⁵⁸ KIRCHNER’s date in the Corpus, associating the references to Medokos (vv. a. 2 and 4) with Xen. Hell. 4. 8. 26 and the expedition of Thrasyboulos. (Note that JOHNSON, 421, had also wished to bring II² 22b. down to c. 378–376 on the strength of the supposed disbursing board.)

⁵⁹ 158–159 note 6, comparing Glotz, REG 34, 1921, 12–13 and 17.

⁶⁰ But, of course, one cannot press this argument since the quantity of the evidence is so slight.

signed the decree to the period 376–360, but JOHNSON,⁶¹ on formulaic grounds, had wished to place it a little earlier than this, thus enabling DINSMOOR to squeeze it into his group III. We should note, however, that TOD argued for a date c. 367, and indeed a date in the 360s seems hard to avoid. Most recently, MOYSEY⁶² has urged a date c. 364. If this be accepted, it is more than just an ‘obstacle’⁶³ to DINSMOOR’s view of the Ten Talent Fund: it also affords an undeniable instance of ‘the treasurers’ paying for the erection of a stone in the 360s, a period which both JOHNSON and DINSMOOR reserve for the functions of the Treasurer of the People.⁶⁴

II² 173. 11–14: the text is highly restored

ἐς δὲ stoich. 32

[τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δῶναι] τὸς ταμ
[ίας τῶν τῆς θεοῦ ΔΔΔ δραχμᾶς ἐκ τῶν δ]έκα τ
[αλάντων τῶι γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς.

but the reference is certainly to plural treasurers, and there is enough on the stone in v. 13 to make it clear that the reference is to the Ten Talent Fund and not to the ten day time-limit. KOEHLER had, very tentatively, suggested that τοῖς ἐπὶ X at the end of v. 8 might permit the association of the decree with the archon Charisandros (376/5), but KIRCHNER was content to settle for ‘ante 353/2’ on the basis of the script. JOHNSON’s reason for placing the text in the period 378–376 was the reference to the Ten Talent Fund, and DINSMOOR acquiesces in this allocation.

II² 245 (= 178) 4–5:⁶⁵ the text is again heavily restored

τὸς δὲ ταμίαις] τῆς [θ]εοῦ δῶν[αι] stoich. 35

[. δραχμᾶς ἐς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν] τῆς [σ]τήλ[ης].

As we have already seen, JOHNSON⁶⁶ thought that the historical circumstances would support a date shortly after 383/2, and this DINSMOOR is glad to accept. But all that can be claimed for this dating is a degree of probability: although the decree *may* be associated with the events in Boeotia at that time, the evidence is insufficient to justify absolute reliance on such a date.

⁶¹ 423.

⁶² AJAH 1, 1976, 182–189.

⁶³ As RHODES refers to it, *op. cit.*, 103 note 7.

⁶⁴ Also relevant to the date of this decree may be the fact that the secretary of the Council is instructed to have the stone inscribed ‘within ten days’ (δέκα ἡμερῶν, v. 14). This phrase seems to have a very limited life in publication formulae, the evidence suggesting a date nearer the *middle* of the century. I have found no other example earlier than the 350s. (See also M. J. OSBORNE, ABSA 66, 1971, 319 note 145.)

⁶⁵ I have already discussed the date of this text with reference to the expression ἐμ πόλει: see above p. 92.

⁶⁶ 419, 439.

DINSMOOR would also place II² 84 in his group III,⁶⁷ although it contains no indication at all of the paymaster(s) involved:⁶⁸

stoich. 20

τὸ δ[ἐ] ἀργύρι
[ον δὸν]αι εἰς τὴν [σ]τήλην τ
[ριάκ]οντα δραχμ[ά]ς ἐκ τῶν
[δέκ]α ταλάντων·

KIRCHNER dated this <ante 378/7> on the basis of the script; for DINSMOOR, because of the mention of the Ten Talent Fund, it should <undoubtedly> belong in the period 378–376.⁶⁹

Finally, we may briefly allude to II² 79. 15–17, where the reference to the paymaster(s) is wholly restored:

stoich. 23

εἰς δὲ τ
[ὴν ἀν]αγραφ[ὴν τῆς σ]τήλης δὸ[ν]
[αι τὸν] τ[αμίαν]-----]

dated <ante 378/7>, on script, by KIRCHNER. Two points may be made here: (i) the appearance of the probouleumatic formula γνώμη[ν δὲ ξυμ]βάλλεσθαι | τῆς βολῆς (vv. 6–7) suggests a date not before 379;⁷⁰ (ii) as DINSMOOR correctly points out, one could equally well restore τὸς τ[αμίας], so that, even if we accept a date as early as 379, the evidence need not be at variance with DINSMOOR's *terminus post quem* for the Treasurer of the People. The text *could* belong in his group III.

It may be appropriate at this point to review the evidence for the Ten Talent Fund, which, as we have seen, is inextricably bound up with the arguments relative to the texts which DINSMOOR places in group III. We have, in fact, already had occasion to discuss all the texts in which reference to the Fund appears or is restored.⁷¹ DINSMOOR's (and JOHNSON's) contention, let us recall, is that this Fund operated only in the years 378–376, that is to say during the last two years of DINSMOOR's group III inscriptions, 378/7 and 377/6. How far then does the evidence go to support this contention that, for a short time before the expense-account of the Assembly was

⁶⁷ 158–159 note 6.

⁶⁸ Cf. SEG XXI 230. 2–3, which is likewise restored without mention of a paymaster:

stoich. 20

ἐς δ[ἐ] ἀναγραφὴν δὸ
[ναι] τριάκ[οντα] δραχμάς·

It is interesting to note the date assigned to this alliance with Arethusa in Euboea: c. 377.

⁶⁹ For the mention of τὸ ἀργύριον plus a specific sum, see above p. 108.

⁷⁰ This earliest example of this formula seems to occur in the decree of the year of Nikon, 379/8 (quoted above): see PRITCHETT CSCA 5, 1972, 164–169, and cf. JOHNSON's comments, 422.

⁷¹ II² 22, 43 (Tod 123), 84, 141 (Tod 139) and 173.

created,⁷² stelai were paid for from a fund of ten talents administered by the Treasurers of the Goddess?

II² 43 (TOD 123) of 378/7 is the only absolutely secure evidence. II² 22 has been associated with an historical milieu c. 390/89, but is otherwise itself dated in terms of the alleged reference to the Fund. Likewise, II² 84 has little beyond a vague script criterion and mention of the Fund itself to establish its date.⁷³ II² 173 might just refer to the archon of 376/5, otherwise we are again dependent on the script and a reference to the Fund itself. Most significantly, II² 141 (TOD 139) seems to require a date in the 360s, perhaps as late as 364. There is, therefore, little basis for the claim that texts referring to the Ten Talent Fund must fall within the years 378–376, and we should reject this as a dating criterion.

Furthermore, if JONES⁷⁴ is right in simply identifying the Ten Talent Fund with the ecclesia's expense-account, a possible hypothesis is as follows: sometime at the beginning of the fourth century, in the general financial reorganization whereby various <allocations> were made to various disbursing authorities, ten talents were set aside each year as a special fund for the expenses involved in inscribing and erecting stelai bearing decrees enacted by the Assembly, and sometimes, when the source of the funds was specifically mentioned in the wording of the decree, the phrase ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλάντων was employed.⁷⁵ In course of time, a more general expression developed, ἐκ τῶν (εἰς τὰ) κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῷ δήμῳ,⁷⁶ a <blanket> term which may have permitted (and may conceal) fluctuations in the size of the appropriation for the Assembly's expense account.⁷⁷

As for the period of activity of the Treasurers of the Goddess themselves, the evidence is in large measure coextensive with that just reviewed in connection with the Ten Talent Fund.⁷⁸ Our chief witness is again II² 43, securely located in 378/7; II² 76 *may* stand association with the same year; there is a slight possibility of placing II² 173 in 376/5, and some evidence to support a date for II² 245 just after 383/2. But II² 141 (TOD 139) seems destined to resist any attempt to locate it in DINSMOOR's group III.

⁷² That is the expense-account for decrees, usually referred to by the words ἐκ τῶν (εἰς τὰ) κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῷ δήμῳ.

⁷³ But see note 69 above, and cf. H. W. PARKE, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933, 83 note 1, who tentatively suggests a connection between the honorand's son Alkibiades (vv. 13–14) and the mercenary commander of that name mentioned by Aischines (2. 168) with reference to the expedition of Chares to Phlious in 366.

⁷⁴ *Athenian Democracy*, Blackwell 1957, 102, with 154 note 33.

⁷⁵ Always (as far as the present evidence goes) in conjunction with a specific sum, and always, it appears, with the Treasurers of the Goddess as disbursing officials.

⁷⁶ The first securely dated appearance of this expression is II² 106. 18–19 (368/7), although it also occurs in II² 82, dated on grounds of script <ante 378/7>.

⁷⁷ On this hypothesis II² 141 (TOD 139) will – if we accept a date in the 360s – simply be a late example of the earlier formula.

⁷⁸ The additional documents are II² 39, 76, 79 and 245 (= 178).

Our conclusion must therefore be that the evidence does *not* support a clear-cut isolation of the disbursing functions of the Treasurers of the Goddess in the years 385–376.

IV. ὁ ταμίας τῷ δήμῳ⁷⁹

DINSMOOR claims that the Treasurer of the People appears as the disbursing official in all decrees later than 376. He rejects the apparently contrary evidence of II² 141, 173 and 245⁸⁰ on the ground that he has shown these to belong to an earlier period. This we have seen reason to doubt: one of the three (II² 141) almost certainly belongs in the 360s.

DINSMOOR is probably correct, however, in eliminating a fourth problematic text, II² 197. In vv. 2–5 WILHELM had read

εἰς δὲ τῇ]	stoich. 26
ν ἀναγραφῇ ⁸¹ δὸν[αι τὸς ταμίας τῆς θ]	
ἐδ ΔΔ δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσμ]	
ατα ἀναλίσκομ[ένων•	

and KIRCHNER dated <ante 353/2> on the basis of script.⁸² But JOHNSON⁸³ had objected that the treasurers of the Goddess never had control of the Assembly's inscription fund and, moreover, that the traces on the stone at v. 4 supported the reading τὸν ταμίαν τῷ δήμῳ. It would be uncharitable to describe this as <convenient>, especially since we now have the authority of PRITCHETT for the same reading⁸⁴ and the same reasoning viz. that WILHELM's text would record a unique payment by the treasurers of Athena out of the contingent fund of the demos. I am prepared to accept PRITCHETT's verdict as to the true reading, but at the same time I would point out that the Treasurers of Athena manifestly made payments ἐκ τῶν δέκα τάλαντων, which was virtually (if not precisely) the same thing as ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῷ δήμῳ.

DINSMOOR also deals with 6 undated decrees mentioning the Treasurer of the People (or the Treasurer without further qualification) which editors had placed *earlier* than 376: II² 21, 24, 25, 53, 56 and 82. These, DINSMOOR maintains, should all be dated *after* 376. Let us consider each in turn:

II² 21. 4–6: these lines are heavily restored, but there is possibly just enough left on

⁷⁹ This official has no *general* financial functions, but merely administers the fund at his disposal.

⁸⁰ All three with disbursing officials other than ὁ ταμίας τῷ δήμῳ and placed *later* than 376 by previous editors.

⁸¹ Line 3 should be printed (ν ἀ)ναγραφῇν, since, as KIRCHNER himself indicates, the stone reads ΝΑΓΡΑΦΗΝ.

⁸² In IG II² IV. p. 37 Kirchner has changed his mind and offers <c. 376/5>.

⁸³ 423.

⁸⁴ And the mu printed *without* a dot: CSCA 5, 1972, 175–176.

the stone to justify the Corpus text, at least as far as the point where the paymaster is mentioned:

τὸ [δ]ὲ [ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν σ] stoich. 36
 [τήλην δῶναι τὸ]ν ταμίαν [τ]ὸ [δῆμο ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψη]
 [φίσματ' ἀναλίσ]κομένων,

Nevertheless, the context is so fragmentary that we cannot even be certain that the payment to be made by the treasurer of the demos is for the publication of a decree (and not for some other purpose); moreover, especially if the year assigned to the decree in the Corpus (390/89)⁸⁵ is correct, we may well hesitate before conceding the restoration of the phrase relating to the Assembly's expense-account.⁸⁶ The termination]κομένων may, in fact, be a red herring: it could, for example, be the genitive of the same verb which appears as]μενοι in v. 387 (? ἀφικό]μενοι), and have nothing to do with expenditure. JOHNSON, of course, on formulaic grounds,⁸⁸ had referred the text to c. 376 or later, when we know that Chabrias was active. Yet even DINSMOOR,⁸⁹ for all his desire to accept this later date, senses the force of KIRCHNER's objection that Seuthes (v. 8) was probably long dead by then.

II² 24 b. 8–10:

δο[ναι δὲ . . . ἔ] stoich. 35
 εἰς ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλ[ης τ]ῶι γρα[μματεῖ τὸν τ]
 αμίαν τῆς βολῆς εἴκο[σι] δραχμά[ς].

This is an intriguing text. Quite apart from the enigma of what might be missing at the end of v. 8,⁹⁰ there is the unexpected entrance of <the Treasurer of the Boule>, an intruder whose presence can only disconcert us the more.⁹¹ Almost certainly, however, he can be gently removed by assuming an error on the part of the secretary or the cutter: what should have been inscribed is τῶι γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς τὸν ταμίαν, or, probably better, τὸν ταμίαν τῶι γραμματεῖ τῆς βολῆς. In other words, the phrase τῆς βολῆς has simply become misplaced.⁹²

Both II² 24 and II² 25, which reads, vv. 10–13⁹³

⁸⁵ On the basis of Chabrias' (see v. 2) activities in Thrace with Thrasyboulos in that year (Xen. Hell. 4. 8. 26).

⁸⁶ The implication of RHODES' footnote (op. cit., 101 note 3) is that only the treasurer of the demos, not the fund itself, is mentioned here.

⁸⁷ [...!.....]μενοι τῶ[ν] σ[υμμάχων]---

⁸⁸ 418, 421.

⁸⁹ 159 note 6.

⁹⁰ Almost certainly *not* καὶ εἰ].

⁹¹ For the treasurers of the boule see RHODES op. cit., 141 note 4.

⁹² This was JOHNSON's solution: 418.

⁹³ I retain the line-numbering of the Corpus. For a new fragment preserving a portion of the prescript of this text, see *Hesperia* 10, 1941, 262–263 no. 66 (and note PRITCHETT's comments there on the question of the dating).

ἐς]

δὲ τὴν ἀν[αγραφὴν δόνα]
ι τὸν τ[αμίαν εἴκοσι δρ]
αχμά[ς].

stoich. 18

would seem to be associated with the campaign of Thrasyboulos against Thasos in 390/89. DINSMOOR, however, prefers a different context for these honours for Thasians, viz. after the foundation of the Athenian League in 377, when Chabrias was recruiting in the northern Aegean. And indeed from the standpoint of purely historical context either c. 387/6 or 377/6 could be the year of these decrees.⁹⁴

Relevant to their dating is also the place of erection of the stones, II² 24 στήσαι [ἐμ πό]λῃι (v. b. 8), II² 25 ἐν ἀκ[ροπόλει] (v. 10). Thus we have two decrees, both concerned with honours for Thasians and both, on any economical hypothesis, probably belonging to approximately the same period, but one with the older, the other with the newer expression for the acropolis. I have argued earlier in this paper⁹⁵ that the evidence points to a time around 386 for the dividing line between the two expressions, but I have also allowed for the possibility of 'overlap' to accommodate documents where there is adequate other evidence. In the case before us, rather than assume a very late instance of ἐμ πόλει in 377/6, I am on balance inclined to admit both documents in the period shortly before 387/6.

II² 53: vv. 7–9

καὶ στήσαι ἐμ πόλῃι, ἐς

δὲ τὴν στήλῃν δόναι τὸ[ν] ταμίαν ΔΔ δραχμάς
[τῶ]ι [γ]ρ[αμματεῖ] τῆς βολῆς.

stoich. 34

In his discussion of this text PEČÍRKA⁹⁶ states that our criteria for dating it are limited to 'the lettering, the orthography, ἐμ πόλῃι in 1. 7 and the title of the disbursing officer in 1. 8'. As for the lettering, KOEHLER placed the document between 403/2 and 377/6, KIRCHNER 'in. s. iv' but before 387/6 because of ἐμ πόλῃι. The consistent spelling, E, O for the spurious diphthongs also indicates the first two decades of the fourth century. As for DINSMOOR's attempt to place the text later than 376 because of the treasurer (of the demos), PEČÍRKA is too generous in conceding that DINSMOOR has proved 'that the term πόλις was used in the publication formula up to at

⁹⁴ Cf. POUILLOUX, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I*, Paris 1954, 196–198 (SEG XV. 85 and 86). (In his forthcoming book 'Naturalization in Athens' [to be published by the Royal Belgian Academy] MICHAEL OSBORNE gives II² 25 the number D9 and dates it c. 388. Although I have had privileged access to his check list of citizenship decrees, I have not seen his detailed arguments for the allocation of particular documents to specific years or periods. I would like to express here my sincere thanks to Dr. OSBORNE for providing me with a complete list of citizenship decrees.)

⁹⁵ See pp. 91–97 above.

⁹⁶ 26–28.

least 375». DINSMOOR reached this lower limit only by *assuming* a twelve year transition period (386–12 = 374) and by then attempting to force the evidence of the disbursing officers to conform.

PEČÍRKA sensibly stresses the perils of placing too great a faith in criteria «which are neither absolutely reliable nor precisely datable», and castigates Miss LAMBRECHTS for falling into this trap.⁹⁷ Certainly we cannot hope to specify a particular year by such means, but, used sensibly and within their limitations, such criteria should be capable of focussing attention on one period rather than another.

PEČÍRKA's conclusion is that the inscription can be assigned to the first third or perhaps the first quarter of the fourth century, and this assessment may not be far wrong. Of the criteria he adduces, script is notoriously unreliable,⁹⁸ and the orthography of Attic inscriptions in the early fourth century is inconsistent, to say the least. On the other hand, with a phrase like ἐμ πόλῃ we can point to the evidence such as we have it, and that would suggest a date not later than 387/6. And we cannot allow DINSMOOR's «theory» (for that is all it is) for the treasurer of the demos to influence our decision, for we have already seen cause to place some texts with the ταμίας τῷ δήμῳ *outside* DINSMOOR's boundaries.

One additional piece of evidence, however, which does not seem to have been adduced previously, is the mention of the right of trial before the polemarch's court: vv. 4–5:

[τὰς δίκας] ἔναι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸμ⁹⁹ πολέμαρχον
[καθάπερ] το[ῖς] ἄλλοις προξένοις.

It may be worthwhile to pause for a moment to consider the evidence relating to the occurrence of this privilege in honorary decrees. For it is perhaps not without significance that apart from II² 53, there is only one possible instance later than the end of the fifth century, viz. II², 265, for which PEČÍRKA¹⁰⁰ argues a date shortly before the middle of the fourth century. A date as late as this for the provision would make it impossible for us to use this criterion as an argument for an earlier rather than a later date for II² 53.

However, one should note that II² 265 is an extremely fragmentary text. I give the relevant lines (vv. 7–9) with and without restoration:

		καὶ ε]	
I N A I	ἵναι [αὐτῷ καθάπερ τοῖς ἄλλ]		stoich. 23
O I Σ Π	οῖς π[ροξένοις πρὸς τὸν πολέ]		
M A P X	μαρχ[ὸν τὰς δίκας Ἀθήνησι·		

⁹⁷ But he is unfair to her insofar as he declares that he fails to see why she «did not accept Dinsmoor's *correction* (my italics)» vis-à-vis ἐμ πόλει.

⁹⁸ Especially in terms of a *terminus post quem non*.

⁹⁹ See PEČÍRKA 27.

¹⁰⁰ 51–53.

It may be observed on the restoration i) that it produces a word-order unlike that in any other example of the formulation;¹⁰¹ and ii) that, in any case, the reference to the polemarch may be entirely illusory: ΜΑΡΧ could, for example, be part of the name of the honorand in a provision of a quite different nature. I am not therefore prepared to accept II² 265 as evidence for the right to appear before the polemarch's court being awarded so late in the first half of the fourth century. II² 53 is consequently probably our only fourth century example, and should preferably be dated as early in the century as possible.¹⁰²

II² 56: the date of this tiny fragment again turns on the restored reference to ἐμ πόλει:

[.....¹⁵.....]ων καὶ [ά]να[γράψαι τὸ ψήφισ] stoich. 36
 [μα τόδε τὸν γραμ]ματέα τῆς β[ουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ λ]
 [ιθίνῃ ἐμ πόλει], εἰς δὲ ἀναγ[ραφὴν τηστήλης δ]
 [ᾶναι τὸν ταμίαν τ]ῷ δήμῳ τῷ [γραμματεῖ τῆς βο]
 [λῆς τριάκοντα δραχ]μάς. vacat

Certainty is impossible here, but the overall reconstruction of the fragment would seem to support the inclusion of ἐμ πόλει. If it be accepted, then KIRCHNER's date, <ante 387/6>, is a necessary consequence.¹⁰³

We must conclude, therefore, that DINSMOOR's claim that, in the texts just examined, <in practically every case we have good grounds for dating them after 376 B.C.>, is just not borne out by the evidence.¹⁰⁴

CONCLUSION

I. ἐμ πόλει / ἐν ἀκροπόλει:

We are now in a position to apply the results of our re-examination of these texts to the conclusions arrived at by DINSMOOR <with regard to the relative use of ἐν πό-

¹⁰¹ In every extant case Ἀθήνησι always *precedes* πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον (e.g. SEG X 23. 4–5; *ibid.* 108. 22–23; I² 152. 4–5 and 153. 7–8).

¹⁰² According to PEČIRKA, D. M. LEWIS would not put the lettering as far back as the 390s.

¹⁰³ The omission of the article with ἀναγραφὴν may also be relevant. This is certainly an <earlier> phenomenon, the later standard formulation being invariably εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν. Unfortunately, the only other instance of the omission of the article *on the stone* is undated: II² 24 b. 8–9. The phrase is also *restored* without the article in II² 1. 68 (403/2), although TON 97 prefers the reading ἐς τὴν στήλην, and II² 51. 14–15. Although I incline towards early dates for II² 24 and 51, this evidence should not be pressed too far.

¹⁰⁴ For II² 33, which KIRCHNER restored with a reference to the Treasurer of the People, see above p. 106. For II² 79, where again the Corpus shows the treasurer, see above p. 110.

λει and ἐν ἀκροπόλει.¹⁰⁵ I shall not, of course, repeat the evidence which has already been set out in detail above.

DINSMOOR's conclusions are as follows:

- (i) <between 399 and 386 B. C., six¹⁰⁶ inscriptions, or 100%, consistently employ ἐν πόλει>: we can accept the allocation to this period of the dated inscriptions II² 13, 17 and 19, in all of which πόλει (πόληι) is probably correctly restored, and II² 51 and 57 probably belong here simply because of the formula ἐμ πόλει itself. But we have seen reason to believe that at least two texts with ἐν ἀκροπόλει may fall within this period: II² 22 and 25.¹⁰⁷
- (ii) <between 386 and 376 B. C. only two inscriptions, or 12 ½%, contain ἐν πόλει, while fourteen, or 87 ½%, employ the new expression ἐν ἀκροπόλει>:
ἐν πόλει: DINSMOOR here cites II² 32 and 245. But, as we have seen, it is of no consequence to our discussion which expression is restored in the former. As for the latter, we may accept, with due caution, both the restoration and the allocation.
ἐν ἀκροπόλει: here we may accept II² 30, 31, 34, 39, 44, 95 and possibly 29. II² 81 could also fall in this period, but with treasurers instead of apodektai. Conversely, II² 40 can stand here as well, but with apodektai instead of treasurers. It may also be possible to include II² 9, 76 and 84.
However, II² 22 may be as early as 390/89, and II² 141 should be placed in the 360s.
- (iii) <between 376 and 370 B. C. we find three inscriptions, or 43%, with ἐν πόλει, and four, or 57%, with ἐν ἀκροπόλει>:
ἐν πόλει: Dinsmoor's three texts, II² 24, 53 and 56, should all be placed before 387/6.
ἐν ἀκροπόλει: we can accept II² 98 and 197, but probably not II² 25 or 82.
- (iv) <uncertain date>:
ἐν πόλει: I can see no reason to reject the Corpus dating of <ante 387/6> for II² 52 and 54. II² 55 belongs in 428/7.¹⁰⁸
ἐν ἀκροπόλει: I would place II² 70 <c. between 390 and 378>,¹⁰⁹ and II² 79 <shortly before 378/7>.¹¹⁰ II² 80 may belong in the period c. 380–370.

In short, the evidence seems to me to support a possible upper limit for ἐν ἀκροπόλει

¹⁰⁵ 159–160.

¹⁰⁶ In fact only five, since II² 27 belongs in 416/15: see SEG X 109.

¹⁰⁷ And possibly also II² 29.

¹⁰⁸ See SEG X 67.

¹⁰⁹ A combination of the earliest likely example of ἐν ἀκροπόλει (II² 22) and the Corpus script criterion <ante 378/7>.

¹¹⁰ See above p. 110.

c. 390, but in no way justifies DINSMOOR's final view that ἐμ πόλει was employed 'as late as 375 at least'.

II. The Disbursing Officers:

reluctant as I am to discard such a neat schema as DINSMOOR's, I do not believe that the evidence supports his clear-cut divisions. Excepting the apodektai,¹¹¹ the evidence such as it is at present¹¹² affords the following picture:

(i) 403–c. 390: οἱ ταμίαι.

Unquestionably the joint treasurers took over after 404 B.C. They are evidenced by II² 1 and 2 (403/2); 3 (c. 403/2); and perhaps 33 (? c. 402) and 5 (c. 400). They are also presumably to be restored in II² 4 (c. 403/2). II² 51 and 57, dated before 387/6 because of ἐμ πόλει (real or restored), may be assumed to be earlier than 390 if it is felt desirable to avoid an overlap with the next group.

(ii) c. 390–?c. 364: οἱ ταμίαι (τῶν) τῆς θεᾶς and ὁ ταμίης τῷ δήμῳ.

The evidence suggests that *both* the Treasurers of the Goddess *and* the Treasurer of the People were called upon as paymasters in this period. For the former there may be a concentration of activity around the time of the establishment of the Second Athenian Confederacy (II² 43; ? 76; ?? 173), but II² 22 – where the restoration of Athena's Treasurers seems necessary – is probably to be dated in 390/89, and II² 141 in the 360s (? 364). II² 245 may perhaps be assigned to the period shortly after 383/2. As for the Treasurer of the Demos, he too seems to make an entrance in 390/89 (II² 21), as well as in several documents perhaps from the early 380s (II² 24, 25, 53, 56, ? 82). The date of II² 197 is impossible to determine any more closely than c. 390–353/2.

(iii) 363–303: ὁ ταμίης τῷ δήμῳ.¹¹³

From 363 onwards the Treasurer of the People is clearly the sole disbursing officer in the matter of payments for decrees: e.g. II² 109 b. 26–29 (363/2); 111 (Tod 142) 25–27 (363/2); 116 (Tod 147) 44–45 (361/0) etc.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Who, it seems, were liable to be called upon *at any time* to make direct allocations for decrees.

¹¹² Further discoveries may, of course, alter the picture once again.

¹¹³ Also frequently referred to simply as ὁ ταμίης.

¹¹⁴ The paymasters after 303 B.C. involve problems of their own. These I hope to treat elsewhere.