

The Wrongful Execution of the Hellênotamiai (Antiphon 5.69–71) and the Lapis Primus

Author(s): Stephen V. Tracy

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 109, No. 1 (January 2014), pp. 1-10

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/673847>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*

JSTOR

THE WRONGFUL EXECUTION OF THE *HELLĒNOTAMIAI*
(ANTIPHON 5.69–71) AND THE *LAPIS PRIMUS*

STEPHEN V. TRACY

ANTIPHON AND THE *HELLĒNOTAMIAI*

THE *HELLĒNOTAMIAI*, THE TREASURERS of the Athenian empire, were a board of ten citizens chosen annually, one from each tribe, to receive the tribute paid by the members of the empire.¹ They were trusted senior officials with some financial expertise, who received payments each year that totaled in the neighborhood of 350 talents and were charged with overseeing the funds and keeping accurate accounts. This was necessarily a complex process, because there were many members of the empire spread out across a wide geographical region and payments did not come in all at one time. In addition, there frequently were partial payments and late payments, sometimes because member states were not ready or able to meet their assessed amounts in a timely fashion. Once the money was collected, the *Hellēnotamiai* calculated the *aparchai*, the sixtieth part of the tribute that was an offering to Athena, deducted it, and turned it over to the *logistai* for auditing. It is probable that they did this all at one time near or at the end of the process. These monies were then passed on to the treasurers of Athena.² It is the records of these payments of *aparchai* that survive on stone as the tribute lists. Whatever their exact duties, the *Hellēnotamiai* were surely among the most important officials of the state;³ the money in their charge was crucial to maintaining Athenian power.

The removal from office of an entire board of *Hellēnotamiai*, followed by the trial and execution of all but one, must have been one of the most

I owe deepest thanks to my colleague Christian Habicht for his keen interest and advice during the preparation of this study. I am also indebted to Professor Dr. Klaus Hallof, the head of the *IG* in Berlin, for putting squeezes of the *Lapis Primus* at my disposal at the end of August 2012, and to the anonymous readers for *CP* for useful suggestions.

1. On the *Hellēnotamiai*, see Swoboda 1913 and Woodhead 1959; for the known holders of the office and their assistants, *ATL* 1: 567–70 and 2: 125–26.

2. From the rather compressed phrasing of the prescript of the first list (*IG* I³ 259.1–2) we learn that the *Hellēnotamiai*, the thirty (*logistai*), and the goddess, presumably her treasurers (the treasurers of Athena), were all involved. The *aparchai* were turned over to the thirty for accounting and then given to the goddess. The (much restored) initial lines of the prescript of the first list are: [ἀπαρχαὶ καὶδε χορὶς χ]σύμ[πασαι παρ]ᾶ τῶν ἡλλ[εν]οτ[αμ]ιῶν ἡ[οῖς] ἐγραμμάτευσ]ε πρ[ὸ]τ[αι τοῖσι] τριάκο[ντα ἀπ]εφάνθησαν [τεῖ θεῷ] (“All the following separate offerings for the goddess were the first ones handed over for accounting to the thirty from the *Hellēnotamiai* for whom so-and-so was secretary” [my trans.]).

3. On the various treasuries and treasurers of Athens in this period, see Samons 2000, 28–83, esp. 36–37.

Classical Philology 109 (2014): 1–10

© 2014 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved | 0009-837X/14/10901-0001\$10.00

notorious events ever in the internal affairs of the Athenians. Incredibly, there is scarcely any mention of it in the evidence that comes down to us. Antiphon is our sole source; he was a grown man at the time it happened.⁴ In the speech he wrote for the defendant in the case of the murder of Herodes (5.69–71), he has him bring it up as follows:

... οἱ Ἑλληνοταμίαι οἱ ὑμέτεροι, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἅπαντες ἀπέθανον ὀργῆι μᾶλλον ἢ γνώμῃ, πλὴν ἑνός, τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα ὕστερον καταφανὲς ἐγένετο. τοῦ δ' ἑνός τούτου—Σωσίαν ὀνομάζουσιν αὐτῷ εἶναι—κατέγνωστο μὲν ἤδη θάνατος, ἐτεθνήκει δὲ οὐπω· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐδηλώθη τῷ τρόπῳ ἀπωλόλει τὰ χρήματα, καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀπῆχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παραδεδομένος ἤδη τοῖς ἑνδεκα, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἐτέθνασαν οὐδὲν αἴτιοι ὄντες.

... your own *Hellēnotamiai*, they all perished out of anger rather than sound judgment, except one, because the facts of the matter became clear too late. This one—his name, they report, was Sosias—had already been condemned to be executed, but had not yet died. And just in time it was revealed how the money had been lost and the man, even though he had already been delivered to the Eleven, was forcibly rescued by the people, but the others had already died although quite innocent.⁵

This chilling tragedy must have had wide repercussions. Of course, we cannot be sure that the account as presented at the trial is totally accurate. We probably have to allow for some forensic exaggeration. The speaker, after all, is drawing a parallel between himself and the hapless *Hellēnotamiai*. He is making the case that the jurors should not condemn and kill him in the heat of the moment only to find out later, as happened in the case of the *Hellēnotamiai*, that he is innocent. While Antiphon surely did not make the incident up out of whole cloth—that, after all, would have been counterproductive to his case—the emphatic statement ἐτέθνασαν οὐδὲν αἴτιοι ὄντες may well be an overstatement. For instance, it could have been the case that the members of the board were inexcusably careless, but not, as it turned out, guilty of crimes that deserved the death penalty.

Whatever happened, the language that Antiphon adopts, ἀπωλόλει τὰ χρήματα, suggests that the money at least was irretrievably lost. Did their accounts also suffer this same fate? The whole affair surely caused serious, widespread upheavals in the entire collection and bookkeeping apparatus for a considerable time. Indeed, when the *Hellēnotamiai* were tried and convicted, it cannot be imagined that others involved in the process, including the thirty *logistai* and the treasurers of Athena, were unaffected.⁶ It also seems probable that in the immediate aftermath leading citizens would have been reluctant to serve on the board.

Unfortunately, this episode cannot be dated precisely, but it probably occurred in the 440s.⁷ That is, it is likely to be contemporary with the quota lists

4. On Antiphon's life and works, see Gagarin 1997, 3–9; and Ostwald 1986, 359–64.

5. The translation is mine.

6. Meiggs (1975, 246) saw the probable impact. “Such an alarming miscarriage of justice might have led to a reorganization and redefinition of financial responsibilities. But at this point guesswork becomes irresponsible.”

7. Gagarin (1997, 209) concludes: “This episode, which is not mentioned in any other source, must have occurred in the 450s or 440s.” Meiggs-Lewis (85–86) date the incident “at some time in or near the forties.” Samons (2000, 80) writes: “If the speech was delivered about 415, this would probably place the executions

preserved on the *Lapis Primus* (*IG I³ 259–72*), which span the years 454/3 to 440/39. If so, there should be reflections of it in our texts, specifically a list or lists missing and irregularities in some of the preserved lists.

THE *LAPIS PRIMUS*

The *Lapis Primus* is the largest freestanding inscription ever created at Athens and is imposing even in its fragmentary reconstructed state in the Epigraphical Museum. Its original dimensions are estimated to have been approximately 4 meters high, about 1.15 meters wide, and 0.39 meters thick. It has recently been argued that this unusually large block was originally designed as an architrave for the Older Parthenon.⁸ This huge block with the lists of quota payments to Athena, set up on the Acropolis, constituted an impressive physical display. The letters, however, are not very large; the headings vary in height from 0.012–0.018 meters and the city entries all have letters in the range of 0.01 meters. Even when the letters were painted, an observer, even one with very sharp eyes, will scarcely have been able to read such small lettering from any distance. It hardly mattered; the cumulative visual effect of this vast list on the viewer will have been overwhelming.

A considerable amount of planning clearly went into the conception of the whole. Moreover, the modest size of the letters proves that the original plan envisioned many annual records of tribute quotas. From the beginning, the year panels were laid out with care, as is obvious from even a cursory examination. The lettering of each panel is quite uniform; there are not many obvious later additions. However the lists to be inscribed came to the cutters, they were complete enough that in most cases the year's record could be laid out and inscribed all at one time. Clearly the treasurers of the empire for the most part provided each year a more or less complete list to those responsible for inscribing the stele.

The lists reveal some development in their arrangement on the stone. The first two (*IG I³ 259* and *260*) cover the front of the stele and continue on to the right side. The first has a four-line heading and six columns of twenty-five lines across the front and a postscript on the right side. It is unique in having the payment listed after the city. The second, after a simple one-line heading, has the payments lined up vertically to the left of the cities; the first letters of city/place names are aligned vertically, taking into account the longest numeral so that no name is indented. This required careful planning. The list itself is arranged in ten columns, seven on the front and three on the right side. Nine of these have eighteen lines and the last has ten.

Beginning with the third list (*I³ 261*) a basic format seems to have been adopted. The decision was made to confine each list to a single face of the stele. After a heading of one line the contributors were to be arranged in five columns of approximately equal length, ranging from thirty to forty lines.

well before 440, and perhaps before the transfer of the treasury to Athens." In addition, he speculates further (80 n. 246) about other contexts for this terrible event, namely, the reorganization of 443/2 or the empty space on the right lateral face reflecting the year 447/6, which might have been left "as a kind of memorial to the debacle resulting in the Hellenotamiai's execution."

8. Miles 2011.

Numerals are placed to the left of the city names. The lists on the narrower sides, namely, I³ 265 on the right, and I³ 271 and 272 on the left, were to be disposed in two columns. The single exception to this arrangement is I³ 264, the last panel on the obverse face. It has just four columns, with thirty-seven or thirty-eight entries per column. Presumably this arrangement was chosen so that the panel would satisfactorily fill the space left for it at the bottom of this face. Five columns of twenty-nine entries would apparently have resulted in rather a lot of blank surface left below the list, but not enough for the next list, which was then placed on the right side.

From a practical standpoint, the inscribers surely exercised some discretionary role in determining, for example, the exact number of lines in each column. Unquestionably, however, the order of listing was decided by others and the cutters merely inscribed what was handed over to them. The contributors in the first seven lists (I² 259–65)—those inscribed on the obverse and right lateral faces—are arranged in no clear pattern. Noting this, Benjamin D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and Malcolm F. McGregor thought (*ATL* 3: 4) that “the payments were recorded as the carriers of tribute arrived in Athens.” This seems improbable, but the lack of any observable order, at the very least, must have made it all but impossible to find a particular contributor in a given list. This may be one of the reasons that in 446/5 (I³ 266), the first year of the third assessment, there was a definite change. Now the cities were grouped into districts, and beginning with the year 443/2 (I³ 269), the last year of the third assessment and a year of the Great Panathenaia, district headings in larger letters were added.⁹ These headings (e.g., Ἴονικὸς φόρος, ἡλλεσπόντιος φόρος) clearly demarcated the various parts of the empire, making the lists more intelligible visually to those looking at them.

In addition, another change was introduced in this last year of the third assessment period. The name of the chairman of the board of *Hellênotamiai* was now to be included. Thus it is that we have the precious information that Sophocles of Kolonos was head of the board in this year (I³ 269.36). Moreover, one Satyros from Leukonoion served as assistant secretary in this year and the next (I³ 269.36, 270.2), that is, the last year of the third assessment period and the first year of the fourth. This official, who appears only on these two quota lists, may have been charged with overseeing the transition from one assessment period to the next. Clearly, the more organized way of listing the contributors on the reverse and left lateral faces indicates that a significant reorganization of some sort was adopted at the opening of the third assessment period (446/5 to 443/2).

Obviously, something occurred in the second assessment period (450/49 to 447/6) to prompt this change. Indeed, the last two lists of this period, I³ 264 and 265, are each in its way unusual. I³ 264, at the bottom of the obverse face, has the lowest number of entries among the lists on the stele, with (as restored in *IG*) 150 contributors.¹⁰ It thus has four columns of contributors instead of the more normal five. And the next list, I³ 265 inscribed on the right lateral

9. Paarmann 2004, 84–85.

10. On this list, see *ATL* 3: 36–39.

face, is the longest, with space for 220 entries.¹¹ It is also unique in having what the editors of *ATL* have termed an “appendix” of sixty-seven lines that includes, on their interpretation, eleven late whole payments from the previous year plus quite a few arrears for that year, as well as late and installment payments from the current year.¹² With (in a number of instances) multiple entries for the same contributors, anyone trying to consult this list confronts a rather confusing record. The Koans, for example, and Thasians apparently each appeared three times: the former at columns I.92 and II.37, 102, the latter at columns I.94, 107, and II.66. Quite a few others occur in two places; some examples are the inhabitants of Tenedos (col. I.5, 102) and of Torone (col. II.71, 101), the Erythraioi (cols. I.58, II.110), the Elaiousioi (col. I.63, 100), and the Myrinaioi (col. I.11, II.111).¹³ And perhaps most confusing for anyone inexpert in the intricacies of the categories of payment are what appear to be dittographies, that is, names repeated in successive lines, namely, Byzantioi (col. I.103–4) and Tenedos (col. II.108–9).¹⁴ This all suggests that severe problems were encountered. Otherwise, one would expect the records to have been consolidated before inscribing so as to eliminate most of the duplication.

Then, too, the inscriber did not manage to dispose the list into two columns very successfully.¹⁵ The actual layout as it appears on the stone can best be appreciated from the drawing of this list on plate VIII of *ATL* 1. The initial letters of the names of the contributors in column I are aligned vertically and the numerals are placed in (sometimes squeezed into) the margin at the left. They seem to begin, as it were, at the name and extend to the left. Or, to put it another way, the initial letters of the numerals do not align vertically above one another. And, when the numeral had many components, the ones that could not be fitted in on the left were placed after the name of the contributor, with three vertical dots of punctuation added to separate it from the contribution to its right in column II. This happened in lines 5, 103, 104, and 106.¹⁶ Long names, too, intruded into the vertical space of column II. This is true of lines 10, 12, 37, 38, 48, 60, 105. As if to balance this, where the names in column I were short and the numeral plus name of column II long, the cutter extended them to the left into the space of column I (see lines 19, 32, 53, 55, 101, 113). Near the bottom (from line 90 down) the lines slant downward slightly from left to right and appear to be more crowded, as though these

11. To explain the difference in numbers, Wade-Gery (1945, 216–17, 226–28) adduces the evidence of the tightening up of the tribute payments contained in the Kleinias decree (I³ 34) and dates it to the year 447 between I³ 264 and 265. Given recalcitrance, if not downright refusal to pay (hence the comparatively few payments in I³ 264), the new measures put forward by Kleinias resulted, he reasons, in the increased payments reflected in I³ 265. He concludes (228) that I³ 265 reveals a remarkable effort to follow the provisions of the Kleinias decree against arrears and defaults. Lewis, too (1992, 129–30), leans toward this explanation; however, the Kleinias decree cannot be closely dated. Samons (2000, 188–93), for instance, dates it to c. 424. And Mattingly (1961, 151–69) long ago argued for a date around 425.

12. For this complex state of affairs, see Wade-Gery 1945, 227–28; and, in greater detail, *ATL* 3: 39–52.

13. I leave out of consideration the restorations, which, if included, would give many more names occurring in two places.

14. These are not perfect duplicates; the numerals differ in the first case, and in the second the preposition in line 109 is by scribal error ΕΒ not ΕΣ.

15. See also on this *ATL* 3: 40–41.

16. In the printed texts of *IG* I³ and *ATL* these numerals are, quite misleadingly, placed in their entirety to the left. The drawing in *ATL* 1, pl. VIII, and Hiller’s text of the last three in *IG* I² 198 show them accurately.

lines of the so-called appendix were a later addition. The hand is the same throughout.¹⁷

It is notable too, from a procedural point of view, that the list of contributors of I³ 265 columns I.4–86 and II.4–73 is identical and virtually in the same order as the entire list of I³ 264.¹⁸ There can thus be little doubt that these are texts from consecutive years.¹⁹ The payment amounts, too, in the few cases where they are not restored and thus can be compared, are mostly identical, as would be expected, since the assessments remained the same. Nevertheless, the people of Lampsakos pay different amounts in the two lists: 86 dr. 4 obols in I³ 264, column IV.3, and 60 dr. in I³ 265, column II.59.²⁰ This reveals that the numbers reflect actual payments and were not simply copied by rote.

Clearly I³ 264 was inscribed well before the record of the contributions was complete. In fact, the last entries in the fourth column (IV.32–39), as Meritt and Alan B. West correctly noted, are in a different hand from those in the rest of the list.²¹ These lines then are a later addition by a different inscriber. In addition, it is apparent that the secretary of I³ 265 (or whoever did it) prepared the text for inscribing in two installments. For the first installment he took over wholesale I³ 264, the list of the previous year, and assigned the inscriber the task of copying it. This was done late enough that the nine entries at the end of the fourth column could be included. Installment two, the appendix as the *ATL* editors refer to it, was added at a later time, perhaps much later; it contained a confusing amalgam of payments arranged in no systematic way, including eleven from the previous year.²²

Moreover, it is just before I³ 264 that many have posited that a list is missing. Of course, up to the year 1935, there was no issue of a missing list. In that year, Wade-Gery published a new joining fragment of list 1 and demonstrated that the preserved letters on the upper part of the right lateral face were not a separate list of year 7 (as *IG I² 197*), but rather a continuation on the right side of lists 1 and 2.²³ With this discovery came willy-nilly the issue of whether or not there was a list missing. And, over this, there has been great disagreement. The *ATL* editors from the beginning stated categorically: “Since no tribute

17. The editors of *ATL* in their printed text and in their explication have done an admirable job of imposing order on a list that verges on chaos. One suspects, indeed, that the rather untidy appearance of the list as it appears on the stele accurately reflects the state of the records supplied to the inscriber.

18. First detailed by Meritt and West (1928), and discussed at *ATL* 1: 176, 3: 39.

19. I³ 264 preceded I³ 265; indeed, the latter was copied from the former. I³ 264 comes at the bottom of the obverse face and I³ 265 is on the right lateral face. They were inscribed by two different men, so it is not impossible that the identical parts of these lists were inscribed fairly close together in time. Wade-Gery (1932/33 [1935], 112) curiously observed (without further explanation) “it is possible (and I personally think it probable) that *S.E.G. V 6* [= I³ 264] (with Σ) is later than *S.E.G. V 8* [= I³ 265] (with δ).” As his n. 2 ad loc. reveals, he was influenced in his thinking here by his beliefs about the dating implications of three-bar and four-bar sigmas.

20. Whatever the exact amounts (some numerals are lost and some restored), the residents of Tenedos also certainly paid different amounts; compare I³ 264 col. I.3 with I³ 265 col. I.5.

21. Meritt and West 1928, 291; see also, on these lines, Meritt and McGregor at I³ 264 (“Col. IV 31–39 manu secunda incisi sunt”); and Tracy 2013, 192–94.

22. It appears quite conceivable that I³ 266 was inscribed near the top of the reverse face before the assembling of the disorganized payments that made up installment two of I³ 265 was finished and inscribed on the lower part of the right lateral face.

23. Wade-Gery 1932/33 [1935], 101–13. See Meritt 1937, 61–65 and figs. 11–12, for further discussion of this fragment.

was collected in 449/8 there is no list 6.”²⁴ Silvio Accame argued that 447/6 was the year missing because growing difficulties with the allies combined with the defeat at Coronea and the revolt of Euboea forced Pericles to remit tribute for this year.²⁵ Raphael Sealey thought that reference to the failure to collect tribute for 447/6 was inscribed in the lacuna at the top of the reverse face.²⁶ Others were not convinced that a list was missing, but realized, given the fact that I³ 264 and I³ 265 belong to consecutive years, that another list, if it once existed, can only have come in between I³ 265, on the right lateral face, and I³ 266, near the top of the reverse face. These matters have been well (and often) rehearsed by others;²⁷ there is nothing to be gained from repeating the arguments here.

In point of fact there is clear evidence that a list is missing. Specifically, between the lists published as I³ 263 and I³ 267, securely numbered in their prescriptions as the fifth and tenth respectively, we have the remains of just three lists.²⁸ No fragments of a fourth survive. Usually arguments based on lack of evidence are to be avoided, but it has been truly observed that inscribed fragments of these lists are easily recognized. That no fragment of a fourth list has appeared is, in this case, quite a weighty argument that there never was one.²⁹ The first of the three lists, *IG* I³ 264, is for some reason unnumbered, and the number of the next, whether *ὀγδόεις* or *ἑβδόμεις*, is uncertain.³⁰ It appears safe to assume that I³ 266, the list that immediately precedes the tenth, had the number nine.³¹

But, could we have at this point, instead of a missing list, a composite list with enough contributors that in fact no list is totally missing? The unusually long list, I³ 265, is the only possible candidate for a composite list. It includes, as the analysis in *ATL* 3: 39–52 has shown, late payments and arrears from the previous year, plus a number of complementary payments, that is, two partial payments that amount to a whole payment. But it has in total 162 separate contributors, which is the normal number for a single list. However jumbled it may be, it is in its essentials the record of one year with arrears from another. It is not a composite list that covers two entire years. We may add in support of this that the total number of contributors recorded on I³ 264 (150) and I³ 265 (162) amounts to 312. But, with the eleven late payments missing from I³ 264, but (according to the arguments of *ATL* 3: 36–37) recorded on I³ 265 at col. I.108–13 and columns II.103–7, the total for I³ 264 is actually 161. The combined total of the two lists then comes to 323 contributors. There should be, in a normal three-year period, about 480 to 490. So, the numbers reveal that

24. *ATL* 1: 133.

25. Accame 1938, 412–14.

26. Sealey 1954/55, 328.

27. Two of the earliest and most balanced discussions are by Gomme (1940, 65–67) and by Wade-Gery (1945, 212–15). See also Meiggs-Lewis, 133–35, for a good summary.

28. The first line of I³ 263 begins ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆ[ς] πέμπτου and that of I³ 267 [ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς] τῆς δε[κάτου],

29. Meritt 1943, 238, Wade-Gery 1945, 213.

30. Meritt and McGregor in *IG* restored *ὀγδοεις* and presented a text laid out *stoichêdon* with twenty letters per line; Dow (1942, 382–83) judged a twenty-two-letter line certain and restored *ἑβδόμεις*. It is impossible to know which is correct (Tracy 2013, 194–95).

31. See Tracy 2013, 195–96, on the initial lines of this list.

we are missing about 160 to 170 payments, the usual number for a whole year. Thus it seems inescapable that an entire list of contributors is indeed missing.

Without more evidence, however, it does not seem possible to know for certain whether the missing list is that of the year 449/8 or of 447/6. Moreover, previous studies have not emphasized enough the evidence for a serious disruption during the second assessment period.³² It is quite clear that after the first year, that is, after list 5 (I³ 263) of the year 450/49, things went very wrong. For the years 449/8 to 447/6, the evidence shows that one list is totally lost and that the other two exhibit surprising irregularities. Whatever the problems were, they have either passed or moderated by the time of the next assessment period, because I³ 266 of 446/5, the first list of the third period, has a clear arrangement by districts and contains, following Lewis' arguments, a normal number of entries.³³

Explanations generally have been inadequate, for they were designed to account only for the single missing year. In any case, scarcely anyone now believes what the editors of *ATL* argued, namely, that the Athenians were so ill advised as to remit the tribute even for a single year.³⁴ And the suggestions that Athena's quota was withheld for one year for political reasons or that the entire tribute for a year went to Athena as a block grant have the same problem; they do not account for a three-year period of irregularities.³⁵ Moreover, since there is little evidence of serious external difficulties, that is, extensive opposition from members of the alliance,³⁶ and since there was no change in the assessments, it might have been better all along to suspect that there was an internal problem in the collecting and recording of the payments.

The puzzling prescript of I³ 264 provides an important clue; it reads simply [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡ]εὶ Μενέτ[ιμο]ς ἰ γρά[μμάτ]ευσε Λαμ[π]τρύε[υ]ς, and this seems certain.³⁷ Strikingly, it is the only *archê* listed on the stele that has no number. Why? It is unlikely that it was omitted by carelessness. Meritt somewhat lamely suggested embarrassment on the inscriber's part.³⁸ However, it was Sealey, followed by Valerie French Allen, who perspicaciously saw what must be the correct answer, namely, that the omission was indicative of a serious problem involving the board of *Hellênotamiai*. Sealey pointed to the mention in Antiphon (5.69–71) of the wrongful condemnation and execution

32. In his discussion of the missing year, Lewis (1992, 125) does note: "At a minimum there seems to be some considerable dislocation of the system of receiving and recording tribute in these years."

33. On the arrangement by districts, see Paarmann 2004, 84–85; on the number of entries, see Lewis 1954, 26–27.

34. See on this point, among many, Meiggs 1975, 154; and Hornblower 2002, 36.

35. Gomme (1940, 67) opines that Thucydides, the son of Melesias, might in 449/8 have carried a measure in the assembly that prevented the quota from the tribute being paid to Athena for that year. Meiggs (1975, 154) writes: "The reason why no quotas were recorded for 44[9]/8 might be that the whole tribute of the year had been given to some other purpose. A block grant, for example, to Athena Nike."

36. But see Piérart's suggestion (1987, 295–300) that crises in the empire led to a large number of cities not paying at the Dionysia of 446.

37. The line was first read in this way by Meritt and West (1926, 88, 92), who did not discuss other possibilities for the name or comment on why the numeral might have been omitted. The name Μενέτλης (*IG* I³ 97.5) is also possible, as *ATL* (1: 176) notes.

38. Meritt 1943, 234: "The omission is easier to explain if the list was the seventh, not sixth, and if it is assumed that the intention of the mason was to avoid the embarrassment of having a list numbered 7 follow immediately after a list numbered 5."

of all but one member of a board as a parallel for a board being dismissed before their term of office was over.³⁹ He imagined that the *Hellênotamiai* of I³ 265 took over early from those of I³ 264, early enough that they were the ones who took the responsibility for the inscribing of I³ 264; “hence they might hesitate to put in the serial number.” French Allen thought that it was the actual incident mentioned in Antiphon that caused the omission and concluded that the secretary of the board did not know which number was correct.⁴⁰ In pointing to the passage in Antiphon, they were on the right track, although they did not appreciate the full extent of the problems.

CONCLUSION

We have found clear evidence in the quota lists of disruptions, for three consecutive years, in the smooth operation of the collection and recording of the tribute. For the last three years of the second assessment period, the years 449/8 to 447/6, one list is totally lost and the other two reveal significant ongoing irregularities. In addition, as a further repercussion, there was a complete overhaul in the organization of the lists that took effect with the third assessment period (446/5–443/2). Surely this is exactly what we would expect as the fallout from the conviction and wrongful execution of the ill-fated board of *Hellênotamiai* mentioned by Antiphon. We can, thus, with confidence date the series of events involving their removal, trials, and executions to the years 449/8 to 447/6.⁴¹ The board that mishandled the money and was removed is almost certainly that of 449/8. Thus this is the year of the missing list.⁴² The upheaval surrounding what happened affected the collection of the tribute and the record keeping for the next two years. Perhaps, in fact, there occurred not just significant disruption, but actual cessation, of the effective activities of the *Hellênotamiai* for a year or more.

The Institute for Advanced Study

39. Sealey 1954/55, 327–28.

40. French Allen (1971, 56–63, esp. 56–59) theorized that two boards, numbers 6 and 7, served in one year and that the secretary left the number out because he was unsure which one to use.

41. Antiphon’s account proves that the executions were not carried out all at once.

42. The conclusion appears to be inescapable that the list could not be inscribed because either the money or the records of that year (or both) were lost and could not be recovered.

LITERATURE CITED

- Accame, Silvio. 1938. Review of Benjamin D. Meritt, *Documents on Athenian Tribute*. *RivFil* 66: 409–16.
- ATL = Benjamin D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and Malcom F. McGregor. *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass., and Princeton, N.J., 1939–53.
- Dow, Sterling. 1942. Studies in the Athenian Tribute Lists, I. *CP* 37: 371–84.
- French Allen, Valerie. 1971. The First Tribute Stele and the Athenian Empire, 455–445 B.C. Ph.D. diss., University of California–Los Angeles.
- Gagarin, Michael, ed. 1997. *Antiphon: The Speeches*. Cambridge.
- Gomme, A. W. 1940. Two Notes on Athenian Tribute. *CR* 54: 65–69.
- Hornblower, Simon. 2002. *The Greek World 479–323 B.C.*³ London.

- Lewis, David M. 1954. Notes on Attic Inscriptions. *BSA* 49: 25–29.
- . 1992. The Thirty Years' Peace. In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5, 121–46. Cambridge.
- Mattingly, Harold B. 1961. The Athenian Coinage Decree. *Historia* 10: 148–88.
- Meiggs, Russell. 1975. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Meiggs–Lewis = Russell Meiggs and David M. Lewis. *Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford, 1969.
- Meritt, Benjamin D. 1937. *Documents on Athenian Tribute*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1943. The Early Athenian Tribute Lists. *CP* 38: 223–39.
- Meritt, Benjamin D., and A. B. West. 1926. A Revision of Athenian Tribute Lists. *HSCP* 37: 55–98.
- . 1928. Correspondences in *I.G.* I², 196 and 198. *AJA* 32: 281–97.
- Miles, Margaret M. 2011. The Lapis Primus and the Older Parthenon. *Hesperia* 80: 657–75.
- Ostwald, Martin. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Paarmann, Bjørn. 2004. Geographically Grouped Ethnicities in the Athenian Tribute Lists. In *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, ed. Thomas Heine Nielsen, 77–109, *Historia Einzelschriften* 180. Stuttgart.
- Piérart, Marcel. 1987. Athènes et la crise de 447–445. *Stemmata: Mélanges offerts à J. Labarbe*, ed. Jean Servais, Tony Hackens, and Brigitte Servais-Soyez, 291–303. Liège.
- Samons, Loren J. 2000. *Empire of the Owl*. *Historia Einzelschriften* 142. Stuttgart.
- Sealey, Raphael. 1954/55. The Peace of Kallias Once More. *Historia* 3: 325–33.
- Swoboda, Heinrich. 1913. Hellenotamiai. *RE* 8: 177–81.
- Tracy, Stephen V. 2013. *IG* I³ 259–272: The *Lapis Primus*—*Corrigenda Selecta*. *ZPE* 187: 191–98.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1932/33 [1935]. Studies in Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C. *BSA* 33: 101–35.
- . 1945. The Question of Tribute in 449/8 B.C. *Hesperia* 14: 212–29.
- Woodhead, A. Geoffrey. 1959. The Institution of the Hellenotamiae. *JHS* 79: 149–52.