



Attic Inscriptions  
Online

---

# Accounts of Payments from the Treasury of Athena in 410-407? BC (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 375 and 377*)

S. D. Lambert

AIO Papers no. 5  
July 2014

Minor corrections and links added: May 2016

## **AIO Papers**

Published by Attic Inscriptions Online, 97 Elm Road, Evesham,  
Worcestershire, WR11 3DR, United Kingdom.

Editor: Dr. S. D. Lambert

AIO Advisory Board: Professor P. J. Rhodes (Durham)

Professor J. Blok (Utrecht)

Dr. A. P. Matthaiou (Athens)

Mr. S. G. Byrne (Melbourne)

Dr. P. Liddel (Manchester)

© Attic Inscriptions Online 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Attic Inscriptions Online, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Dr. S. D. Lambert at the above address or via the contact given at [www.atticinscriptions.com](http://www.atticinscriptions.com).

ISSN 2054-6769 (Print)  
ISSN 2054-6777 (Online)

# ACCOUNTS OF PAYMENTS FROM THE TREASURY OF ATHENA IN 410-407? BC (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 375 AND 377*)<sup>1</sup>

*S. D. Lambert*

[IG I<sup>3</sup> 375](#) and [377](#), respectively the front and reverse faces of the so-called “Choiseul Marble” in the Louvre, contain accounts of payments from the treasury of Athena. [375](#) is dated to 410/9 BC (archonship of Glaukippos, l. 1), and its text is not controversial. [377](#) is more difficult. This paper supports the English translations of [375](#) and [377](#) which are published today on AIO. It (a) presents a fresh text of [377](#), (b) discusses its date, and (c) presents an annotated table of the accounts on both faces of the inscription.

## **Text of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#)**

There are currently three texts of all or part of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) in circulation, for the *IG* text, by David Lewis, published in 1981, but signed off in 1976, differs at numerous points, in particular in lines 1-27, from the, essentially contemporary, rival texts of Pritchett 1977, and Meritt 1978. The judgement of the last two scholars was severely distorted by the spirit of unbridled polemic which marred their work on this topic;<sup>2</sup> but both (especially Pritchett) had also made a close study of the stone and of numerous photographs, and their readings can not in every case be dismissed out of hand. Lewis’ text is the best-judged, but it was informed by study of photographs rather than by independent autopsy, and though he attempted to give due credit to Pritchett, his loyalty to Meritt, of whom he was a pupil, is also apparent, here as elsewhere in *IG I<sup>3</sup>*. The stone is very difficult to read, and, as is well-known to every epigraphist with experience at the epigraphical “coal face”, the evidence of photographs tends to be misleading or controversial precisely at those points where readings are most difficult. Further conventional autopsy would be laborious and would probably yield little; new technology for reading abraded stones offers a way forward; but in the meantime the translator needs a text to translate and the historian needs a text and a translation to work with. At the end of this paper I publish a composite interim text, which reproduces only those readings on which Lewis, Pritchett and Meritt were in agreement. It forms the basis for the translation of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) on AIO.

---

<sup>1</sup> I prepared this paper and the associated translations while a Visiting Fellow of Utrecht University in spring 2014, and completed it in the excellent library of the Seminar für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik of the University of Heidelberg in May-July 2014. I am very grateful to my hosts in those places, Josine Blok and Christian Witschel, and for financial support to Utrecht University and the Humboldt Foundation. I thank Roy van Wijk for invaluable assistance during my stay in Utrecht. I am grateful to Christian Mann for his hospitality in Mannheim, where a short version of this paper was delivered in June 2014. I am grateful to members of the AIO Advisory Board, especially to Peter Rhodes and Josine Blok, for helpful discussion and comments on a draft. I thank John Morgan for his advice on the date of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) and for permission to summarise his new argument, which has important wider implications for our understanding of Athenian chronology. I use the following abbreviations:

Pritchett 1977: W. K. Pritchett, “The Choiseul Marble: a Palimpsest with Graffiti”, *BCH* 101 (1977), 7-42;

Meritt 1978: B. D. Meritt, “The Choiseul Marble Again”, *Arch. Eph.* 1978 [1980], 95-108.

<sup>2</sup> In my experience Pritchett’s tendency to insist on perverse readings and Meritt’s to develop fancifully speculative ones was exaggerated when, as here, they were at loggerheads.

## Date of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#)

A word is also needed on the date.<sup>3</sup> The front face of the inscription, [IG I<sup>3</sup> 375](#), neatly covers the accounts of a single year, whereas on [377](#) we have two blocks of text separated by a *vacat*: lines 1-27, before the *vacat*, contain entries from the last three prytanies of one year and the first two prytanies of a succeeding year; after the *vacat*, lines 28-52 contain entries from the second prytany of a year. Neither block preserves an archon date.

As Lewis makes clear (p. 359), the parameters for the date of [377](#) are supplied by the accounts on the front, [IG I<sup>3</sup> 375](#), explicitly dated to 410/9, and by [IG I<sup>3</sup> 378](#), which should date at the latest to 406/5. The years represented on our inscription should therefore be 409/8, 408/7 or 407/6. None of these three years can be ruled out, nor has there been agreement on whether the block of text after the *vacat* follows on in sequence from that before the *vacat*, but in my view the strongest theory is that the upper block of text belongs to 408/7 and the beginning of 407/6 and the lower block succeeds directly from it in 407/6. The two most important chronological indicators for the upper section are: (a) the names of the tribes in prytany; (b) the implied relationship between the Council's calendar and the lunar calendar.

(a) *Names of tribe in prytany.*

Two arguments are in play, tending in opposite directions:

(i) [IG I<sup>3</sup> 476](#) shows that Aegeis held the ninth prytany in 408/7 (l. 282) and that tribe also holds the ninth prytany in the upper part of our inscription (l. 6). This suggests, but does not prove, that the upper part of [377](#) belongs to 408/7.

(ii) [IG I<sup>3</sup> 476](#) also shows that the sequence of the tribes in prytany in prytanies 5, 7, 8 and 9 of 408/7, was as follows (the Roman numeral here is used to indicate the tribe's position in the "official" order, used for some purposes where official responsibilities rotated among the tribes):

pryt. 5 Oeneis VI (l. 57)  
pryt. 6 Unknown (l. 61)  
pryt. 7 Leontis IV (l. 66)  
pryt. 8 Pandionis III (ll. 183-4, 267-8)  
pryt. 9 Aegeis II (l. 282)

---

<sup>3</sup> To avoid becoming entangled in a morass of inconclusive arguments, I do not give full references to the twists and turns of previous scholarship on this point or to the weaker arguments that have been adduced. I also deliberately avoid stating whether, on this or that point, I "follow Meritt", or "follow Pritchett", since such statements tend to imply and embed misplaced tribal loyalties. It may help readers unversed in the Athenian calendar to be informed that the Athenian year consisted of 12 "lunar" months (i.e. months which followed in theory and possibly in practice a lunar cycle) of 30 days ("full") or 29 days ("hollow"): Hekatombaion, Metageitnion, Boedromion, Pyanopsion, Maimakterion, Posideon, Gamelion, Anthesterion, Elaphebolion, Mounichion, Thargelion, Skirophorion. Periodically intercalary months were inserted to ensure, over the long term, correspondence between this year and a solar year. In the late 5<sup>th</sup> century the Council's year was a "solar" year of 366 days, and was divided into 10 prytanies (periods during which the tribal contingents of the Council, or "prytanies", acted as its executive committee, in rotation, in random order). In the 4<sup>th</sup> century the Council's year was coterminous with the lunar year. See further below and [AIO Papers no. 4](#), 23-25.

It has been held that this should imply that Erechtheis, tribe I in the official order, held the tenth prytany in 408/7, which is inconsistent with [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#), 14, where the tenth prytany is held by Antiochis. This argument has much less weight than (i). There is no reason to suppose that, in this year, or in any other, tribes were deliberately made to hold prytanies in reverse official order. All our other evidence suggests that tribes held prytanies in a random order, and a random sequence occasionally produces an illusion that it is a deliberately ordered sequence. This is most likely what has happened in this case. In a random order, no sequence is more or less probable than any other sequence; and (pace Lewis, p. 359) no sound argument can be based on a calculation of the probability of this particular sequence occurring by chance; it is the same as the probability of any other sequence.

(b) *Synchronism of the Council's calendar and the lunar calendar.*

This is a matter of teasing out the implications of the calendar equations by which entries in these accounts are dated. So, for example, the first entry (l. 3) is dated: “on the twenty-third of the prytany (8), the third of Mounichion”. On this topic I am grateful for the advice of Professor John Morgan of the University of Delaware, currently the foremost authority on the Athenian calendar, who has developed a persuasive (if, again, not quite conclusive) argument based on forward calculation from a well-established synchronism between the prytany calendar and the lunar calendar in 411. In 411 the first day of the first prytany coincided with 14 Skirophorion (Ath. Pol. 32.1), and Morgan shows in a chapter of a forthcoming book that if one projects forward from that equation on the basis of what we know about the workings of the Council's calendar and the lunar calendar at this period, and in particular on the assumption of a Council year of 366 days,<sup>4</sup> one would expect the equivalences in our inscription to have occurred at the end of 408/7 and the beginning of 407/6. More specifically, one would expect the equation 1 Hekatombaion = pryt. I 1 at the beginning of 407/6, as implicitly in the second year recorded in the upper part of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) (20<sup>th</sup> Hekatombaion = pryt. I 20, ll. 24-26).<sup>5</sup>

No other arguments that have been developed on this issue seem to have weight. These two arguments suggest, though they do not prove, that the upper part of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) dates to the end of 408/7 and the beginning of 407/6.

---

<sup>4</sup> This is implied for 426/5-423/2 by [IG I<sup>3</sup> 369](#).

<sup>5</sup> As Morgan also points out, this casts doubt on the usual interpretation of this inscription as showing that, from 407/6 onwards, the beginning of the Council year was systematically synchronised with the beginning of the lunar year. Morgan goes on to develop a further argument, which again seems to me persuasive, but not conclusive, based on the equations in this inscription, that, in 407/6, the Council year was not in fact coterminous with the lunar year, the Council year still consisted of 366 days, that it had 37 days in each of the first six prytanies and 36 in the last four prytanies (which arguably applied also in 426/5-423/2), and that the omitted day to create a hollow month in Metageitnion of this year was not δευτέρα φθίνοντος (“second of the waning month”, i.e. penultimate day), but might have been ἐνάτη φθίνοντος (“ninth of the waning month”, i.e. 22<sup>nd</sup>, the day on which the countdown to the end of the month begins). On the omitted day see also my remarks, “Athenian Chronology 352/1-322/1”, in A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie and S. G. Byrne eds., *Philathenaios. Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne* (Athens, 2010), 100-101 = *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees* (Leiden, 2012), 398-99. Morgan further suggests per ep. that the shift to a coterminous Council and lunar year may have coincided with the re-establishment of democracy after the fall of the Thirty, perhaps 403/2 BC. [On Morgan's view of the calendar of these years see further now [AIO Papers no. 7](#) (2016), 9-10].

### Date of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) - Lower section

The lower part of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#), i.e. ll. 27-52, following the *vacat*, would seem best taken as following on directly from the upper part. This is the most natural and obvious way to read the text; it is consistent with the fact that the tribe Erechtheis is named as holding the second prytany in both the last line of the upper part and the first line of the lower part; and it is also consistent with the fact that the first calendar equation in the lower part, 20 Metageitnion = pryt. II 13, follows on sequentially, at an interval of twelve days, from the last one given in the upper part, i.e. 8 Metageitnion = pryt. II 1.

Why is there a gap between the two sections of text? Several explanations are possible. One is that in this inscription the accounting year, appropriately enough for the treasurers of Athena, was conceived of as running from Panathenaia to Panathenaia (the principal day of which was the 28<sup>th</sup> of the first month of the year, Hekatombaion), and that the very last payment in the upper section, on 8 Metageitnion, a few days after the Panathenaia, was a carry-over from the previous year.

It seems, therefore, that while the date of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) can not be proved, on current evidence it is a reasonable working hypothesis that all the entries on [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#) date to the year 407, specifically to the last three prytanies of 408/7 and the first two of 407/6.<sup>6</sup>

### Table of payments in [IG I<sup>3</sup> 375](#) and [377](#)

Purpose (H = fodder for horses, D = diobelia, <sup>7</sup> U = Unspecified, O = obol <sup>8</sup> ).	Date	Recipient officials (h = hellenotamiai, l = logistai) <sup>9</sup>	Amount
375, 3-5 H	410/9 I Aiantis	h Kallimachos of Hagnous, Phrasiteleides (?) of Ikaria	3 talents 3,237 drachmas ½ obol (Polias), 91 dr. ¾ ob. (Nike)
375, 5-6 Great Panathenaia	410/9 II Aegeis	athlothetai, Philon of Kydathenaion <sup>10</sup>	5 tal. 1,000 dr. (Polias)
375, 6-7 hekatomb	same	annual hieropoioi, Diyillos of Erchia <sup>11</sup>	5,114 dr. <sup>12</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The accounts for the period 409/8-408/7 pryt. I-VII were perhaps inscribed on another stele, which might be [IG I<sup>3</sup> 376](#).

<sup>7</sup> The diobelia was introduced by Kleophon (Ath. Pol. 28.3), supervised by Archedemos in 406/5 (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.2) and dissolved by Kallikrates of Paiania (date unknown), “having first undertaken to add to the two obols a further obol” (Ath. Pol. 28.3). Josine Blok will publish elsewhere a paper which explores the nature of this payment. [*ZPE* 193, 2015, 87-102].

<sup>8</sup> The nature of this payment will be discussed elsewhere by Josine Blok. [*ZPE* 193, 2015, 87-102].

<sup>9</sup> For the names of the officials see the translations. I do not repeat them all in this table.

<sup>10</sup> The athlothetai (“Games-masters”) were responsible for the competitive elements of the Panathenaia that occurred every four years (“Great Panathenaia”), the hieropoioi for the elements, such as the sacrifices, which occurred every year (“Little” or “Annual Panathenaia”).

<sup>11</sup> See previous note.

<sup>12</sup> From this point onwards in this account it is not specified whether payments are from the account of Athena Polias or the account of Athena Nike.

375, 7-8 H	410/9 III Oineis	h Perikles of Cholargos	2 tal. 5,420 dr.
375, 8-9 H	same	same	2 tal. 5,400 dr.
375, 9-10, for Hermon, archon at Pylos <sup>13</sup>	same	same	6 tal.
375, 10 D	same	same	2 tal.
375, 11-12 H	410/9 IV Akam.	h Perikles of Chol.	3 tal.
375, 12 D	same	same	8 tal. 1,355 dr.
375, 14 D	410/9 V Kek.	h Perikles of Chol.	4 tal. 2,200 dr.
375, 14-15 U	410/9 VI Leon. 3	h Dionysios of Kydataenaion	1,284 dr.
375, 15-16 U	410/9 VI 9	h Thrason of Boutadai	3 tal. 1,083 dr. 2 ob.
375, 16-17 for the general from Eretria, Eukleides, acknowledgement <sup>14</sup>	410/9 VI 11	h Proxenos of Aphidna	3740 dr. 1¼ ob.
375, 18-19 U	410/9 VI 13	h Perikles of Chol.	[one digit] + 4,906 dr.
375, 19 U	410/9 VI 28	h Spoudias of Phlya	2 tal. 2,000 [one or two digits] + 100 dr.
375, 20-21 the (money) from Samos, acknowledged <sup>15</sup>	410/9 VI 30	h Anaitios of Sphettos and his deputy	57 tal. 1,000 dr.
375, 21-22 D	410/9 VII Antioch. 5	[h] Dionysios of Kyd.	1 tal.
375, 22-23 D	410/9 VII 7	h Thrason of Bout.	1 tal. 1,232 dr. ¾ ob.
375, 23-24 H	410/9 VII 7	h Phalanthos of Alopeke	4 tal. (?)
375, 24-25 U	410/9 VII 16	h Proxenos of Aphidna	1,534 dr. 3 ob.
375, 25-26 U	410/9 VII 24	h Eupolis of Aphidna	5,400 dr.

<sup>13</sup> This payment was perhaps in the context of defence against the ultimately successful Spartan attempt to re-establish control over Pylos at this period. See Ath. Pol. 27.5 with Rhodes ad loc.

<sup>14</sup> This seems to have been a book transaction. In other words income for Athena arising in Eretria was not remitted to Athens, but appropriated directly for military use by Eukleides, apparently an Athenian general operating in Euboea. The income perhaps arose wholly or in part from rentals of properties in Eretria owned by Athena. Cf. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 418, 9* with N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 2009), 91-92.

<sup>15</sup> As with the payment to Eretria, this was a book transaction. Samos was also the location of sacred estates owned by Athena, and functioned at this period as the major Athenian base for naval operations. See Papazarkadas, 92.

375, 26-27 U	410/9 VII 27	h Kallias of Euonymon	1 tal. 2,565 dr. 4½ ob.
375, 27-30 U	410/9 VIII Hipp. 12, 24, 36	h Proxenos h Dionysios h Thrason	3 tal. 634 dr. 4 ob.; 3 tal. 4,318 dr. 1½ ob.; 1 tal. 3,329 dr. 3 ob.
375, 30-34 U	410/9 IX Erech. 12, 23, 36	h Proxenos h Dionysios h Thrason	2,188 dr. 1 ob.; [one digit] + 3 tal. 793 dr. 3 ob.; 2 tal. 3,850 dr. 2½ ob.
375, 34-36 The allies acknowledged money from Samos <sup>16</sup>	410/9 IX 36	Named generals on Samos, and trierarchs	21 tal. 1,000 dr.; 6 tal.; 5 tal.; 5 tal. 3,896 dr.; 3,000 dr.; [. . .]
375, 37-40	410/9 X Pan. 11, 23, 36	h Proxenos h . . . h . . .	5 tal. 442 dr. 5 ob.; 2 tal. 5,090 dr. 3 ob.; 5 tal. 4,656 dr. 4 ob.
375, 40	Total	-	. . .
[375 D	Total		at least 16 tal. 4787 dr. ¾ ob. <sup>17</sup> ]
<b>377 Upper<sup>18</sup></b>			
377, 2-4 U	408/7? VIII 23 = Moun. 3	1 [named]	[one digit?] + 1 tal. 2,500 dr. + [up to seven digits]
377, 4-5 U	408/7? VIII 26 = Moun. 6	h -on of Kollytos (?), -sistratos of [Phaleron?]	1 tal. + [two digits] + 20 dr. + [up to six digits]
377, 5-7 U	408/7? IX Aegeis 2 = Moun. 17	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	[up to three digits] + 10 dr. + [up to six digits]
[377, 7-9 D	408/7? IX 4 = Moun. <1>8	h Athenodoros of Melite	2 tal. + [one digit?]

<sup>16</sup> Another book transaction. Cf. previous note.

<sup>17</sup> This sum is not given on the stone, but is included here for ease of reference. It is a minimum, as there are a number of entries in the accounts where the use to which the money is to be put is unspecified.

<sup>18</sup> It would seem from the calendar equations in the upper section of [377](#) that there were severe calendrical irregularities in the second half of Mounichion.



377, 9-10 O	408/7? IX 7 = Moun. 25	1 Archedemos of Marathon, <sup>19</sup> h Kephalion (?) of Kopros	-
377, 11-13 O	408/7? IX 15 = Tharg. 2	1 Archedemos of Marathon, h Athenodoros of Melite	1,250 dr.
377, 13-14 O	408/7? IX - = Tharg. 11	1 Archedemos of Paionidai	-
377, 14-16 O	408/7? X Antioch. 12 = Skir. 5	1 Archedemos of Paionidai h Protarchos of Probalinthos	1,100 dr.
377, 16-18 U	408/7? X 12 = Skir. 5  [X] - = Skir. -	1 Archedemos of P. h -sistratos of Phaleron;  h Lysitheos of Thym.	-  [up to two digits] + 20 (?) dr.
377, 18-20 To Thorikos <sup>20</sup>	408/7? X - = Skir. -	h Protarchos of Probalinthos	1 tal.
377, 20-22 O? <sup>21</sup>	408/7? X 23 = Skir. 16 <sup>22</sup>	1 Archedemos of -	[one or two digits?] + 20 dr. + ?
377, 22-23 U	408/7? X 33 = Skir. -	h Lysitheos of Th.	150 dr. + ?
377, 23-25 D	407/6? I Ant. or Hipp. 20 = Hek. 20	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	[up to 3 digits] + 10 dr.? +
377, 25-26 U	407/6? I 20 = Hek. 20	?	17 tal., 1,500 dr.
377, 26-27 U	407/6? II Erech. 1 = Met. 8	h	1 tal. +?
<b>377 Lower<sup>23</sup></b>			

<sup>19</sup> The logistai are associated with the hellenotamiai in relation to the obol grant, but not the diobelia. The significance of this will be discussed by Josine Blok.

<sup>20</sup> If this was for the fortification of Thorikos in 409 to receive grain ships diverted in consequence of the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia (Xen. *Hell.* I 2, 1), the accounting may have been somewhat delayed. W. K. Pritchett, "Loans of Athena in 407 BC", *Ancient Society* 8 (1977), 33-47, at 46-47, however, takes the payment to be "for assisting the military operation".

<sup>21</sup> It is not certain that this entry relates to the obol grant.

<sup>22</sup> After the date there is the following obscure wording: ". . . of - and Eua- and Amphikedes, from the . . .".

<sup>23</sup> On the interpretation of the calendar equations see above n. 5.

377, 28-30 <sup>24</sup> D	407/6? II Erech. 13 = Met. 20	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	for Athena Nike, <sup>25</sup> 215 dr. 4 ob.
377, 30-32 D	407/6? II 17 = 25 Met.	h Thrasylochos of Thorikos	113 dr.
377, 32-34 D	407/6? II 17 = 25 Met.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	for Athena Nike, <sup>26</sup> 986 dr. 1 ob.
377, 34-36 D	407/6? II 18 = 26 Met.	h Protarchos of Probalinthos	[ <i>one digit</i> ] + 2 dr.
377, 36-37 D	407/6? II 19 = 27 Met.	h Protarchos of Probalinthos	205 or 210 or 250 dr.
377, 38-39 D	407/6? II 22 = last day of Met.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	17 dr. 4 ob.
377, 39-41 D	407/6? II 23 = 1 Boed.	h Thrasylochos of Thorikos	162 dr. 2 ob.
377, 41-43 D	407/6? II 24 = 2 Boed.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	6 dr. 3½ ob.
377, 43-44 D	407/6? II 26 = 4 Boed.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	85 dr. + [ <i>one or two digits</i> ]
377, 45-46 D	407/6? II 30 = 8 Boed.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	for Athena Nike, <sup>27</sup> 506 dr. + [ <i>one digit</i> ]
377, 46-48 D	407/6? II 30 = 8 Boed.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	82 dr.
377, 48-50 D	407/6? II 36 = 14 Boed.	h Protarchos of Probalinthos	28 dr. 1¼ ob.
377, 50-52 D?	407/6? II 36 = 14 Boed.	h Lysitheos of Thymaitadai	...

<sup>24</sup> These lines begin a new section of text, separated from the previous section by a vacat.

<sup>25</sup> This perhaps means that this cost was to be attributed specifically to the account of Athena Nike (rather than Athena Polias), just as some expenses listed in [375](#) are attributed specifically to A. Polias or A. Nike ([375](#), 4-5, 6). Note that in two of the three instances of this specification there is another payment on the same day, presumably from A. Polias.

<sup>26</sup> See previous note.

<sup>27</sup> See previous note.

Composite text of [IG I<sup>3</sup> 377](#), Pritchett 1977 and Meritt 1978.

[. . . λ]ογισταῖς [. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .]ΡΑ<sup>-</sup>Α[. . .]Ο[. . . . .<sup>10</sup>. . . . .]ι χρεμ[ά]το[ν] καὶ ἐκ το[. . . . .<sup>21</sup>. . . . .] stoich. 73  
 [. . . ]ι Νομενίο<ι?> Μαραθο[ν]ίοι, Ἄ[ρχ]εδέμοι [Π]αιονίδει, [. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .]ιο[. . . . .<sup>15</sup>. . . . .]οχιδει [Ἄλοπ]-  
 408/7 BC? [εκῆ?]θεν, Φαινίπποι Παιονίδει, τρίτε[ι καὶ] εἰκοστῆ [τῆς πρ]υτα[νείας (8)] τρί[τ]ει Μονιχιῶνος ἰ[στ]-  
 [αμ]ένο [.]ΤΧΧ[. . .<sup>7</sup>. . .] ἔλλενοταμίαις καὶ παρέ[δ]ρο[ις . . .<sup>6</sup>. . .]ονι Κολλυτεῖ? [Ἐρα or Ναυ]σιστράτοι [Φα]-  
 5 [λερ?]εῖ ἔκτει καὶ εἰκοστῆ τ[ῆ]ς πρυτανείας ἔ[κ]τει Μον[ιχι]ῶνος ἰ[σταμ]έ[ν]ο Τ[. . .]ΔΔ[. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .]· ἐπὶ [τῆ]-  
 [ς Α]ἰγείδος (9) ἔλλενοταμίαις [κ]αὶ [π]αρέδροις [Λ]υσιθέοι [Θυμαι]τάδει καὶ συνάρχουσιν δευτέρα  
 [τῆ]ς πρυτανείας ἑβδόμει ἐπὶ δέκα Μονιχιῶνος . . .]Δ[. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .]· ἔλλενο[ταμίαις] κ[αὶ] παρέδροις Ἄ-  
 [θεν]οδόροι Μελιτεῖ καὶ συ[νά]ρχουσιν τετάρ[τ]ει[ι τῆς πρυτανεί]ας ὀγδόει <ἐπὶ δέκα> [Μ]ονιχιῶνο[ς] ἑ[ς] τ[ῆ]ν δ[ι]-  
 [οβ]ελίαν ἢ ΤΤ[.] ἢ λογισταῖ[ς] Ἄρχεδέμοι [Μ]αραθ[ον]ιοὶ καὶ συνάρχουσιν [καὶ ἔλλ]ενο[ταμίαις] Κεφ[α]-  
 10 λιονι Κ<ο>πρέιοι ἑβδόμει τῆ[ς] πρυτανείας ἔ[κ]τει [φθ]ίν[οντος] Μονιχιῶνος ἑ[ς] τὸν ὄβολον [. . .<sup>5</sup>. . .]  
 [.]· λογισταῖς [Ἄρ]χεδέμοι [Μ]αραθονιοὶ καὶ συν[ά]ρχουσιν καὶ ἔλλε[νο]ταμίαις Ἄθην[οδ]όροι Μελ[ιτ]  
 πένπτη καὶ δεκάτη τῆς πρυτα[τα]{[νε]ίας δευτέραὶ Θαρ[γ]ηλιῶνος ἰ[σταμ]ένο [ἐκ?] τὼν - - - - - non-stoich.  
 [.]ον οἱ λογισταὶ ἕξ τὸν ὄβολον ΧΗΗ<sup>Ρ</sup> ἢ [λ]ογισταῖ[ς] Ἄρχε[δ]ή[μοι] Παι[ο]ν[ί]δη [κ]αὶ [συνάρχουσιν - - - -]  
 τῆς πρυτανείας ἑνδε[κάτη] Θαργηλιῶνο[ς] [.]Α[.]Γ[. . .] ἕξ τὸν ὄβολον [-]· ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος (10) [λογισταῖς Ἄρχεδή]-  
 15 μοι Παιονίδη καὶ συνάρχουσιν καὶ ἔλληνοταμίαι[ς] Προτ[ά]ρχοι Προ[β]α[λ]ισί[οι] [καὶ συ]νά[ρχ]ο[σιν] δωδεκάτη τῆς  
 πρυτανείας πέν]-  
 πτη ἰσταμένο Σκιροφοριῶνος το[. . . τ]ον ὄβολον ΧΗ· λογ[ισ]ταῖ[ς] Ἄρχεδήμοι Παιο[ν]ίδη καὶ συνάρχουσιν καὶ ἔλληνοταμίαις  
 -σιστρά?] -σιστρά?  
 τοὶ Φαληρεῖ καὶ συνάρχουσιν δωδεκάτη τῆς π[ρ]υταν[ε]ίας π[έ]νπτη[ι ἰστ]α[μέ]νο Σκιροφορ[ιῶ]νος - - - ἔλληνοτα]-  
 μίαις καὶ παρέδ : Λυσιθέοι Θυμαι καὶ συνάρχουσιν [- - - τῆς πρυτα]νείας [- - Σκιροφ]ο[ριῶ]νος [.]ΔΔ· ἔλλ[ληνοτα]-  
 μίαις καὶ παρέδροις Προτάρχοι Προβα[λ]ισίοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν [- - - - - τῆς πρυτα]νείας [- - - - φθίνον]-  
 20 τος Σκιροφοριῶνος ἕξ Θορικὸν Τ· λογισταῖς [Ἄρ]χεδήμοι [- καὶ συνάρχουσιν καὶ ἔλληνοταμίαι]ς Κε[φ]αλί[ο]-  
 νι Κοπρέιοι καὶ συνάρχουσιν τρίτη καὶ εἰ[κ]οστ[ή] τῆς [πρυ]τανείας ἔκ[τ]η ἐπὶ [δέκ]α Σ[κ]ιροφ[ο]ρ[ι]ῶ[ν]ος - - -]

κ<α>ὶ Εὐά[. .]έλο καὶ Ἀμφικίδος ἐκ τῶν ΛΙΑ[. . . .]ἔς [τὸν ὀβολὸν ? . .]ΔΔ[- -- ἔλλ]ηνοτα[μίας κα]ὶ πα[ρ]έδροις Λυ[σι]θέοι  
 Θυ[μα]ιτ[ ]

407/6 BC? καὶ συνάρχουσιν τρίτη καὶ τριακοστῇ [τῆς π]ρυταν[ε]ία[ς - - - - -] Σ[κ]ιροφοριῶνος ΗΓ[- ἐπὶ τῆς [- - - πρότης]  
 πρυτανευόσης ἔλληνοταμίαις [κ]αὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθ[έοι Θυμ]αι[τάδ]η[?] καὶ συνάρχουσι[ν] εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας [εἰκοστ]τ[ῆ]ι  
 25 τῷ μηνὸς Ἐκατομβαιῶνος [ἔς τῆ]ν διοβελίαν [. . .]Δ[- - - - - εἰκοστῇ τῆς] π[ρ]υταν[ε]ί-  
 ας εἰκοστῇ τῷ μηνὸς Ἐκατονβ[α]ιῶνος ΔΓΓΤΧΓΓ· ἔλληνοταμίαις [- - - - - ἔ]-  
 πὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος πρότη τῆς πρυτα[νε]ίας ὀγδόη τῷ μηνὸς Μεταγ[ε]ιτινιῶνος Τ[.] *vacat*

*vacat* 0.038

ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθείδος δευ[τ]έρας Ε[. . .]ΕΡ[. . .] ἔλλ[λ]ηνοταμ[ί]α[ι]ς καὶ παρέδρο[ις Λυσι]θέοι Θυμαϊτά- stoich. 73 or 74  
 δει καὶ συνάρχουσι τρίτ[ε]ι καὶ δεκάτ[ε]ι τῆ[ς] π[ρ]υταν[ε]ία[ς δεκάτ]ει π[ρ]οτέραι Μ[ε]ταγειτινιῶνος  
 30 ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν Ἀθνα[ί]α Νίκει ΗΗΔΓΓΓΓ· ἔλληνοταμ[ί]αις κ[αὶ] παρέδροις Θρ[α]συλ[ό]χοι Θορικ-  
 οῖοι καὶ συνάρχουσι ἑβδόμ[ε]ι καὶ δεκάτ[ε]ι τῆς π[ρ]υτανείας ἔ[κ]τει φθί[ν]ον[τ]ος Μεταγειτινιῶνος  
 ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν ΗΔΗΗ· [ἔ]λληνοταμίαις [κ]αὶ πα[ρ]έδροις [Λυσι]θέοι Θυμ[αιτ]άδει καὶ συνάρχουσ[ι]  
 ἑβδόμ[ε]ι καὶ δεκάτ[ε]ι τῆ[ς] πρυτανείας ἔκτει φθίνον[τ]ος Μεταγειτινιῶνος ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν Ἀ-  
 θεναῖοι Νίκει ΓΗΗΗΗΓΔ[ΔΔ]ΓΗ· ἔλληνοταμίαι[ς] καὶ παρέδροις Πρ[οτ]άρχοι Προβαλισιοῖοι καὶ σ-  
 35 υνάρχουσι ὀγδ[ό]οι καὶ δεκάτ[ε]ι τῆ[ς] πρυτανείας πέμ[π]τε[ι] φθίνον[τ]ος [Μ]ε[τ]αγειτινιῶνος ἔς τὴν  
 διοβελία[ν . .]ΗΗ· ἔλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Π[ρ]οτάρχοι [Π]ροβαλισιοῖοι καὶ συνάρχουσι ἑνά-  
 τει καὶ δεκάτ[ε]ι τῆς πρυτανείας τε[τ]ράδι φθίνοντος Μετα[γ]ειτινιῶνος ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν ΗΗ . .  
 ἔλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθέοι Θυμαϊτάδει [κ]αὶ σ[υ]νά[ρ]χο[ι]σι δευτέραι καὶ εἰκοστ[ε]ι  
 40 τῆς πρυτανείας ἑνεὶ καὶ [ν]έαι Μεταγειτινιῶνος ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν ΔΓΗΗΓΓ· ἔλληνοταμίαις [καὶ]  
 παρέδροις Θρασυλόχοι Θ[ο]ρικόιοι καὶ συνάρχουσι τρίτ[ε]ι καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας [ν]ο[μ]ε-  
 νία Βοεδρομιῶνος ἔς τὴν διοβελίαν ΗΓΔΗΗ· ἔλληνοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθέοι Θυ[μα]ι-  
 τάδει καὶ συνάρχουσι τετάρτ[ε]ι καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας δευτέραι Βοεδρομιῶνος ἔς τ[ὴν]

διοβελίαν ΓΗΙΙΙϚ· ἔλλενοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθέοι Θ[υμ]αιτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσι ἔκτε[ι]  
 καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας τετράδι ἰσταμένο Βοεδρομι[ὸ]νος ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν ϜΔΔΔΓ[. <sup>1 or 2</sup>. ἔλ]-  
 45 λενοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθέοι Θυ[μ]αιτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσι τριακοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας-  
 ας ὀγδόει ἰσταμένο Βοεδρομιῶνος ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν Ἀθηναῖαι [Ν]ίκει ϜΓΗ[.]. ἔλλενοταμία[ις κα]-  
 ἰ παρέδροις Λυσθέοι Θυμαιτάδει καὶ συνάρχουσι τριακοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας ὀγδόει ἰστ[αμέ]-  
 νο Βοεδρομιῶνος ἐς τὸν διοβελίαν ϜΔΔΔΗϚ· ἔλλενοταμίαις καὶ παρέδροις Προτάρχουι {[Π]ρο[τάρ]-  
 50 [δ]ρομιῶνος [ἐς τὸν δ]ιοβελ[ί]αν ΔΔΓΗΗΗΤ· ἔλλενοταμίαις [κ]αὶ παρέδροις Λυσιθέοι Θυμαι[τ]άδ[ει]  
 [κα]ὶ συνάρχ[ουσι ἔκτε] καὶ τριακ[οστῆ] τῆς πρυτανείας [ς τε]τράδι ἐπὶ δέκα Βοεδρομιῶνος [ἐς τὸν  
 [διοβελίαν - - - - -]ιτ - - - - -

1-2 in. Perhaps Ἀρχεἰδέμο]ι Νομενίο Μαραθο[ν]ίοι (thus *IG I<sup>3</sup>*), cf. l. 9 etc., the patronymic added uniquely here to help differentiate this man from Archedemos of Paionidai, named next.

4. -ονι Κολλυτεῖ Ἐρασιστράτοι [. . .]ει Pritchett 1977, Meritt 1978, -ι Να[υσι]στράτοι [Φαλλερ]εῖ *IG I<sup>3</sup>*.

12-13. [ἐκ] τῶν ταμι[ῶν τοῦ]το π[αρέλα]βον *IG I<sup>3</sup>* seems the most plausible of the readings proposed.

16-17. Ναυσιστρά]τοι *IG I<sup>3</sup>* (cf. l. 4).

23 fin. The candidates for the tribe are Ἀντιοχίδος (Pritchett) and Ἴπποθοντίδος (Meritt, Lewis).

37 fin. ΗΗϜ or ΗΗΔ or ΗΗΓ.