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ABBREVIATIONS

In addition to the standard abbreviations for classical journals and the corpora of inscriptions, the following abbreviations have been used in the notes:


Hartel I, II, III = W. von Hartel, "Studien über attisches Staatsrecht und Urkundenwesen," Sb. Wien XC (May 1878), 543-624 (=I); XCI (June 1878), 101-94 (=II); XCII (October 1878), 87-184.


The abbreviations used in Part Two are the same as those used by Kirchner in IG II² and by Tod in GHI.

Throughout the study, dr is used for both drachma and drachmai.
INTRODUCTION

During most of the fourth century B.C., and sometimes in the third, the Athenians specified in their public decrees how much money was to be paid for inscribed stelai. The study of these prices for inscribing is intrinsically important for several reasons. First, the prices form a significant body of primary economic data. Close study of this group of inscriptions can provide us with important insights, especially when considered in conjunction with other economic data. Secondly, prices provide a unifying element by which a sizeable number of inscriptions on diverse topics may usefully be examined and compared. It is in the study and comparison of such groups of inscriptions that our best hope lies for learning much about the particular workings of the Athenian democracy.1 Lastly, a thorough re-examination of the pertinent texts alone justifies the study: corrections can be offered of misreadings which have persisted in the Corpus and in later publications of the texts, and refinements can be made in dating numerous smaller fragments containing a price for inscribing. A new study of these inscriptions as a group is sorely needed. The question has not been examined in full since 1896, when Drerup published his study "Ueber
His conclusions were incorporated into Larfeld's *Handbuch der griechische Epigraphik*, published in 1907, before the second edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae* I and II was published. There have been many developments in epigraphy since then: the Athenian Agora has been partially excavated and has produced many new inscriptions; at the same time, the inscriptions known to Drerup have been studied and restudied by several generations of scholars. Furthermore, although Drerup's conclusions have been widely accepted, his study is not reliable, as I will show, either in method or in many of its details. The whole problem needs therefore to be re-examined.

The aim of this study, then is: to set out and examine in detail all the pertinent evidence concerning the cost of Athenian inscriptions in the fourth and third centuries B.C., to correct what I believe to be an erroneous interpretation of that evidence, and to glean whatever conclusions are possible from the limited data that we possess.

The most important evidence consists of the formulae for publication contained on the inscriptions. Not all inscriptions, however, or fragments of inscriptions, are of equal value. A small fragment with nothing more
preserved than the price for inscribing tells us little, except that a given price was paid within a vaguely defined period of years; this period is often defined only by the letter forms of the fragment or by the language or orthography of the decree. The inscriptions most valuable as evidence are those which are complete enough to enable study of the problem of the price scale. There are about forty of these, depending on how strict one is in accepting restorations in the sums and in using incompletely preserved decrees. There is also some evidence on the cost of inscribing from outside Attica, and a bit of evidence concerning wages, gathered for the most part from the Erechtheum accounts and building accounts from Eleusis.

First, a brief introduction to the publication formula will be given. Detailed discussion of the implications of the formula will be deferred until after Drerup's treatment of the evidence is discussed. Since Drerup's work is crucial to the study, it is examined at length. After his work is considered, the evidence is re-examined completely, and the implications of the publication formula and the price contained within it discussed in detail. Finally, the historical and economic background of the prices for inscribing is considered.
Part Two is a catalog of those inscriptions which are crucial to the discussion of the price scale. It is meant to be used as an adjunct to Part One, the discussion. The reader is advised to turn to it while reading the discussion. It is not meant to be read through *seriatim*. 
Notes to the Introduction


3. Since most of the discussion necessarily hinges upon how much was paid for a given stele, and how long the decrees were, this information must be preserved, or at least ascertainable with a reasonable degree of certainty. Inscriptions with large lacunae of indeterminable length therefore are not usable as evidence in the discussion of the price scale. So too, if the sum is not preserved, or cannot be restored with a reasonable degree of certainty, the particular inscription is not usable as evidence. Since there are variations in the way that the sums are inscribed, restoration with any certainty is often impossible (see below, p. 13).

4. See below, p. 52 and n. 10.

I. THE PUBLICATION FORMULA

If a decree was to be published and inscribed on stone in Athens, the publication and inscribing had to be authorized.¹ That authorization was included in the decree and on the stele, with a publication formula which had the following components:²

1. a verb, usually in the infinitive, authorizing publication
2. what is to be published
3. who is in charge of publishing
4. on what the decree is to be inscribed
5. a verb authorizing the setting up of the stele
6. the place where it is to be erected.

A typical example³ is provided by ²²²² (with the third and fourth components reversed):

(1) ἀναγράψαι δὲ (2) τὸ δὲ τὸ ἤριστον (4) εἰς στῆλην λιθοῦν (3) τὸ γράμματος ἡ τὸν κατὰ κρυπτανὲς
(5) καὶ στῆσα [i ] (6) ἐν ἀξρόπολης

If the decree was to be funded by the state, the publication formula was usually (but not always) immediately
followed by an allotment for inscribing, with the following components:\textsuperscript{4}

1. a prepositional phrase specifying that the money is for inscribing the decree
2. a verb authorizing payment (usually \textit{μερίζα} but occasionally \textit{δοῦναι} in the first quarter of the fourth century)
3. who is to pay
4. how much is to be paid
5. from what fund payment was to be made.

An example is provided by \textsuperscript{2109}:

\begin{quote}
(1) \textit{εἰς ὃ ἐὰν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στηλῆς} \\
(2) \textit{δόναι} \\
(3) \textit{τὸν τὰ μὲν ἄν ὅμοιο} \\
(4) \textit{Ἀδ χρῶμας} \\
(5) \textit{ἐκ ἔτειν Κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλογικομένων αἱ δήμωι}
\end{quote}

Much information may be gained from close study of these formulae. It is clear, for example, that the Secretary of the Boule was in charge of the whole process. No other official is enjoined with the publication of decrees, as is evident from the index of IG II\textsuperscript{2} (s.v. \textit{ἀναγραφή}). That this secretary is identical to the one usually named in the prescript of the decree, and that only his title, not his office, changed later in the century, has been shown by Pritchett and Meritt.\textsuperscript{5} These formulae also tell
us much about the financial administration of Athens, particularly the changes in it, which are reflected by changes in the officials dispensing funds. Finally, the allotment formulae provide the sole information for the cost of the decrees.

As a preliminary to our examination of the cost of inscribing it will be helpful to review the evidence for who dispensed the money for inscribing, and from what funds the money came, since changes occur in both these categories. In the fifth century, the Kolakretai, that is, "the gatherers," dispense the money to the Poletai, the "letters or renters" who then pay the mason:

\[
\text{ἀπομισθουσάντον δὲ ὁ[ἱ] πολεταῖ, τὸ δὲ ἄργυριον παρασχόντων ὁι ν[οὶ] λακρέται} \quad \text{(IG I² 63, lines 25-6)}
\]

After the reorganization of 411, the Hellenotamiai replace the Kolakretai as dispensers of funds, but the Poletai are still mentioned as letting out contracts, and presumably continued to do so into and possibly throughout the fourth century. At times in the fourth century it seems that the money was paid directly to the Secretary, as is clear from:

\[
\text{τὸ δὲ ἄ[ργυριον εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς]στ[ὴν]} \quad \text{(IG I² 63, lines 25-6)}
\]
From 403 to 376, several different boards and officials were responsible for payment. The Treasurers of Athena and the other gods (ταμίας τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν), the Apodektai (ἀποδέκται —"the receivers"), and the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου were in charge of payment at various times throughout this period. From 376 to 303, the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου is the sole dispenser of funds for inscribing, with one exception, where the Poletai pay. After 302, various officials dispense funds for inscribing. From 301 to 295, the ἔξεταστής and τριττούρχος dispense the money. After 295 the officer(s) in charge of administration (ὁ ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως) and the treasurer of the stratiotic fund (ὁ ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν) take on this responsibility. The fund from which the money was dispensed also changed with time. "The fifth century inscriptions do not mention a specific fund at all for state publications, and it is possible that none existed, the Kolakretai, and later the Hellenotamiai, simply drawing on a general fund from the state treasury for this purpose." In the first quarter of the fourth century, the various officials probably still dispensed the money from the general state fund, until about 376, when a specific fund was established "to cover the running expenses of the ecclesia, τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλημμένα κτλ." The first dated occurrence of this
phrase is in 368/7 (2106, ll. 18-19), but the fund may have been established by 376, when the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου first appears.14 This fund continued in existence until 302/1; the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου was apparently the sole dispensing officer of funds from it until the last decade of the century, at which time several payments are made by ὁ ἐξ ἀυτῶν διοικητὴς and by the treasurer of the stratiotic fund.15 After this fund disappears from use in 302/1, "the officers are named, but the funds from which they pay are not."16

It is not clear whether the fund ἐκ τῶν ἐλευθερίων κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ is to be identified with the ten talent fund mentioned in several inscriptions from the period 386-376.17 A. H. M. Jones, in Athenian Democracy, and G. Lalonde in his unpublished dissertation make the identification,18 but there is no firm evidence for it, although there is also none against it. As Rhodes points out,19 however, the ten talent fund may be a good indication of the size of the fund ἐκ τῶν ἐλευθερίων κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ, from which the money for inscribing was allocated. This fund was probably meant to cover all expenses incurred by the assembly in passing decrees, and not just the expense of inscribing.

The language employed to indicate the money allotted for inscribing also changes through time. In the
fifth century, and until about 390,²⁰ a specific sum is simply referred to as τὸ ἀργυρίου. From 390 to about 300, and occasionally after the turn of the century, specific sums in drachmae are given. These sums are always in ten drachma increments: 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, or 60 dr are always the sums allotted for inscribing. The majority of inscriptions cost 20 or 30 dr.

That the sums are always in ten dr increments seems to imply that some kind of price scale is in operation, a price scale most probably set up by the state.²¹

Two inscriptions from the fourth century indicate that one part or another of the publication and payment process were under the laws of the state. ²³54 has the following publication formula:²²

τὸν δὲ γραμ[ματēτα]
τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν ἀναγράφατο τὸδ[ε] τὸ ηὴφίσμα ἐν στήλῃ λιθηνη καὶ στήσατε δ[ε]ν τῶι]
ἐργεί τοῦ Ἀσκληπιου εἷς δὲ τὴν ἀναγράφην]
τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δῆμου[ου : Δ]

Δ Δ : δραχμάς θευν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσι[ν].
This is unusual, and is the only occurrence of the phrase θευν οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν, which is "probably a reference to any financial source which was allowed for civil use, such as the psephismatic fund still in general use at the
time;"23 viz., the fund ἀκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῶι δήμωι.

The publication formula of 240 includes a similar phrase:


[ἐν Ἀχρ/οπὸλ]είς εἰς [δ]ὲ τὴν ἀναγρ[αφὴν τῆς ο/τῆς-


It is unclear, however, to what the phrase κατὰ τὸν νόμον refers: the sum itself (as Tod seems to interpret by his translation in GHI 181, p. 238), the whole payment process, or even the whole publication process. It may mean little more than that everything was done properly, according to the usual state procedures.24

The best evidence that a price scale was in use, and that it was established by the state remains the invariable use of ten dr increments in the payment formula.

The numerals were inscribed in two ways. If 20, 30, or 60 dr were allotted, the words ἐκχοσι, τριακόντα, or ἐξηκόντα might be inscribed (δέκα and τεσσαρακόντα are not attested). Most frequently, however, acrophonic numerals were used,25 sometimes set off by a vacat on each side, or by punctuation (: or ;). Punctuation is both irregular
and erratic. The stoichedon order was also sometimes violated. Thus, ΔΔ (2106, 2107, 2111, 2113), :ΔΔ:
(2338, IG VII 4252), ΔΔ: (253), and ΔΔ (in three spaces: 2148) are all attested to indicate that 20 dr were allotted for the inscribing. So too with 30 dr: ΔΔΔ (2141, 2222), ΔΔΔ: (2302), :ΔΔΔ: (2120, 2426, 2509) or vΔΔΔv could be inscribed. Thus, if the whole sum is not preserved, and there are four spaces available, we cannot know whether ΔΔΔ: or :ΔΔ: or ΔΔΔΔ or ΔΔΔ in four spaces is to be restored. The problems of restoration of the numerals are thus very real and must not be minimized.

After 300, a vague formula begins to be used again, and becomes standard for the remainder of time that the publication formula is used: the disbursing officer is simply directed to pay ῥὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα. Thus, the evidence for the exact cost of Athenian inscriptions is confined to the fourth century, for the most part, and our inquiry must be confined to that period.

We should perhaps ask at this point: "What does the sum in the formula represent?" An upper limit for bids by competing masons? The actual payment to the mason? Or the amount the state was willing to contribute for inscribing, which did not necessarily cover all expenses? What was the money meant to pay for: just the inscribing,
or the whole process of quarrying, transport of the stone
to Athens, and the making, inscribing, and setting up of
the stele? These difficult questions are the ones most
useful to this study. They shall be deferred, however,
until Drerup's work has been fully considered.
Notes to Chapter One: The Publication Formula


3. Throughout this study, inscriptions from the second volume (second ed.) of Inscriptiones Graecae are generally cited simply by their number, preceded by a superscript "2": e.g. 2222, except where this might cause confusion when they are cited in the standard fashion; viz., IG II² 222.


6. I have used Lalond's translation of these terms from "The Publication and Transmission of Greek Diplomatic Documents" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Wash., 1971), 45. Lalond kindly sent me photocopies of the pertinent pages.

7. That the Poletai are no longer mentioned, but still probably active in the procedure, suggests that some points of the whole payment process may simply be passed over in silence (a point I owe to A.G. Woodhead). This will be significant when the πολισία of the stele is considered.

8. The placement of six undated decrees determines what officials were responsible for disbursing funds. The six undated decrees are: IG II² 21, 24, 25, 53, 56, and 82, cited by Dinsmoor in "The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens," AJA XXXVI (1932), 157-160. Dinsmoor modified the treatment of A.C. Johnson, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions," CP IX (1914), 417-423, cited in Rhodes, Boule, 103 n. 7. Johnson's schema is as follows:
(I) the treasurers (of Athens and the Other Gods), 404-394 B.C.
(II) the treasurer of the Demos, 394-387 B.C.
(III) the apodektai, 387-384 B.C.
(IV) the treasurers of Athena, 384-377 B.C.
(V) the treasurer of the Demos again, 377-303 B.C.

Dinsmoor, by placing the six undated decrees after 376 (see p. 159 n. 6 for his reasoning), simplifies the schema as follows:

(I) the treasurers (of Athens and the Other Gods), 404-386 B.C.
(II) the apodektai, 386/5 B.C.
(III) the treasurers of Athena, 385-376 B.C.
(IV) the treasurer of the Demos, 376-303 B.C.

9. R.S. Stroud, "An Athenian Law on Silver Coinage," Hesp. XLIII (1974), 157-188. This is the only example where the Poletai are named as actually dispensing the funds. That they are mentioned, however, implies, I think, that they are still taking an active part in the process, as suggested above in note 7.

10. For detailed discussions of officials in charge of paying for decrees at various times, see A.C. Johnson, CP IX (1914), 417-423; AJA XVII (1914), 180; AJP XXXVI (1915), 432-4 . See also Dinsmoor, AJA XXVI (1932), 157-160; Dow, Prytaneis, Hesp. Suppl. I, 11-13. See also several important discussions in Hesp. IX 348-51, X 270-273, XI 278-80, XXXII 2-3; Pritchett in AJP LVIII (1937), 331 ff. Finally, Rhodes, Boule, 98-110.

11. Lalond, 68 ff.


13. Rhodes, Boule, 101 and n. 3.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid. 108 and n. 5, 109 and nn. 1 and 2.

16. Ibid. 109.

17. Ibid. 103 and n. 7.
18. Jones, Athenian Democracy, 102, 154 n. 33; Lalond, 68 and n. 126.


20. The first occurrence of a specific sum is in 222, dated approximately to 390 by historical context and letter forms. The first securely dated occurrence is in 231, from 386/5.

21. The one exception, 2839, a list of dedications to the ζερός ζαρός, dates from late in the third century (221/0), by which time the practice of specifying prices had long since ceased. The stele is clearly privately financed: 8½ dr were paid, most likely by Eukles, who dedicated the stele (line 84; Eukles' name occurs in line 2). The 8½ dr probably represent the actual amount paid to the mason (as opposed to the allotments in decrees). The late date, however, precludes its use as direct evidence that the price scale was established by the state and not the masons. Nevertheless, it does give us some idea of the price paid for inscribing near the end of the third century.

22. I owe these references to Lalond, 68-69.

23. Ibid.

24. Personal communication from A.G. Woodhead.

25. See A.G. Woodhead, Study of Greek Inscriptions (Cambridge, 1959), 107-110, where the following are cited in note 1 on p. 131:

M.N. Tod, BSA XVIII (1911-1912), 98-132; XXVIII (1926-1927), 141-157; XXXVII (1936-1937), 236-257; XLV (1950), 126-139. See also JHS XXXIII (1913), 698-9; W. Larfeld, Griechische Epigraphik, paragraphs 184-92.

II. DRERUP'S INTERPRETATION OF THE EVIDENCE

If then a price scale fixed by law was in operation, how were the prices determined? By the number of letters in the decree(s) or by the size of the stele required? By the quality of lettering? Or by a combination of these factors? To these questions we should be able to suggest some answers. After all, we have the inscriptions (though not as many as we would like); we can examine them, count the number of letters on them (or in many cases estimate them quite closely), measure them, and see if any correlations and correspondences occur.

The first hypothesis to be tested is that the number of letters alone determined the price. R. Schöne, in his *Griechische Reliefs*, published in 1872, was the first to study the question; he suggested that the price was determined by the number of letters in the decree: that 10 dr were paid for every 500 letters, but the base price for an inscription was 20 dr. This implies that 1000 letters are the limit for a price of 20 dr, 1500 letters are the limit for 30 dr, 2000 letters the limit for 40 dr, 2500 letters the limit for 50 dr, and 3000 letters for 60 dr. Hartel, in "Studien über attisches Staatsrecht und Urkundenwesen," published in 1878, examined the same
question, but concluded that the evidence was not sufficient for him to make firm conclusions, since he had not been able to examine the stones himself; he tentatively suggested, however, that he saw no strict correlation between the number of letters and the price: that Schöne's hypothesis did not appear to him to work.² Drerup, however, in an article entitled "Ueber die Publicationskosten der attischen Volsbeschlässe," published in the *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* for 1896 (pp. 227-257), which sets out the evidence available then concerning the cost of Attic decrees, concluded that Schöne's hypothesis worked. In a second article, a "Nachtrag" to the first, he considers whether the sum given in the formula for the cost refers only to the inscribing or includes transportation costs and the making of the stele. He concluded that the sum must include all costs (see below, pp. 48-54). He maintained, however, that the conclusion he had reached in the previous year's article was still valid, viz., that the price was still determined by the number of letters in the inscription, and that Schöne's hypothesis still worked. His conclusions were accepted by Larfeld, and incorporated in the *Handbuch der griechischer Epigraphik*.³ Tod also seems to have accepted Drerup's conclusions.⁴ Lately, however, doubts have been raised.⁵
My procedure in what follows will be to summarize Drerup's first article (without comment, for the most part), and then point out and discuss the general difficulties and serious problems in his treatment of the evidence. For detailed discussion of the inscriptions cited, the reader is referred to Part Two.

Drerup begins by establishing that during the fourth century, a fixed price scale determined by the state was in operation (pp. 227-228). He then briefly disposes of the possibilities that the physical size of the stele and the quality of the lettering were important factors in determining the price. He denies that any correlation can be found between the physical size of the stele and the price, of between the price and the quality of inscribing (pp. 228-230). He is right, but his treatment is inadequate: he really does not substantiate his claims with sufficient examples; perhaps he was constrained by space limitations. He then gives a list of those decrees with sums preserved in the cost formula, and gives examples of how the sums are inscribed on the stones, warning that the restoration of sums is hazardous (p. 231).
Drerup concludes that the number of letters, which will usually determine the size of the stele, determines also the price to be paid for the inscribing. He adopts Schöne's hypothesis that every 500 letters cost 10 dr, with a base price of 20 dr (20 dr inscriptions should not therefore be longer than 1000 letters, 30 dr inscriptions not longer than 1500 letters, etc.). He then examines six inscriptions (pp. 232-233), and from these six inscriptions concludes that Schöne is corroborated, and that the scale holds for the other inscriptions known to him, if an excess of a few letters in some of the inscriptions is allowed, and if the anomalies that remain can be explained.

Since the anomalies are numerous, and crucial to the acceptance of the scheme, Drerup spends the rest of the article explaining them. He does this in two ways. First, on a stele that contains more than one decree, or has an extensive amendment to the original decree, he contends that the price always refers to a single decree or amendment, whichever has the proper number of letters. Thus, if an inscription seems to have too many letters according to the hypothesized price scale, it can often be accounted for by concluding that the price refers only to the section in which the price occurs.
Drerup's second explanation is that anomalies in the price scale do not occur in public documents as such, but in private copies of public decrees, and that any discrepancy between the allotted price and the number of letters on the inscription was made up by the person who wanted the decree inscribed, or must be ascribed to errors in the copying process, either in the archives or by the mason. His criteria for differentiating a private from a public copy are two:

1) If an inscription has a relief on it, it is likely to be a private copy, or at least the sculpture would not have been paid for by the state.

2) An abbreviated or truncated form of the decree, or peculiarities in its language indicate a private copy of a public document.

The principal difficulty in Drerup's theory is that most of the evidence does not conform and can only be accommodated by special pleading. Of the 33 inscriptions which have a price allotted and are usable as evidence, only 13 fit Schöne's scale without the need for special explanation, as can be seen from Table 1. This table provides a complete list arranged by price of the inscriptions usable in testing the hypothesis that the letter count alone determined the price. The number of letters in each inscription appears in column three.
Subtotals are also provided for parts of an inscription; i.e., if an inscription has more than one decree on it, the number of letters on each decree is given, along with the total for the inscription. The count was reached by using the stoichedon pattern wherever possible, and multiplying the number of letters in a line by the number of complete lines. Incomplete lines have been individually counted in most cases. Complete accuracy is impossible, but great care has been taken and the margin of error should be small. If a decree is inscribed stoichedon, and if the line-length can be accurately determined, I have given a restored number of letters without comment; where a lacuna of uncertain length occurs, I have followed Hartel's and Drerup's convention of giving the number of letters preserved followed by " + X " e.g., 1567 + X.

Column four indicates whether the inscription conforms to the hypothesized price scale and, if it does not, the number of letters by which it over or undershoots the limit is indicated in parentheses by a + or -. If an inscription was not usable as evidence, it has not been included in the table. My main criteria for inclusion of an inscription as evidence in this table were two: the size of the inscription must be determinable with reasonable certainty, and the sum must be preserved on the stone, or restorable with some degree of certainty (those restored
TABLE ONE: NUMBER OF LETTERS PER INSCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of letters</th>
<th>Conforms to hypothesized Price Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 10 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²140</td>
<td>353/2(?)</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>no (+480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag.XV.71</td>
<td>283/2</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>no (+387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG.XXV.89</td>
<td>282/1</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>no (+776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG.XXV.90</td>
<td>281/0</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>no (+521)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG.XIV.64</td>
<td>271/0</td>
<td>c. 1172</td>
<td>no (+672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²808</td>
<td>239-29</td>
<td>1120 + X</td>
<td>no (+620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 20 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²51</td>
<td>before 387/6</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²76</td>
<td>before 378/7</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²106</td>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²107</td>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>1349; 806 total: 2155 + X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²109</td>
<td>363/2</td>
<td>1128 + X yes (?)</td>
<td>744 (amendment) yes (?) 1872 + X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²111</td>
<td>363/2</td>
<td>2365 (decree) yes (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1125 + X (oath)</td>
<td>3490 + X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²133</td>
<td>355/4</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²238</td>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>796 + X</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG.XII.87</td>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²276</td>
<td>before 336/5</td>
<td>806 + X</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²238</td>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4252</td>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4253</td>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²641</td>
<td>299/8</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²657</td>
<td>283/2</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>No (+1942)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

average: 1185
## TABLE ONE: NUMBER OF LETTERS PER INSCRIPTION

C. 30 dr inscriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of letters</th>
<th>Conforms to hypothesized Price Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>386/5</td>
<td>780 + X</td>
<td>no (-220?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>361/0</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>no (+304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>1133 (decree)</td>
<td>1290 (inventory) yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>347/6</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>no (+702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>c. 342</td>
<td>924 + X</td>
<td>no (-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2237</td>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>no (+76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>no (-352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>no (-448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4254</td>
<td>329/8</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>328/7</td>
<td>1020 (1st decree)</td>
<td>422 (2nd decree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>325/4</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2466</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>1872 + X</td>
<td>no (+372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2496 - 507</td>
<td>303/2</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>c. 303/2</td>
<td>945 + X</td>
<td>no (-55 + X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. IX 20 (r)</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>no (-244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXIV 119</td>
<td>301/0-295/4</td>
<td>650 + X</td>
<td>no (-305 + X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2643</td>
<td>298/7</td>
<td>638 + X</td>
<td>no (-362 + X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**average:** 1259
**TABLE ONE: NUMBER OF LETTERS PER INSCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of letters</th>
<th>Conforms to hypothesized Price Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. 40 dr inscriptions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>c. 330</td>
<td>$1864 + X$</td>
<td>yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505 (r)</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td>$2477 + X$</td>
<td>no (+ 497 + X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>average:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. 50 dr inscriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448</td>
<td>318/7</td>
<td>$1353$ (1st decree)</td>
<td>yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2103$ (2nd decree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3456$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>$2338$ (decree)</td>
<td>yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5680$ (sugraphai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8010$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>278/8</td>
<td>$1072$ (1st decree)</td>
<td>no (+612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2040$ (2nd &amp; 3rd decree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3112$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. 60 dr inscriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>378/7</td>
<td>$2323$ (decree)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500$ (names)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2825$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>average:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are marked in the table with (r) after the inscription number; see warning above on how these numerals were inscribed, p. 13).

It can be seen from an examination of Table 1 that Schöne's hypothesis does not hold in every case: there are many anomalous inscriptions which have either too few or too many letters. The following inscriptions fit the price scale hypothesized by Schöne without juggling or adjustment:

inscriptions costing 20 dr:  \textit{IG II}^2 51, 76, 106, 338, 641
\textit{IG VII} 4252, 4253

inscriptions costing 30 dr:  \textit{IG II}^2 237, 354, 500  
\textit{IG VII} 4254

inscriptions costing 60 dr:  \textit{IG II}^2 43

\textit{IG II}^2 133 and \textit{SEG XII} 87 have the proper number of letters to fit the scale in the 20 dr range, but both have a relief on them; they will be discussed below.

The following inscriptions fit, if the price is interpreted as referring only to a specific section of the stele and not to the whole:

inscriptions costing 20 dr:  \textit{IG II}^2 107, 109, 111, 235

inscriptions costing 30 dr:  \textit{IG II}^2 120, 360
inscriptions costing 50 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 463.

The following inscriptions are anomalous—they have either too few or too many letters to fit Schöne's scheme (the number of letters by which the inscription overshoots or undershoots the hypothesized limit for a given price has been given in parentheses):

too many letters

10 dr: all

20 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 657 (+1942)

30 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 116 (+304), 212 (+702), 466 (+372 + X)

40 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 505 (+477 + X)

50 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 488 (second decree: +503; both decrees: +1856; see Part Two),

672 (+612).

too few letters

30 dr: \textit{IG II}^2 31 (-220, but all of decree is not preserved), 240 (-352), 344 (-448), \textit{Hesp. IX} 20 (-244).

Drerup attempted to explain these anomalies, but with little success.

There are two major problems with Drerup's presentation:
1) the method by which he concludes that Schöne's hypothesis is corroborated is weak at best.

2) his explanation of the numerous anomalies, on which the whole scheme rests, is unconvincing.

In general, Drerup's reasoning is disappointingly circular.

Drerup examines only six inscriptions (pp. 232-233) to conclude that Schöne is corroborated and that the hypothesized price scale holds, if an excess of a few letters in some of the inscriptions is allowed (never defining what he means by a "few") and if the anomalous inscriptions can be explained. The methodological drawbacks are obvious: Drerup chose six inscriptions which fit the price scale (without justifying the choice), "proved" with them that the price scale works, and then used the six as a basis for further discussion. Unfortunately, the majority of the other inscriptions are anomalous, and do not fit the scale. Drerup is especially wanting in his explanation of the anomalies.

As mentioned above, Drerup reconciled many of the anomalous inscriptions by maintaining that the price refers only to the decree in which it occurs, or to a section of the stele that has the proper number of letters to suit Schöne's hypothesis. He considered three different classes of inscriptions: stelai containing decrees with sizeable
amendments, stelai with more than one decree inscribed on them, and stelai with decrees having a list or catalog appended. For those stelai containing a decree with an amendment or amendments, Drerup maintained that the price referred either to the body of the decree alone or to the amendment alone, choosing whichever one appeared to suit the hypothesized scheme. He is particularly arbitrary concerning those stelai with decrees having a list or catalog appended: in one case (IG, II² 43) he would have the price refer to all the inscribing on the stele, in others, he maintains that the price can only refer to the section which has the proper number of letters, be it the decree alone, or the catalog alone. For those stelai with more than one decree on them, he maintained that the price must refer only to the decree in which it occurred. In each of the above cases, he supposes that a private party paid for the extra inscribing.

There are serious objections to all these suggestions. In each of the three classes, it appears in fact more likely that the price refers to the inscribing of all the material on the stele.

For decrees with amendments, Drerup suggests that there are several examples where both the body of the decree and the amendment originally included separate price allotments but the complete inscription has not survived. The
problem with this suggestion is that there is no certainly attested example of an inscription from the period under consideration which has a separate price allotment in both the body of the decree and the amendment. None of the examples Drerup cites have separate price allotments actually preserved; in one case (2109), he suggests (p. 234) that the allotment for the decree could have occurred in the lacuna of the inscription (see Part Two for a detailed discussion). This is not a reliable methodology; it is wishful thinking. The parallel he cites to 2109, viz., 2373, is not a parallel at all. 2373 contains one decree with a complete publication formula and allotment for inscribing (ll. 9-15), and another partially preserved decree which includes part of the publication formula only. It cannot be known, therefore, if there was in fact a second price allotment. Furthermore, what Drerup calls an amendment is in fact a second decree, with its own prescript. Finally, this second decree was inscribed at least ten years later than the first.11 For these reasons then, 2373 is not usable as a parallel to 2109.12

There are numerous examples of decrees with the price specified in the body of the decree and an amendment added,13 but in these cases the amendment never has a separate allotment for inscribing. In every case, it is clear that the allotment was made in the original draft of
the decree, i.e., in the probouleuma. In short, the addition of an amendment did not change the allotted price. Moreover, the amendment would be inscribed under the same allotment as the body of the decree.¹⁴

On the other hand, an amendment is often added for the very purpose of getting the decree inscribed, as in 2206 and 2232. 2206 awards proxeny to a certain Theogenes. The main body of the decree is clearly probouleumatic, but does not contain an authorization to publish or an allotment for the inscribing of the decree. These are contained in the amendment, which must have been proposed in the assembly:

"Ιεροκλείδης Τ[ιμοστράτου Ἀλωπεκ]—
[ἡ]θεν εἰπεν· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇβι
βουλῆι, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸν ψήφιον—
μα τὸν γράμματ[έα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ]—
οκόλει καὶ στῆσαι δέκα ἡμέρας, εἰς]
dὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦν]—
τὸν [τὰ]μῆν τοῦ [δήμου ΔΔ δραχμας]—
κ τῶν κατὰ ψηφιο[ματα ἀναλισχομέν]—
ὡν τῇ βι δήμωι.
232, honoring the people of Tenedos and Aratus, a citizen of the same city, is similar; the amendment is added expressly for the purpose of publishing the decree and authorizing payment for the inscribing:

Φ[ιλοφήμων Αθόσταλ] -
emption[ς είπεν· τα μὲν ἄλλα] -
α καθάπερ τῇ [βουλῇ, ἀναγράφα]-
[ε]ς τόδε τὸ ψ[φισμα εν στήλῃ λ] -
[ε]ς τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήθα[ς εν δικαιοδοξίᾳ, εἰς]
δὲ τὴν ἀν[αγράφη[ν τῆς στήλης δο] -
ναι τὸν ρα[λλαν τοῦ δήμου ....]
δραχμὰς ἐκ[τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα]
ἀναλίπον[τοὺς δήμων].

In both of these examples there is neither an authorization to publish nor an allotment for inscribing in the body of the decree.

Those inscriptions which have a decree and a list, catalog, inventory, or the like appended,15 are all similar in that something (the list, inventory, etc.) is ordered to be inscribed, and the decree enjoining the inscribing is included on the stele. It seems natural that the decree
ordering the inscribing should be included on the stele, and that the allotment of money is for the inscribing of the whole stele, and not just for the particular list, contract, oath, inventory, or whatever. Drerup, however, again maintained that the allotment could only refer to the section which had the proper number of letters. He is particularly arbitrary with respect to \(^2\)43 and \(^2\)237 (pp. 236-238). In the case of \(^2\)43, he maintained that the list of names of those states joining the Second Athenian Confederacy was included in the allotment, because the decree and the list together have the proper number of letters. For \(^2\)237, however, he maintains that the list of names was not included in the allotment, since the combined total of letters (1576 + \(X\)) is too much for the 30 dr allotted. This is inconsistent, especially since the publication formula of \(^2\)237 specifically calls for the names to be inscribed:

\[
\text{[ἀναγράφεισαι] \(δ\) ἐ τὸ τοῦ ψηφίσμα ἐν στ-}
\]
\[
[κλῆσις] λιθ[ήνη] \(τοῦ νυμματέτεικ] \(τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στῆσαι}
\]
\[
[ἐν αὐτῷ κροσὸςεἰς. Ἀναγράφεισαι \(δ\) \(καὶ \(τὰ δύναμα τῶν Ἀκαρ-}
\]
\[
[νάν] ἐἰς τὴν αὐτῆσιν στῆσαι τὰς κόλεις—}
\]
\[
[τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας ἐν εἰς ἐκείνης τῶν κρατήσεων εἰς \(δ\) \(τὴν ἀνα-}
\]
\[
[γραφήν καὶ τῆς στῆψις δούναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δῆμου τῆς}
\]
\[
[γραμματείας τῆς βουλῆς τῷ ἑσδεούσᾳ \(δ\) \(ραχύμας ἐκ τῶν πατ-
\]
\[
[a προσφυματα ἀναλισκομένων] \(τῇ δήμῳ \[ν]\.]
\]
It is possible that Athenian practice had changed in the forty year span which separates this decree from 243, but Drerup does not mention this as a possibility. Perhaps, instead of saying that the Athenians at one time included the list of names in the reckoning of the price, and at another did not, it is preferable to say that the price for inscribing changed.

Of those inscriptions usable as evidence concerning the price scale, four contain more than one decree: 2107, 2330, 2360, and 2448. All are crucial in the discussion; I refer the reader to Part Two for a detailed treatment of each. Drerup again maintains that the price refers only to the decree in which it occurs and that all are private copies of public decrees, or at least that a great part of the inscribing was privately subsidized. Although this is possible, I wish to emphasize that it is not necessarily the case. The question of private copies of public decrees will be discussed below; the question under consideration here is whether the price refers to a part of the inscription or the whole.

Despite Drerup's attempt in each case\(^\text{16}\) to minimize the fact, each inscription specifies in the publication formula of the main decree that the main decree is to be inscribed along with the previous decrees (see Part Two
for the texts and detailed discussion of each). The overall pattern is clear: in each case, the latest decree in date contains the publication formula with a price for inscribing: this price is meant to cover the cost of all the inscribing on the stele. Usually, the most recent decree is inscribed first, with the earlier decree or decrees below it,\(^{17}\) although 2448 is a notable exception. In this inscription, the decree earlier in time comes first, followed by the later, which specifically ordains the reinscribing of the earlier decree. The earlier decree was then recopied verbatim, including the publication formula and cost allotment.\(^{18}\)

To conclude this discussion of Drerup's first method of accounting for anomalous inscriptions: in none of the above cases does Drerup have good evidence or a strong argument. In many cases, he tries to force the evidence to fit his hypothesis. In several cases, he is compelled to invent some rather dubious speculations about how mistakes could have been made, either in the archives or by the mason.\(^{19}\) In short, the most logical and economical assumption, contrary to Drerup's theory, is that the price is meant for the inscribing of everything on a given stele.
Drerup's second method of dealing with the entire problem is to argue that the anomalous inscriptions are not public documents, but rather private copies of public decrees, and that any discrepancy between the allotted price and the number of letters was made up by the person who wanted the decree inscribed. Thus, if the honorand or his relatives or descendants wanted a particularly fine stele erected, they had the mason add a relief, or put other honorary decrees pertaining to the honorand on the same stele at their own cost. This is indeed possible, and in several cases it appears to be a likely explanation (see below). But if it is the case with all the anomalous inscriptions, as Drerup argues, we must conclude that almost two-thirds of the public documents that we possess are in fact privately funded copies. If this is so, a price scale established by the state is meaningless.

The major problem is distinguishing a public decree or a document inscribed at public expense from a privately financed inscription or a "private copy of a public decree." Clear criteria have never really been established, although one frequently comes across statements that a given inscription was doubtless inscribed privately. Drerup employed two basic criteria for differentiating a public decree from a private copy, neither of which, as we shall
see, is particularly reliable. His first criterion was that a relief on a stele indicated that the inscription was funded at least in part by a private party, and that the state did not pay for the relief.\textsuperscript{20}

an bildnerischen Schmuck der Inschriftstelen auf Staatskosten dürfen wir schon gar nicht denken; in keinem einzigen Fall lässt sich eine beglaubigte officielle Aufschrift mit Reliefschmuck nachweisen, bei der die Kosten des Bildwerkes in die Preisangabe einbezogen wären, so dass wir darin überall ein Indizium der privaten Herstellung oder der Beisteuer zu den Kosten von seiten der Interessenten erblicken dürfen.

His second criterion was the language and form of the decree itself; in this, he followed Hartel.\textsuperscript{21} Hartel posited that a decree was privately inscribed if 1) a part of the prescription, or the sanction formula ( ἔδεσεν τῆς θουλῆς καὶ τῆς ὑγιείας ) is omitted, or 2) if the parts of a decree do not flow smoothly, or 3) if there are abbreviations. Hartel, however, probably had a too strict view of how prescripts ought to have been inscribed. Current attitudes are well summarized in the conclusion to A. S. Henry's The Prescriptions of Athenian Decrees. It is worth quoting at length:\textsuperscript{22}

In the first place it should by now have become apparent that the Athenian prescript never actually achieved a fixed and final pattern. Certainly it gradually developed a very stereotyped form which, from the end of the fourth century, was more or less
adhered to by the recording secretaries. But even to the very last years of our extant evidence variation and experimentation continued.

This is not to suggest that there was never anything approaching a paradigm: that there undoubtedly was, embracing the canonical items which the chancery style had embodied in the fifth and fourth centuries. Nevertheless it is true to state that, at any given period the secretary qua drafter was never bound to include all the items then at this disposal. He could—and did—make his own choice, whether to employ the 'full' stock prescript, or to reduce it by omitting one or more items: and, as far as we can tell, this was his privilege.

This leads us to a second point, viz., that the Athenian secretaries clearly had much greater discretion in deciding how to frame the minutes of the meetings they attended than do their modern counterparts. No rigid standards or narrow guidelines of secretarial practice seem to have been imposed, so that, to some extent, the secretary was a free agent in deciding how to lay out his text in preparation for publication on stone. And, as we have seen, this freedom extended not only to a choice among the canonical items but to a decision—admittedly within narrower limits—on the order and form in which the items were to be expressed.

Secretaries were also not infrequently guilty of carelessness, for example, in describing the nature of the meeting or of the enacting body, a carelessness which would hardly be tolerated in the publication of modern acts of parliament. Moreover, their collaborators in publication, the masons, were also not above making a few blunders in the finished article on stone, blunders which they may have deliberately left uncorrected for purely aesthetic reasons. But neither party should be too severely censured: we must not apply modern standards to ancient practice, nor must we forget that the recorders of the ancient world had to make do with a somewhat more primitive technology than that available today.

And not only that. This lack of precision which so offends our senses may in fact have been quite acceptable in the Athenian state. This supposition is perhaps borne out by examples of quotation in
literary sources of documents which we also possess on stone: it is quite clear that verbatim accuracy was neither demanded nor expected. The ancient attitude to the recording of documents, whether on stone or some less durable material, was very different from ours: provided the essential information was conveyed, complete fidelity of reproduction just did not enter into it. This is surely totally predictable in a society which did not possess the printing press: every copy of any text was to some degree unique.

In short, we cannot posit a canonical form into which decrees were put at any one time, especially during the fourth century. A form of sorts evolved, and had taken shape in the fourth century but there were always variations from that form, and omissions were often made, even of what might seem to us indispensable parts of a decree. That a part of the prescript, or even an hypothesized part of the decree, was omitted, then, is not a reliable indicator that the decree was privately inscribed.23

The question of reliefs is a very difficult one--perhaps no sure conclusions can be made. The following inscriptions with a price preserved for inscribing have reliefs on them:24 231, 2116, 2133, 2226,2448, and SEG XII 87. For full bibliography and detailed discussion of the historical background, possible motive for the passage of each decree, and Drerup's treatment of each particular
inscription, I refer the reader to Part Two.

Drerup maintained (p. 230) that the reliefs must have been funded privately, as there is no instance where the state (or the state treasurers) is specifically mentioned as paying for the relief. As has been mentioned above, this is not necessarily so. On the one hand, good reasons can be adduced to justify payment by the state for reliefs, especially on treaties (such as ²116), important laws such as the law against tyranny (SEG XII 87), and honorary decrees for important foreigners.²⁵ On the other, in the case of such stelai as ²212 (in honor of the Bosporan kings), ²226 (in honor of Arybbas), and ²448 (in honor of Euphron of Sicyon), it seems inconceivable that 30 or 50 dr were sufficient to pay for stelai with reliefs, especially when the same sums were being allotted for contemporary stelai without reliefs (e.g., ²237 and ²463).

The time and cost involved in the sculpting of the reliefs make it inconceivable that 30 or 50 dr were sufficient to pay for the reliefs on ²212, ²226, and ²448. These are all carved in high relief, while ²31, ²116, ²133, and SEG XII 87 are carved in low relief. Low reliefs may not have taken a great deal of time to carve.²⁶ Depending on how the publication formula of each decree is interpreted (SEG XII 87 is problematical—see Part Two) between five and
thirty days' wages were allotted for the inscribing of any
given stele (if we define a day's wages as somewhere between
one and two dr per day), since 10 (if we interpret liter-
ally the publication formula of SEG XII 87), 20 (2133 and
possibly SEG XII 87), or 30 (231, 2116) dr are allotted for
the inscribing of these stelai. If we accept the restora-
tion of δέκα ἡμερῶν in 2133 (1.17), and interpret it to
mean that the stele is to be completed within ten days of
the passage in the Assembly, 20 dr are not an unreasonable
wage27 for what is apparently considered ten days' work,
including the carving of the relief.28

On the other hand, the high reliefs, and the stelai
on which they appear, must have taken much longer to carve.
The only indication we have of the cost of comparable work
is from the Erechtheum accounts, where 60 dr were paid for
each figure in the frieze at half life-size.29 Unfortunately, this is a sum for fifth century work, so it is
difficult to use except for a rough comparison. I sus-
pect, however, that the work involved in carving a high
relief of the type found on the inscriptions would be
approximately the same as that in carving a frieze figure, or
perhaps a bit less.30 For the sculpture alone on those
inscriptions with high reliefs, then, we can perhaps
suppose that at least as much again was paid, over and above the
amount normally allotted by the state for inscribing.
We are left with two possibilities: that the state paid for the relief, but the fact is not specified, or that a private party paid for it. If we decide that the state paid for the relief, but the fact was not specified, we arrive at a conclusion similar to the one made below concerning the cost of marble, transport, and working of the stele into shape, namely that financing the relief is passed over in silence. If, on the other hand, we decide that a private party paid for it, this does not necessarily mean that the state did not pay for the inscribing on the stele; therefore, to conclude that the reliefs were privately financed does not help to explain anomalies in the price scale.

To sum up this discussion of the reliefs: of the eight inscriptions considered, three (2212, 2226, 2448) are quite likely to have been privately financed, at least in part (and probably the larger part). The rest are at least as likely to have been paid for by the state as by private financing. If, then, the sculpture cannot be considered a reliable indicator that an inscription was privately financed, Drerup's argument is further weakened.

We have seen that each of Drerup's explanations is subject to varying degrees of doubt, that none of them
is convincing, and that alternative explanations can be put forward in each case. To recapitulate: the price does not necessarily refer only to the section in which it occurs: in most cases in fact it seems more economical to assume that it refers to the inscribing of the entire stele. Drerup's criteria for identifying private copies of public decrees are unreliable: neither alleged deficiencies in the language or form of the decrees, nor the presence of a relief on a stele are infallible indicators of their private nature. A given inscription may or may not be private, but it will not do to dismiss as private copies all those inscriptions with reliefs or supposed deficiencies of form or irregularities of language. It is, I think, a better method to include the anomalous inscriptions in our consideration of public decrees and to conclude that the price was not determined solely by the number of letters.

The whole question, and all the evidence, needs to be reconsidered.
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8. The inscriptions which are of use as evidence are: 2107, 109, 206, 232, 235, 276.
9. IG II² 43, 111, 120, 237, 463.
10. IG II² 107, 330, 360, 448.
11. See Part Two for discussion.
12. Drerup also adduces 2235 as evidence--but only the amendment is preserved; see Part Two for text and discussion.
13. Decrees with price specified in the body of the decree and amendment added: 2107, 141, 176? (the end is not preserved), 189? (ditto), 226, 276 (end not preserved). Of these, the following are probouleumatic according to Rhodes: 2107, 176, 226.
14. The first decree of 2107 provides an excellent example of this. See Part Two for text and discussion.
15. IG II² 43, 111, 120, 237, 463.
16. Drerup discusses the pertinent inscriptions on the following pages:

45
17. **IG II² 107, 330, 360.**

18. See discussion in Part Two. This does not imply, I think, that another allotment was made for the inscribing of the first decree—the sum was simply copied over. The allotment in force is the one in the most recent decree.

19. See particularly his treatment of ²212 (pp. 245-6), 360 (pp. 243-4), and 448 (p. 240). A mistake by the mason is always a possibility for any given inscription if one considers how the drachma sums were inscribed—it would be easy enough to leave out or add a delta, as Hartel (II, 157) points out. See above, p.13. Such mistakes, however, do not suffice as an explanation of all the anomalies; they are not frequent enough to explain why so many of the inscriptions that can be used for evidence do not fit the price scale.


23. This therefore vitiates Drerup's arguments concerning IG II² 240, 505, and 647: see Part Two for each. Nor are abbreviations a good indicator of the private nature of a given document—the Prytaneis inscriptions (although of later date) are full of them, and surely they are public documents (a point I owe to S.V. Tracy).

24. Decree-reliefs are treated by R. Binneboessel, *Studien zu die attischen Urkundenreliefs des 5 und 4 Jahrhunderts* (Diss. Leipzig, 1932). This, however, is now out of date. I have not had the opportunity to examine a recent dissertation by C. Lawton (Princeton, 1980).

25. Again, see Part Two for the particulars of each inscription.
26. Some of them may not have been carved to order, but may have been on hand in the mason's workshop (the motif of the horse and rider, as on IG II² 116 and 133, seems particularly common, and could be used for almost anyone who was honored, I should think). This would be a situation analogous to that with grave stelai: some of them apparently were not made to order, as Clairmont has pointed out in *Gravestone and Epigram* (Mainz on Rhine, 1970), 62-64.

27. See below, pp. 52 ff., for a discussion of wages.

28. Binneboessel, 20-21, uses IG II² 133 to tie the carving of the relief closely to the inscribing of the decree, and thus claims to have a firm date for the relief.


30. Unfortunately, I have had no experience in working with marble, so this remains an estimate based on speculation.

31. As is most likely the case with IG II² 226 and 448.

32. I owe thanks to J. Binder for her help with this whole problem, and for her explanations concerning the reliefs. She considers that IG II² 31 and 133 were also privately financed, i.e. that all the honorary decrees were privately financed, at least in part; that the state awarded the honor and authorized a relief on the stele (as it would authorize honorary statues, portrait herms, and grave stelai with reliefs in the public cemetery) but that the honorand or his relatives would be all too glad to pay for the honor.
III. THE EVIDENCE RECONSIDERED

We can at this point restate those questions earlier deferred, namely: "What does the sum in the formula represent?" An upper limit for bids by competing masons? The actual payment to the mason? Or the amount the state was willing to contribute for inscribing, which did not necessarily cover all expenses? What was the money meant to pay for? Just the inscribing, or the whole process of quarrying, transport of the stone to Athens, and the making, inscribing, and setting up of the stele? The first question, the most important one perhaps, is the most difficult to answer. Since its answer depends somewhat on the answers to the other questions, I shall reserve my consideration of it until the end of the study.

The first problem to be considered is: What was the money paid for? In the fourth century, three basic phrases specify what the money is for, with the usual minor variations in wording and word order, which do not, however, change the basic categories. The money is paid either "for the inscribing of the stele" (εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης), or more simply, "for the inscribing" (εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν), or "for the stele" (εἰς τὴν στήλην). The phrase εἰς τὴν κοσμησιν τῆς στήλης does not appear until ca. 300 B.C. in 2706 [restored]. Throughout the third and second centuries,
money is sometimes allotted specifically for the inscribing (ἀναγραφήν), the making (πολήσιν) or the preparation (κατασκευή), and the setting up (ἀνάθεσιν) of the stele, but a standardized formula including all these parts of the process never emerges. 2 The most common formula, however, is still simply εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στηλῆς.

Given the lack of rigid standardization in the formulae of Athenian public decrees, it would therefore be unwise to insist that this phrase, εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφήν τῆς στηλῆς, most common in the fourth century, covers only the inscribing of the stele. The making of the stele is probably assumed and thus passed over in silence. 3 This conclusion is supported by evidence from outside Attica concerning the cost of inscribing, and by evidence concerning wages as compared with possible rates of inscribing and rates of work.

The evidence from outside Attica is rather sketchy, and must be used with caution. 4 At Epidaurus at various times throughout the fourth century, rates for inscribing varied from 3 to 5 1/2 obols per hundred letters, as Burford has shown. 4 At Lebadeia in the second century, 1 Boiotian Stater and 3 obols were paid for 100 letters (IG VII 3073, 10-12). 5
At Delos in 279 (IG XI 2, 161 A) and 274 (IG XI, 199C) which is late to be of direct value as evidence, but gives us some comparison, accounts were inscribed at a rate of one dr per 300 letters; one of these accounts also provides us with the most detailed information on the whole process by which the stele was obtained and inscribed, and how much was paid for each step: 6

στήλη παρὰ Φιλωνίδου ΑΔΥΤΙ παραγαγόθη τὴν στήλην ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιείου καὶ εἰς τὸ λεπτὸν ἀναχωρίσαιν ἔγραψαντε τὴν στήλην Δεινομένῳ τῆς δραχμῆς γράμματα τρισιμία, τὰ πάντα γράμματα τρισιμία, μισθὸς δραχμῆς ἤ μελιβός ἔχει ὑπὸ τοῦς στήλας τὴν στήλην. 25 dr were paid for the stele, 5 dr for lead, 1 dr for wood, one and a half dr for transport, and two and a half dr for the setting up of the stele. 7

The stele is quite large: 1.61 m. high, 0.77 m. wide, and 0.103 m. thick. It is inscribed on both sides with a long text of various accounts of the priests of the sanctuary of Apollo. The stele itself was obtained from a certain Philonidas—he must have quarried the marble (or had someone quarry it for him), and worked it into form. This is by far the most laborious (see below) and expensive part of the process, apart from the inscribing of the letters. It is noteworthy that a different man, Deinomenes, inscribed the letters, at what appears
to be the set rate for Delos, viz., 1 dr per 300 letters. Perhaps 300 letters were considered to be a day's work, and 1 dr a reasonable wage for it. The text of this inscription is very long—30,000 letters, according to the text—and must have taken a considerable time to inscribe.

Presumably the lead was used for seating the stele in its base; this is the third most expensive item. Transport cost is minimal, compared to the cost of inscribing and the cost of the stele. As Delos is not a large island, the distance from the Asclepion to the sanctuary could not be too far. At some point in the process, wood was used. Could this be for heating up the lead? Or for transporting the stele, and putting it in place? The text does not specify for what it was used.

Comparing this with Athenian prices, we find that the Athenian prices average a great deal more, if only the inscribing is meant. For example, inscriptions averaging between 500 and 1000 letters were allotted 20 dr for the inscribing, which would mean a rate of 1 dr per 25 letters (for a 500 letter inscription) or 1 dr per 50 letters (for a 1000 letter inscription). This is three to ten times the rate paid elsewhere, as Drerup pointed out. It appears highly unlikely therefore that the price quoted on Athenian stelai was only for the inscribing; it must refer to the entire cost from start to finish.
Our evidence concerning wages is meager,¹⁰ and must be used with caution. We know that a dr per day was paid to the workmen on the Erechtheum at the end of the fifth century. By the end of the fourth century, this had risen to one and a half and two and a half dr per day; this we know from the Eleusis accounts.¹¹

If we consider various rates of inscribing, and what wage this would imply, we arrive at a very high rate of pay, if we hypothesize (and I emphasize hypothesize) what would seem to be a reasonable rate of work. Let us take as an example a 20 dr inscription with 1000 letters, which is the average length of a 20 dr inscription. If the mason inscribes 100 letters in a day, for example, he will spend ten days on the inscribing and, if the payment is for inscribing alone, will receive two dr per day. This is perhaps a reasonable rate of pay for skilled labor in the fourth century, and accords with the figures for wages that we have, but is it a reasonable rate of work? I think not, especially considering the small, lightly cut lettering of most fourth century decrees and considering also the nature of Pentelic marble, on which the majority of decrees under consideration were inscribed: it takes a chisel mark fairly easily and is quite easy to scratch.¹² The layout of the stoichedon pattern would take some care, but could not have accounted for a large percentage of the mason's
total labor—perhaps a few hours would suffice. It is likely, I think, that the mason did not in most cases write out the text on the stone in paint or graphite before inscribing, but worked straight from the text provided to him by the secretary. Furthermore, I believe that he inscribed with the whole edge of his chisel perpendicular to the surface of the marble (i.e., was not "furrow-cutting" but "stem-cutting") which would allow him to produce letters fairly rapidly. One hundred letters a day then is not a rapid pace. If we were to assume an eight-hour day (which may or may not be a rash assumption) the mason would be inscribing between twelve and thirteen letters in an hour, or approximately a letter every five minutes. Three or four taps of the chisel should not take this long.

If the mason inscribed two hundred letters per day, which I believe is a more reasonable and likely rate, he would complete the inscribing in five days and will have been paid four dr per day for his work, a high salary indeed. If the mason inscribed 400 letters in a day, a bit fast, but perhaps possible (50 letters/hour in an eight hour day), the inscribing alone would take only two and a half days, at a rate of 8 dr per day, an unheard of rate of pay. It seems likely therefore that the sum
must refer to the whole process, including the cost of the
stele, layout of the text, and the inscribing itself. A
great deal of the mason's time and expense must have been
in the quarrying, transport, and fashioning of the marble
into a stele, if he did these things himself, which is
probably unlikely. This conclusion is certainly supported
by the figures from Delos cited above (p. 50 ).

Perhaps at this point it is useful to envision the
steps involved for the mason in procuring and preparing
the marble for the stele. A mason who did much inscribing
for the state would probably live in the city, to be close
to the source of his work. If he were involved in carving
grave stelai as well or, if his shop were, he would also
want to be close to the Kerameikos.16 To procure his
marble, then, he would either have to pay someone else to
bring the marble to the city (a likely possibility) or go
out and get it himself. The costs in either case would
probably be the same in time or money. Someone who
specialized in bringing marble into the city could probably
do it more cheaply than a single mason. If the mason were
to quarry it himself, he would need a cart and an ox (or
oxen), and probably helpers (apprentices or slaves), and
certainly time. In the fourth century, the marble would
probably come from Mt. Pentele, about 14 km. from the city.
It is not until the end of the century that Hymettan marble begins to be used (if it were taken from Hymettus, it would probably be cheaper because of the shorter distance involved, but it seems to have been harder to work with).\textsuperscript{17} It would take a mason at least a long morning to get out to Pentele from the center of the city, more probably the greater part of the day, and with an ox and cart it could conceivably take almost two days. Once at Pentele, the steps would be the same, whether the mason himself did the work, or paid for the services of someone else. I doubt that it would have been worth the mason's time to trek out to Pentele for a single stele; I assume he would have brought back at least a cartload, and would maintain a supply in his workshop.

Two steps of the whole must have accounted for most of the time and labor involved: the quarrying itself and the fashioning of the stone into a stele. The quarrying was a laborious process. The marble was dug manually out of the mountainside or off a quarry face with picks, wedges, and sledge-hammers.\textsuperscript{18} Some indication of the expense of quarrying is given by the Asklepiion accounts at Epidaurus, where quarrying costs between two and three times as much as transport or polishing the stone.\textsuperscript{19} This, however, is for limestone. Stanier estimates, after consulting with masons in England, that it would take five times as long to work with marble.\textsuperscript{20} This all concurs
with the figures from Delos cited above. I assume that the blocks could be separated from the quarry face at nearly the size used finally, to avoid wasted effort. Before transport the blocks would be worked to nearly their final form, to save weight. Only a shell would be left on the blocks to protect them during transport.

Pentelic marble weighs 2.69 tons per cubic meter.\textsuperscript{21} Calculating from their volume (see Table 2), and assuming that the figure given is in metric tons, i.e., 2,200 lbs. per ton, stelai range in weight from about 175 lbs. (e.g., \textsuperscript{2111}) up to about half a ton (\textsuperscript{2212}), with an average weight somewhere around 250 lbs. Assuming a cart load of about one ton\textsuperscript{22} with one ox drawing it,\textsuperscript{23} marble for eight to ten stelai could be loaded onto one cart. Using Stanier's figure of about 56 dr per ton for quarrying cost,\textsuperscript{24} we arrive at a cost of about 5.6 dr per stele for quarrying. This is perhaps a bit low, especially compared with the transport figures arrived at below, and compared with the Delos figure cited above, but well within reason, particularly if we double it to account for inflation between the fifth century and the fourth (Stanier was trying to find a cost for the Parthenon).

There are two approaches for estimating the cost of transporting a cartload of marble. We can attempt to estimate how many people and animals would be involved in
the process, and how much it would cost to maintain them
and assume this as a base price, on which a markup would
be added if the mason himself did not transport the marble,
or we can use the figures derived by Stanier from IG II²
1673.²⁵

If we try to estimate costs by the first method,
the analysis is difficult and necessarily speculative.
Where do we start? Before or after the marble has been
brought down the mountain? How many people do we assume
at each stage? The marble would be brought down the moun-
tainside either with an ox and cart, or, if a large load of
stelai was to be brought down the mountain, it would be
moved in the same fashion as any large load of marble, i.e.,
it would be put on a sledge with logs as rollers underneath
and lowered with ropes and bollards down the paved runway
still partly visible on Mt. Pentele.²⁶ At whatever point
the transfer was made to a cart with an ox, the marble
would be loaded onto the cart with block and tackle, or a
wooden ramp, or even just lifted by two or three men, if
blocks near their final size were being loaded. Let us
assume a load of a ton, consisting of ten blocks weighing
slightly more than 200 lbs. each. Such blocks would not
have taken too long to load; two or three men could con-
ceivably do so in a morning, perhaps even in an hour or
less. Even assuming a wage of 2 dr per day, which is
probably far too high, as this is not particularly skilled labor, this part of the operation would cost a few obols at most. The real expense in transport would come from the use of the cart, and the maintenance of ox and driver. Maintaining the driver would not cost too much—he could be fed on one or two obols a day,\textsuperscript{27} depending on what period we are discussing. Maintaining the ox could not cost a great deal—he would eat between 20 and 50 lbs of fodder, depending on his size and the quality of the fodder. He could be allowed to graze, at little or no cost to the owner.\textsuperscript{28} This gives us a total of under 5 dr per day for a load of 10 average sized stelai; under 10 dr assuming that the trip from Pentele to Athens took 2 days. This estimate tallies well with the figures mentioned by Glotz, Stanier, and Burford derived from the Eleusis account.\textsuperscript{29}

Stanier arrives at a figure of 22.5 dr per ton in 330 B.C.\textsuperscript{30} I suspect that this figure reflects the greater cost required for moving large blocks of marble, up to five tons. This required many yokes, and thus the price would be considerably more than for stelai.\textsuperscript{31} Payment for a yoke of oxen at Eleusis was 4 dr 1/2 obol per day according to Burford.\textsuperscript{32} If we assume a single ox, rather than a yoke, we can divide this by two.

In any case, we arrive at a figure somewhere between 10 and 22.5 dr for the transportation of a load of
marble from Pentele, at a cost of 1 to 2.25 dr for each stele. This accords well with the figure from Delos, where a dr and a half was paid for the transport of a single stele.  

The final step, before the layout and the inscribing, would be working the marble into a stele. Again, there are no explicit sums available, but perhaps Stanier's figures for the polishing of a stone in the Parthenon can be of some use. He derives an estimate of 16.35 dr per sq. meter for polishing the stone into final form. (Again, he has multiplied the figures we possess from Epidaurus by five to account for the difference in working limestone and marble). If we were to double this to account for inflation between 445 and 330 B.C., we arrive at a sum of 32.7 dr per sq. meter. Since the 20 and 30 dr stele of the fourth century average between .25 and .33 sq. meters (see Table 2), we can estimate the cost of making the stele at about ten dr. This is high, when compared with the cost of quarrying suggested. Perhaps it would be less (by as much as 1/2?), since the blocks are considerably smaller than the blocks used in temples, from which the figure is derived. Also the only part of a stele that is finished smoothly is the face on which the inscribing appears.
The total cost, then, using these figures would be (the numbers refer to dr/stele):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low estimate</th>
<th>high estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarrying</td>
<td>5.6 dr</td>
<td>11.2 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1.0 dr</td>
<td>2.25 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of stele</td>
<td>5.0 dr</td>
<td>10.0 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6 dr</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.45 dr</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see, therefore, that the cost of the stele would make up at least half the price allotted by the state, assuming that the allotment was meant to pay for all the costs, and not just the inscribing.

The size of the stele must have been an important factor in the mason's costs: a large stele must have cost more to transport, and would take more labor to work it into shape. It is not clear, however, if this is reflected in the sum allotted by the state. Table 2 lists those inscriptions, again grouped by price, which can provide data to test the hypothesis that the physical size of the stele (as opposed to the number of letters) determined the price. Inscriptions which are preserved on a complete stele have been listed, along with those whose original measurements could be restored, at least approximately. Thus, not all the inscriptions from Table 1 are included--
some simply are not well enough preserved to enable restoration of the original measurements with any degree of confidence. In most cases, the restorations are made by using the stoichedon pattern to estimate how much of the stele is missing. The measurements are somewhat simplified: mouldings and pediments were not taken into account, nor were margins figured in the case of restorations. The measurements represent the whole stele, not just the area covered by the decree. Finally, the areas and volumes of the inscriptions have been calculated from the measurements, and the results expressed in square meters \(m^2\) for area, and cubic meters \(m^3\) for volume, rounded to the nearest centimeter for area \((0.00 \ m^2)\), and to the nearest cubic millimeter for volume \((0.000 \ m^3)\).

If size or weight (as determined by volume) is the sole determinant of the price, we should expect either the area or the volume of a 30 dr inscription to be one half again as large as a 20 dr inscription. This, however, is not the case, either for size or volume, as the following figures show.

Two sets of averages for area and volume have been calculated for each group: one includes all the inscriptions for the particular group, the other excludes those
TABLE TWO: THE SIZE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 10 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H IX 15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXV 89</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXV 90</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIV 64</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 20 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>[.76]</td>
<td>[.37]</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XII 87</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2641</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4252</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4253</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average: .414</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area = height x width

volume = height x width x thickness
TABLE TWO: THE SIZE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscrip. No.</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 30 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>[.48]</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>[.78]</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>[.45]</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 4254</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.0225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2496 + 507</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H IX 20</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average:</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 40 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 50 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. 60 dr inscriptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inscriptions which are noticeably larger than the others in the group.

\[ A_a = \text{Average area for all 20 dr inscriptions} = .41 \text{ m}^2 \]
\[ A'_a = \text{Average area of 20 dr inscriptions excluding} \]
\[ \text{SEG XII 87, IG II}^2 107, 657 = .288 \text{ m}^2 \]
\[ B_a = \text{Average area for all 30 dr inscriptions} = .49 \text{ m}^2 \]
\[ B'_a = \text{Average area for 30 dr inscriptions excluding} \]
\[ \text{IG II}^2 212, 226 = .327 \text{ m}^2 \]

If there is to be a correspondence between price and area, \( B_a \) should equal \( 3/2 \) \( A_a \) and \( B'_a = 3/2 \) \( A'_a \) since 30 dr = 20 dr \( \times \) 3/2. But \( .49 \neq .41 + .205 = .615 \) and \( .327 \neq .288 + .144 = .432 \).

The same is true of the volume.
\[ A_v = \text{Average volume of all 20 dr inscriptions} = .049 \]
\[ A'_v = \text{Average volume of 20 dr inscriptions excluding} \]
\[ \text{same inscriptions as above} = .023 \]
\[ B_v = \text{Average volume of all 30 dr inscriptions} = .0675 \]
\[ B'_v = \text{Average volume of 30 dr inscriptions excluding} \]
\[ \text{same inscriptions as above} = .030 \ (0.0296) \]
\[ B_v = .0675 \neq A_v + 1/2 \ A_v = .049 + .0245 = .0735 \text{ and} \]
\[ B'_v = .030 \neq A'_v + 1/2 \ A'_v = .023 + .0115 = .0345. \]
This last equation may be close enough to be significant. I have performed similar computations with the other price ranges and have found no correspondences.

In the 20 and 30 dr price ranges, then, there seems to be no significant correlation between the size of the stele and the price. Five inscriptions are significantly larger than the other inscriptions in these two classes: SEG XII 87, IG II^2 107, 657, 212, and 226 (listed in order of increasing magnitude). It should be mentioned that with respect to volume, the 30 dr inscriptions are about a third again as heavy as the 20 dr inscriptions, but the price is one half again as much. There is a large overlap in the range of sizes for the remaining 20 and 30 dr inscriptions: the 20 dr inscriptions range between .24 and .37 m^2 in area, and .015 and .031 m^3 in volume, while the 30 dr inscriptions range between .25 and .43 m^2 in area and .020 and .048 m^3 in volume. Thus, 2116, for which 30 dr were allotted, has about the same volume and weight as 276 and 2133, for which 20 dr were allotted.

The next hypothesis to be tested is whether the quality of lettering had any effect on the price, that is, whether those inscriptions with relatively few letters and a higher price than would be expected under Schöne's hypothetical price scale have better quality lettering than
other decrees of the same price with more letters. It also remains to be tested whether the quality of lettering is the sole determinant of the price.

Immediately, however, we come up with a very difficult problem, viz., that of defining the quality of lettering. What constitutes good or bad lettering? How do we judge? And when we have judged, how can we know that the ancients would have agreed, or what they would have thought about it? Their standards may have been quite different from ours, especially with respect to what we might think of as horrible lettering; presumably all the examples we possess of state decrees were considered to be acceptable, else they could have been refused, and returned to the mason to be redone.35 We cannot really know.

Subjectivity is unavoidable. Table 3 attempts to set out the data needed to test the above hypotheses. The inscriptions have been grouped by price, and a judgment given as to the quality of lettering. Photographs have been provided where possible, or references have been made to published photographs as a control for subjectivity.

For purposes of analysis, the inscriptions have been judged to have good, average, or poor lettering, which are represented in Table 3 by a I for good lettering, a II for average lettering, and a III for poor lettering. Most of the lettering I have classified as average, lettering which is
outstanding either on the good side or the bad is rated a I or a III. Average lettering for the fourth century is considerably smaller than that of the fifth, i.e. between 5 and 8 mm in height. The stoichedon pattern is generally square, or close to it, with a checquer pattern determined by a unit which is generally twice the size of the letters. The letters are generally well-formed, with either one or two strokes of the chisel per hasta (an exaggerated example of the latter is \( \text{2226} \)), but not exceptionally well formed; that is, right angles are generally square, but there may be small variations, and letters such as \( \Lambda \), \( \Delta \) and \( \wedge \) are usually, but not always, symmetrical, depending on the idiosyncracies of the particular inscriber. The chisel strokes themselves are generally not too deep, again, in contrast to much of fifth century lettering. In general, the average lettering of the fourth century is not nearly as impressive as that of the fifth; the smaller, shallower letters can sometimes give the impression that speed in inscribing was more important than care, and the letters are simply not as carefully formed.\(^{36}\)

Examples of what I have classified as average lettering are: \( \text{2109, 2111, 2226, 2235, 2240--see plates; 2500} \) (photo in Eph. Arch. 1910 p. 401).

The inscriptions that I have classified as having good lettering (I) generally have larger lettering which
is more carefully formed (i.e., right angles are almost always square, symmetrical letters are truly symmetrical), and a more liberally spaced chequer pattern. Examples of what I have classified as good lettering are (see part II under each inscription for reference to photos): 243, 251, 276, 2105 + 523, SEG XII 87.

The inscriptions that I have classified as having poor lettering generally have carelessly formed letters (strokes do not meet; strokes are left out; angles are not square or symmetrical), which give the impression that they were carved in haste. Mistakes and erasures are more frequent. Such lettering can be difficult to read even when the surface of the stone is well preserved. Examples of what I have classified as poor lettering are: 2106, 2120, 2360, 2505.

I am unable to find any correlation between the price and the quality of the lettering. It is clear that the quality of lettering is not the sole determinant of the price: there is no observable gradation in the average quality of lettering among 20, 30, or 50 dr inscriptions, that is, 20 dr inscriptions do not, on the whole, have the worst lettering of all, 30 dr inscriptions are not inscribed noticeably better or worse (again, taken as a whole), and 50 dr inscriptions are not inscribed best of all. This conclusion agrees with that of Drerup.
### TABLE THREE: QUALITY OF LETTERING

I = Good     II = Average     III = Poor

#### A. 10 dr inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter height</th>
<th>Stoich. patt.</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.125 x 0.125</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H IX 15</td>
<td>285/4</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.014 x 0.014</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXV 89</td>
<td>284/3</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>not in Hesp.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXV 90</td>
<td>281/80</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XIV 64</td>
<td>271/0</td>
<td>0.005.6</td>
<td>non-stoich</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2808</td>
<td>239-29</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0113 x 0.0113</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21247</td>
<td>mid 3rd</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>non-stoich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. 20 dr inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter height</th>
<th>Stoich. patt.</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>387/6</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>.0182 x .0105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>378/7</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>.0178 x .0175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>.013 x .015</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>.015 x .0145</td>
<td>III, r^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>363/2</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>fr a. 0.0104 x 0.0105</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fr b. 0.0117 x 0.0105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>363/2</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008 x 0.0085</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>355/4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>not able to measure</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2235</td>
<td>340/39</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.015 x 0.02</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2238</td>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.0145 x 0.017</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XII 87</td>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01 x 0.01</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2276</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>336/5</td>
<td>0.006-7</td>
<td>0.014 x 0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2641</td>
<td>299/8</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0125 x 0.011</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657</td>
<td>287/6</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.0135 x 0.0135</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. See Part Two
## TABLE THREE: QUALITY OF LETTERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter height</th>
<th>Stoic. patt.</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>386/5</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0157 x 0.143</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105 + 523</td>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.018 x 0.018</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>361/0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0087 x 0.0087</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.012 x 0.012</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>347/6</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>c. 342</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.027 x 0.0275</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2237</td>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0105 x 0.0105</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016 x 0.016</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>332/1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.0152 x 0.0152</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>328/7</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.0113 x 0.0111</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>325/4</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.0091 x 0.0091</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2466</td>
<td>307/6</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0112 x 0.0115</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.0106 x 0.0106</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>c. 305/2</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0155 x 0.0157</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H IX 20</td>
<td>302/1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXIV 119</td>
<td>301/0-295/4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01 x 0.01</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2567</td>
<td>fin. s. IV</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>non-stoich</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2643</td>
<td>298/7</td>
<td>0.005-6</td>
<td>0.013 x 0.013</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. 40 dr inscriptions

| 2410            | c. 330 | 0.005         | 0.01 x 0.01   | II      |
| 2505            | 302/1  | 0.005         | 0.009 x 0.009 | III     |

### E. 50 dr inscriptions

| 2448            | 318/7  | 0.007         | not available | II      |
| 2463            | 307/6  | 0.007         | 0.0135 x 0.0135 | III     |

### F. 60 dr inscriptions

| 243             | 378/7  | 0.009         | 0.005 x 0.015  | II      |
Von alle dem findet sich in den Monumenten keine Spur. Wir kennen prächtig ausgeführte Stücke bei den 50drachmigen Inschriften so gut wie bei den 20drachmigen; und umgekehrt ist nachlässige Arbeit bei den 20drachmigen Stelen verhältnismäßzig nicht häufiger als bei den höher bewerteten.

As examples, I suggest the following:

well inscribed 20 dr inscriptions: SEG XII 87, IG II² 51, 76, 238
poorly inscribed 50 dr inscriptions: ²463
poorly inscribed 20 dr inscriptions: ²106
well inscribed 50 dr inscription: There really are none—448 has average lettering.

Nor can the quality of lettering be used to explain inscriptions that are anomalous in Schöne's hypothesized price scale: those inscriptions with too few letters are not inscribed noticeably better than other inscriptions of the same price; nor are those inscriptions with too many letters inscribed noticeably worse. Of the 20 dr inscriptions to which I had access, the following fit the price scale without juggling; the judgment on their lettering is included in parentheses, using the same convention as in Table 3: IG II²51 (I), 76 (I), 106 (II), 641 (II'). Those inscriptions which fit with juggling all have average lettering: IG II²107 (see part II), 109, 111,
235. Only one 20 dr inscription, 2657, has too many letters; unfortunately, I did not have access to it. I can see no pattern. Perhaps in general the 20 dr inscriptions appear to be better inscribed, a judgment which does not help to explain anomalies in the price scale, is just the opposite of what might be expected and probably stems from the fact that more of the 20 dr inscriptions come from earlier in the fourth century, when inscribing was somewhat better than later (see below).

Of the 30 dr inscriptions, three fit the scale without any kind of juggling: IG II² 354, 500, and IG VII 4254. I did not have access to IG VII 4254; IG II² 354 is quite well inscribed (I), and ²500 has average lettering (II). The following inscriptions have too few letters for the price scale: IG II²31 (I), 240 (II), 344 (II), Hesp. IX #20 (III). The following have too many letters: IG II²116 (II), 120 (III), 212 (II), 360 (III). The quality of the latter does seem to be a bit worse on the average, but there are really not enough inscriptions usable as evidence to provide a solid statistical base for comparison.

The only pattern observable in general is that the quality of inscribing begins to deteriorate after 318, and deteriorates rather rapidly after the restoration of
the democracy in 307/6. Dow has summarized the trend succinctly:

Athenian inscriptions reveal strict and sober canons of the craft down to the Lykourgan period of minute lettering (much of it for accounts), and on until the time (ca. 317 B.C.) when Demetrios of Phaleron ended the series of fine grave monuments, and with them, evidently, the traditional good work by stone masons in lettering. At any rate the bounteous publications on stone which began after he left Athens in 307 B.C. (as well as the few of 317-307 B.C.) show a decline in style: strokes tend to be thick at one end, pointed at the other, a sort of approach to cuneiform, but shallow (unlike good cuneiform work) and ugly.

This decline in the quality of lettering can probably be linked to political and economic conditions, as Austin has pointed out; these conditions, and their implications will be discussed in the final chapter.

To this point, most of my discussion of the data has ignored the chronological order of the inscriptions. It is necessary, and quite fruitful, to consider the inscriptions in their chronological order, to see if there are any significant patterns to be found.

The use of a given price may have gone in phases; time and economic factors may be more important than letter counts. There seem to be several dividing points, and several phases. Table 4 lists chronologically the inscriptions usable as evidence in the discussion of the price scale, arranged in columns according to their price.
Inscriptions from IG II² are listed without a superscript, while inscriptions from SEG and Hesperia are preceded by an S and H respectively. The numbers in parentheses are the number of letters in each inscription.

Prices first began to be specified in ca. 390.⁴² Before 368, however, there are comparatively few inscriptions with a price for inscribing (only five are well enough preserved to be used as evidence in a discussion of the price scale). After 368 (most notably after 362), there is a dramatic increase in the number of inscriptions, and all but one until 332/1, have a price of 20 or 30 drachmas. After 332/1 for about a generation, i.e., until 229/8, 20 dr inscriptions do not occur. After 298 20 and then 10 dr inscriptions (beginning about 285) became the norm. Thus, the following periods impose themselves:

ca. 390-368 Few inscriptions in general; fewer with prices for inscribing

368-332/1 Many inscriptions; all except one cost 20 or 30 dr

331-299 Many inscriptions; no 20 dr inscriptions; all inscriptions cost 30, 40, or 50 dr

318-307 Oligarchic rule; very few inscriptions

298-270 Many inscriptions; some 20 dr ones but after 268 10 dr becomes apparent norm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>10 dr</th>
<th>20 dr</th>
<th>30 dr</th>
<th>40 dr</th>
<th>50-60 dr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b=before)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 387/6</td>
<td>51(374)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>31(780+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 378/7</td>
<td>76(440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43(2825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368/7</td>
<td>106(723)</td>
<td>105+523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367/2</td>
<td>107(2155+)</td>
<td>(1419)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361/0</td>
<td></td>
<td>109(2616)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>111(3480)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353/2</td>
<td>133(776)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347/6</td>
<td>140(980)</td>
<td>120(2623)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 342</td>
<td></td>
<td>212(2202)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>226(924+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338/7</td>
<td>235(600+)</td>
<td>237(1576)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337/6</td>
<td>238(796+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322/1</td>
<td>IG VII 4252</td>
<td>344(552)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IG VII 4253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 330</td>
<td>410(1864+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4254(1356)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>354(1462)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>360(3325)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>466(1872)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>463(8018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>558(945)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>500(1196)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H IX 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(756)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299/8</td>
<td>641(750)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>643(638+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285/4</td>
<td>H IX 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(897)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284/3</td>
<td>S XXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 (1276)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>647(2942)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281/0</td>
<td>S XXV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 (1021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>672(3112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implications of the above chart are that the prices changed in the course of time. If there ever was a limit to the number of letters for any given price, it was also probably subject to change. The limits may also have varied within a given year, according to that year's budget, or have been different in different years. Thus, from 386 to 322, 20 or 30 dr were usually allotted for decrees\textsuperscript{43} --20 dr were allotted for the shorter decrees, 30 dr for the longer ones. After 332, however, 30 dr seems to have become the base price, at least until the turn of the century. 40 dr could be allotted for somewhat longer decrees, and 50 dr for the longest of all (after 318/7, for the most part). In the first quarter of the third century, 10 dr began to be allotted for shorter decrees, whereas this price was never paid in the fourth century (with one possible and dubious exception--\textsuperscript{2}140). By this time, however, the practice of specifying the price seems to have fallen out of use, or at least was not used consistently.

An examination of all inscriptions containing the end of a decree which belong to this period (including those too fragmentary to be of use as evidence for a price scale and therefore excluded from Table 4) bear these divisions out (see Table 5). Such an examination also gives us some idea of the ratio between those inscriptions which are clearly published and financed by the state, and those
which are likely to be privately inscribed. Those inscriptions containing the end of a decree can be divided into the following categories:

I) those with a directive to inscribe \( \lambda \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \) and a specific price

II) those with \( \lambda \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \) and a directive that state treasurers are to pay for the decree, but without a specific price

III) those with \( \lambda \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \) but no directive for payment

IV) those with the end of the decree preserved, but no publication or cost formula at all.

Included under category III are also those decrees which are to be paid for by the honorand (\( \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma \tau \omicron \upomicron \ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \nu \varsigma \)).

I interpret these categories as follows: The \( \lambda \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \varepsilon \alpha \) clause directs the secretary to see that the decree is inscribed; it implies that the state supervises the inscribing but may or may not finance it. Thus, I interpret decrees in categories I, II, III to be documents that have been officially published by the state, if not financed by it. I interpret decrees in category IV as documents which were presumably published privately, unless there is good reason to believe otherwise. Decrees which were to be financed by the state are those which have a clause directing that money be paid out by one
state paymaster or another, specifically for the inscribing of the stele (ἐγὼ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης). This includes all decrees in categories I and II. The decrees in category III I interpret to be published under the supervision of the state, but, for the most part, from private funds.

In Table 5, I have tried to include and classify all the pertinent inscriptions known to me from IG II² (whose numbers appear in the table without the superscript), SEG (marked by an S in the table), and Hesperia (marked by an H). The table is as complete as possible; if a fragment or two was missed, I do not believe the omission will change the overall picture. Those numbers in the table with brackets around them have the price restored. The horizontal lines in the table within each time period divide those inscriptions that can be dated with some degree of certainty from those which are only approximately datable, often only by letter forms.

Several important conclusions can be drawn from Table 5: the first concerning the ratio of inscriptions funded by state paymasters to those not, the others concerning dating criteria for small fragments with only the price allotment preserved.
# TABLE FIVE: PUBLICATION FORMULAE

I. ἀπαράτα + specific price
II. ἀπαράτα + vague price paid for by state treasurers
III. ἀπαράτα, but no direction for ῥαύφα to pay
IV. end of decree, but no publication or cost formula—not published by state?

386-368 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>10 dr</th>
<th>20 dr</th>
<th>30 dr</th>
<th>40 dr</th>
<th>50 dr</th>
<th>60 dr</th>
<th>Price allotted but not preserved</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[33]</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

lesser 51 [56] 79
surely 53 84
dated 76 S.XII. 230
81 [82]

approximated 148 [149] 52 48
dated by 151 [176] 54 77
letter forms [183] [198] 55
or language [189] 69
197 73
80

totals: 13 6 1 4 10 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 dr</th>
<th>20 dr</th>
<th>30 dr</th>
<th>40 dr</th>
<th>50 dr</th>
<th>60 dr</th>
<th>price allotted but not preserved</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>368-332</td>
<td>140?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>[105 + 523]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[117]</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[223]</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[333]</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[336]</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[132]</td>
<td>[220]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[347]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>[221]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[204]</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[206]</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[235]</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.87</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>[H.XIII.3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less securely dated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[184]</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[288]</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[292]</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[HVIII.6]</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>304?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>306?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.VII.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.VII.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 dr</th>
<th>20 dr</th>
<th>30 dr</th>
<th>40 dr</th>
<th>50 dr</th>
<th>60 dr</th>
<th>price allotted but not preserved</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331-302</td>
<td>H.X.19</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td>[351]</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td>[374]</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[391]</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[392]</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[394]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[397]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIV.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[456]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XVI.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td>[510]</td>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>[511]</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>securely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dated,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XXI.344]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XIII.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XXI.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XXI.344]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XIII.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XXI.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XII.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XXI.344]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S.XIII.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.XXI.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 dr</td>
<td>20 dr</td>
<td>30 dr</td>
<td>40 dr</td>
<td>50 dr</td>
<td>60 dr</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H.IX.10]</td>
<td>[H.IX.40]</td>
<td>[H.XXII.3]</td>
<td>H.XXXII.40</td>
<td>H.XXXIII.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>H.IX.15</td>
<td>S.XXIV.119</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>[676]</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>S.XXV.89</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>[H.IX.20]</td>
<td>[H.XI.53]</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>675?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third</td>
<td>S.XXV.90</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>H.XIII.7</td>
<td>[H.X.70]</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>century</td>
<td>S.XIV.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>660 b</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>663</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>672</td>
<td>[676]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>682</td>
<td>[674]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>686</td>
<td>[676]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>S.XXI.357</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>[H.XXI.17]</td>
<td>706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>securely</td>
<td>[H.V.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[725]</td>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[721]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.XXIII.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[H.XXX.7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.IX.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a significant change in the ratio of inscriptions funded by the state paymasters to those not paid for by them. From 386 to 368, 29 inscriptions are financed by the state paymasters, as opposed to 13 which have no directive for them to pay, or are expressly financed by a private party (τέλεσι τοῦ δεξιοῦ). Thus, 69% of the surviving texts are financed by the state. After 368/7, the state paymaster pays for most decrees, and a majority of these have a price specified in drachmas. From 368 to 302, 138 inscriptions (87%) are funded by the state paymasters as opposed to 21 inscriptions which have no cost formula, or are to be financed by a private party. The state continues to pay for inscribing after 302/1: 50 inscriptions (93%) are funded by various financial officials of the state (see above, Ch. I) whether the price is specified or not, while only four inscriptions from this period are not. After 295, however, and possibly as early as 302, prices are no longer consistently indicated, and the phrase τὸ γενομένον ἀνάλωμα (or an equivalent), becomes standard terminology (18 inscriptions with a specific price/24 without specific price).

As noted above, 20 dr inscriptions stop, for the most part, after 332/1. Only two inscriptions with a price of 20 dr that are firmly dated occur after this date (2641,
2657; see Part II) and they both occur after 302/1, when prices were not consistently specified. There are no securely dated small fragments with a price of 20 dr from after 332/1. I suggest therefore that a small fragment with a 20 dr price, if criteria other than letter forms are lacking, is likely to belong before 332/1. 45

40 and 50 dr inscriptions occur late in the century. If other criteria are lacking, a fragment with a price of 40 or 50 dr allotted for inscribing ought therefore to be dated late in the century, probably after 318/7. 46 An allotment of 10 dr indicates a date in the third century, between 285 and ca. 265 (2140 is the only exception—see discussion in Part 2).
Notes to Chapter Three: The Evidence Reconsidered

1. IG II-III² part iv, sermo publicus s.v. ἀναγραφή.

2. Ibid.

3. As may have been the case with the Poletai, as mentioned above in Chapter One, p. 8 and n. 7

4. The evidence is conveniently gathered in Drerup, "Nachtrag." The material from Epidaurus has been set out in GTBE, 196-7 and Table IX. I have not examined the Epidaurus inscriptions, and have therefore relied on Burford entirely. The inscriptions are reedited by Burford in BSA LVI.

5. Drerup, Nachtrag, 871.

6. Ibid.


8. Cf. the Asklepiion inscription from Epidaurus (IG IV² 1, 102), where 1 dr per 200 letters was paid according to Drerup's calculations (Nachtrag, 872).


11. IG II² 1672, cited in Jones, Athenian Democracy, 143-144 n. 86.

Mason, Hesp. Suppl. XV, xi (hereafter cited as Lettering).

13. See Tracy, Lettering, pp. 86-88 for a discussion of these terms and further reff.

14. If we accept 1 dr as a reasonable hypothesized day's wages, it would seem that between 200-300 letters were expected of masons at Epidaurus per day; more, if we hypothesize 1½ dr as the daily wage. See Drerup, Nachtrag, 872, and Burford, GTBE, 196-7.

15. Tracy suggested a rate of 422 letters per day as a possibility in Lettering, 119 n. 70. He now thinks this to be a bit high.

16. Cf. the "Street of the Marble Workers" under the Acropolis, near the Agora, excavated by R. Young and reported in "An Industrial District of Ancient Athens," Hesp. XX (1951), 135-288.

17. There is an extensive bibliography on Attic marble: see the Papers of the British School in Rome XXXIX (1971), 88-89. R.E. Wycherley, "Pentelethen," BSA LXIII (1973), 349-53, discusses the most important work, particularly on the problem of terminology with the labels "Pentelic" and "Hymettan." Fritchett in particular is dissatisfied with the terminology. A.G. Woodhead, in a personal communication, suggests that "the names can be used as a convention, as long as we know what colour of marble we are talking about." A work that is dated, but still useful, is Lepsius' Griechische Marmorstudien, Abh. d. Akademie der Wissen. zu Berlin (1890).


20. Ibid. 71.

22. See Burford, GTBE, 187.

23. Possibly a yoke; for the draught capabilities of oxen, see Burford, "Heavy Transport," 4 and 9.

24. Stanier, 71. This figure is two steps removed from the original evidence (the Asklepieion accounts at Epidaurus: IG IV² 1, 102): first, inflation has to be considered (but it is probably cancelled out by the difference in the Attic and Aiginetan dr); and, the Asklepieion figures have been multiplied by six to account for the difference in limestone and marble.

25. Ibid.

26. See Orlandoos, II, 90-93 and plates 31, 32, and 37 (a reference I owe to E. Vanderpool).

27. See Glotz, Ancient Greece at Work, 286. Jones, Athenian Democracy, 135 n. 1 suggests ½ dr as a more likely sum.

28. There is no evidence for the cost of fodder, but it could not have cost more than a dr or two a day at the most. A medimnus of barley cost 3 dr through most of the fourth century; a medimnus = ca. 1.5 bushels = 72 lbs. (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, Springfield, 1961) = 2 day's rations for an ox? See also Jardé, Céréales, 124 ff.


30. Stanier, 71.

31. For the possible yoking arrangements see Burford, "Heavy Transport," 12.

32. Ibid., 14.

33. See above, p. 50. Although the stone is larger than most stelai for Attic decrees, it was probably transported a shorter distance (or was transported by sea, would also probably be cheaper).
34. Stanier, 71.

35. A passage in Thucydides is instructive (VI 54), where Thucydides describes the altar dedicated by Peisistratus. He says that the inscription is written in ἄμνὸς γραμματόστις. ἄμνὸς means "dim" (LSJ s.v. ἄμνὸς), and may imply no judgment about their quality, i.e. whether they are aesthetically pleasing; possibly it refers only to their state of preservation. A look at the photograph in Kirchner's Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum (2nd ed., 1948) pl. 5, #12 will show that the letters are quite legible, although not so legible perhaps as the letters of #10 on the same plate. Does Thucydides mean that the letters are ἄμνὸς because there is no longer any paint in them, and are therefore not as easy to read? The problem is perhaps insoluble.


37. These are the only groups numerous enough to discuss average quality of lettering: there are only two 40 dr inscriptions, and the 10 dr inscriptions are all late, and a class in themselves: by then the price scale had changed and the quality of lettering on the whole had dropped. (See below, p.76).

38. p. 229.

39. Forward to Tracy, Lettering, xvii.

40. Stoichedon Style, 104 ff.

41. The economic factors will be discussed below.

42. 222 is the first example.

43. 243, for which 60 dr were allotted, is the only firmly dated example.

44. A note of caution concerning these: there is never any justification given by Kirchner in IG for the restoration, and I suspect that usually none was given in the original publication of the fragment (I did not track down each small fragment). In several cases Kirchner refers to Drerup; I therefore assume that restoration was made with a letter count in mind, if one could be obtained; if not, the available spaces were probably filled with what
seemed to be a plausible number of deltas.

45. The dating of the following, at least, should be reconsidered: IG II² 514, 524, 531, 534, 575, S. XXI 336.

46. 2304 and 306 are dated by Kirchner to the mid-fourth century. I have not seen 2306. 2304 is edited by Hübner in Hesp. XXVIII (1959) pp. 169-171, #1. He dates it to 337/6 by restoring the demotic of the priest in line 17 and fitting him into the priest cycle between the years 352/1 and 337/6. However, because of the restoration the date can hardly be considered certain.
IV. The Economic and Historical Context

The patterns observed in the last chapter need to be placed in their economic and historical context. This chapter attempts to do this.

As mentioned above, prices for inscribing begin to be specified around 390.\(^1\) The first firmly dated example is \(^2\)\(^3\)\(^1\) from 386/5. Several explanations for beginning the practice of specifying the price for inscribing seem plausible. First, it is simply a further development and reflection of the Athenian penchant for recording public expenditure which began in the fifth century. One of the prime motives behind this must have been a desire to cut down on possible corruption, a desire which is quite clear from the practice of the euthyna at the end of each official's term of office. Secondly, the practice of specifying prices for inscribing is probably connected with merismos, instituted about that time,\(^2\) which was probably meant to make Athenian finances more efficient. In this case, greater efficiency meant keeping track of each public expenditure or allotment for expenditure.

The change of the secretaryship sometime between 368 and 362 from an office which changed hands every prytany to a yearly office necessarily had some effect on the
practice of inscribing decrees. This change too appears to reflect a desire on the part of the Athenians for greater efficiency and professionalism in an important office: recording the decrees of the people was an important—if not the most important—function of the secretary. After this change, there is an overall increase in the amount of inscribing commissioned by the state. This increase is also probably to be connected with a rise in Athenian imperialism which eventually led to the Social War.³

The next clear demarcation point is the grain crises of ca. 330 to 320, "Athens suffered from severe shortage of grain that drove prices up to dizzying heights . . . The prices of wheat and barley, which normally cost respectively five to six drachmas and three drachmas the medimnus, rose upon occasion to six times those figures, to thirty-two drachmas the medimnus of what and eighteen drachmas the medimnus of barley."⁴ As Isager and Hansen point out in another context, "the grain crisis of 330-320 was, however, a severe below for Athens, and from the close of the fourth century one may justifiably speak of an economic decline for Athens."⁵ This crisis, lasting as it did for a decade and more, must have had some effect on other prices at Athens. As the present study has shown, the prices for inscribing clearly reflect it: from 330
until after the reorganization of the government in 301, there are no longer any inscription with 20 dr allotted for the inscribing: all inscriptions cost either 30, 40, or 50 dr. Obviously 20 dr was no longer an adequate allotment for inscribing. That 40 and 50 dr inscriptions do not occur until late in the century lends further support; in fact, we may suspect that the allotments of 40 and 50 dr for inscribing may be caused by inflation.

The change from democracy to oligarchy (332 to 307, with a brief democratic restoration in 318) must have had a significant effect on those masons who earned much of their income from inscribing (probably a limited number). The practice of inscribing public documents after all is primarily a democratic one, the purpose being to enable the people to see what has been enacted, what laws are in effect, what expenditures have been made in their name. None of this is necessary or desirable in the case of an oligarchy. Under oligarchical rule the Assembly was inactive for the most part and passed very few decrees. The inscribing of decrees, therefore, practically ceased. In addition, many stelai from the period of the democracy were destroyed by the oligarchy, as is clear from IG II² 448.

Demetrius of Phaleron, who governed the city for a decade (318-307), dealt another severe blow to the masons
with his sumptuary laws limiting the expenditure for funerals. Sculptured reliefs were no longer allowed; only a "round column, a simple slab, or a graceful vase" were permitted. The inscribing trade must have been connected with that of making grave stelai; decree and grave stelai were probably done in the same workshops (there is a later example of a grave stele being reused for a decree). Thus, a significant loss of business in the funerary trade would have been a blow to these shops and probably caused masons to leave the city in search of employment elsewhere (the East might be particularly inviting at this time) or go out of business.

The observations above concerning inscribing as a predominantly democratic practice are confirmed by the restoration of the democracy in 307. In the preceding decade of oligarchy, there are only eight known inscriptions, while in 307/6 alone there are more than twenty. The flood continues until 302/1, after which inscribing falls off in the turbulent years that follow.

Some of the offices which had been abolished under the oligarchy were reinstated by the democracy; at the same time, some of the oligarchical reforms were retained in the interest of greater administrative efficiency. The Superintendent of the Administration (διοικητής) is first attested in the inscriptions from this
period (307-301), a sign of his increased influence (if the position had been created in Lycurgus' time; if not, his appearance marks the creation of the position).

As noted in the last chapter (p. ) the quality of inscribing took a turn for the worse after 307. Several factors must have caused this. There was the break in demand for inscribing long decrees under the oligarchy; ten or fifteen years was long enough for a significant number of the practicing masons to die off, leave town, or go out of business, and, most significant of all, no one would be trained to replace them. Additionally, the economic crisis of 330-20 surely had a lasting effect on the Athenian economy; the situation had not improved with the restoration of the democracy. The drachma was not what it once was and clearly did not have the same buying power as before the crisis.

An indication that measures of economy were being taken is the increased use of Hymettian marble. Quarried at Mt. Hymettus, it must have been cheaper: the distance from Hymettus to the city is considerably less than from Pentele (11 km as opposed to 14 km), and transport would cost correspondingly less. It may, however, have been slightly more difficult to inscribe, for Hymettian marble does not take a chisel stroke as easily as Pentelic.
The democracy lasted just seven years. The defeat of Antigonus and Demetrius at Ipsus in 301 resulted in the overthrow of the "radical democracy" (as Ferguson puts it) favorable to Demetrius and its replacement by a government of "moderates." The change of government again resulted in constitutional changes; the most important of these, for our purposes, occurred in the city's financial administration:

Our defective records enable us to detect a reconstruction of the financial administration, and the substitution of elected for allotted magistrates. Subsequent to this epoch, at any rate, we miss various officials who had earlier been of importance in finance, notably the treasurer of the demos while an elected officer, the exetastes, or inspector, makes his appearance to co-operate with the trittarchs in controlling various public monies (IG II2641; cf. Εφ. Αρχ. 1900, p. 133). In 297/6 B.C. a further change was effected, and the general superintendent of the administration was given charge of the state treasury, from which disbursements were made for legislative and diplomatic purposes (IG II2646, 648 (295/4); cf. Klio 1905, p. 171, and Westermann, Class. Phil., 1910, p. 212 f.). At the same time, probably, the treasurers of Athens were abolished.

After the establishment of the Superintendent of the Administration as dispenser of the state treasury in 297/6 prices for inscribing are no longer regularly or consistently specified in the inscribed documents. This is the clearest demarcation point of all, for it explains
why the practice stopped. Basically the practice of specifying prices was a democratic one. When the democracy collapsed, and reforms were instituted in the financial administration the democratic practice of specifying prices was axed.

In 294, Demetrius Poliocetes reentered the city in triumph and again reinstituted a democratic form of government. The exetastes and trittyarchoi no longer dispense funds for inscribing, and the single superintendent of the administration is replaced by a board of administrators, a logical democratic procedure. This then is an indicator of democratic control of the city in the confused years that follow:

Inscriptions may be inscribed to the periods of Macedonian control or of independence according as a single officer or a committee is in charge of the administration ... Apparently an annual appropriation was still made for inscriptions, and from this a separate payment was made for each document to be recorded on stone. This practice seems to be characteristic of the Nationalists [i.e., the democratic faction] for it recurs again during the Chremonidean War and was revived later by Euryclides.

When a democratic government was in power in the 280's, there was a brief resurgence of the practice of specifying prices for inscribing, but the resurgence did not last long (283-0). In addition to having the prices
for inscribing specified, the funds were disbursed by a plural board of administrators. The pattern, therefore, is clear: when the democracy was in power, a committee in charge of the administration disbursed funds for inscribing, and prices were often specified; when an oligarchic government ruled, a single officer dispensed funds for inscribing and the prices are not specified.  

There remains to be considered how the prices for inscribing compare with other known prices from the same period, and what this may imply. This is not an easy task, for the simple reason that a good listing of prices does not exist, apart from Pritchett's work on the Attic Stelai, and Heichelheim's article on "Sitos" in RE Suppl1b. VI.  

It is beyond the scope of this study to do anything more than give a representative sample of some of the most important prices gleaned from work already done by other scholars.  

Since grain prices are the basis for all estimates of the cost of living in the fifth and fourth century, I begin with them. Except in times of shortage, grain prices apparently remained fairly steady throughout the fourth century, with perhaps a slight overall rise. Pritchett gives the following table, based on Heichelheim, which gives the known evidence for the price of wheat at Athens in the fourth century.
Prices of Wheat at Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Price per medimnos</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-330</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arist., Eccl., 547-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 330</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 408, line 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Demosthenes, XXXIV, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330/29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 360, line 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 1672, line 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329/8</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{163}</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 1672, line 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I.G., II\textsuperscript{2}, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>300 or 1800\textsuperscript{164}</td>
<td>Plutarch, Demetr. 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is based on F. Heichelheim, R. E., Supplement VI, s.v. Sitos, 887-888.

The lower price in the same document is probably to be explained by inferior quality of the wheat.

The preserved text of Plutarch states that 300 drachmas was the price for a modios (1/6 of a medimnos) during the siege of Athens by Demetrios Poliorcetes. The lower figure rests on an emendation of the text by J. W. Wilamowitz and is the one frequently adopted; see W. S. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, London, 1911, p. 133 and A. Jardé, Cereales, p. 176, note 3. During the siege of Athens by Sulla, a medimnos of wheat brought 1000 drachmas; see Plutarch, Sulla, 13. The author of the second book of Aristotle's Oeconomica gives several examples of extortion rates in times of scarcity.

It is clear that there is a significant dislocation of prices in 330, and a terrible problem when Athens was under siege by Demetrios; but in time of peace, the price remained fairly steady.\textsuperscript{23}

A choinix of wheat is commonly mentioned as a day's ration,\textsuperscript{24} and a medimnos contains 48 choinices; therefore,
if the price of a medimnos was 5 or 6 dr, a day's ration would cost less than an obol. Barley cost about half what wheat cost, but is less nourishing.25

There are some prices quoted in the religious calendars,26 but they are difficult to use for two reasons: several of the calendars can only be dated approximately, secondly, the prices are standardized within each calendar and also between calendars. Be that as it may, sacrificial animals worth the following were required in the various calendars of the mid-fourth century:27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>piglets</td>
<td>3, 3 1/2 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pregnant sow</td>
<td>20 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full grown pig</td>
<td>40 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ox</td>
<td>70, 90 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>7 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 15 dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goat</td>
<td>10, 12 dr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are not very many different prices; still, it is significant that the prices are specified at all; this, according to Dow, is unique to Attic religious calendars and he suggests that economic reasons underlie this practice:

It was the Erkhian Calendar which suggested a motivating force more precise and practical than scholarship, convenience, or reform. This motivating force is the difficulty of finding money. Formerly the rich Gennetai could and did pay for most of the sacrifices in the Deme. The Deme itself, though constituted only under Kleisthenes, may have paid for some. Now, however, the rich were poorer. The situation was desperate enough so that an elaborate system of allotment had to be devised in order to get the sacrifices paid for. . . .28
The Calendars, different in origin, affected many differing cults and a host of persons. No one motive explains all the Calendars equally, but they do all share an interest in costs. This is the reason, we can now say, for their distinctive character. Everywhere, and in the main, all sacrificial calendars give the details important for their purposes. It is no accident that prices are the feature that distinguishes these present calendars from all others. In different organizations the financial interest differed. The Salaminioi and the State had problems and interests that were quite different from each other's, and so also did the Demes. In at least three of the Demes in the Fourth Century, the Gennetai could no longer pay; in two of these Demes, and probably in most others throughout Attika, finding the money for sacrifices had become an acute problem. 29

Getting things paid for was indeed a problem in the fourth century; hence the need for increased leitourgia, the institution of the symmories and then the proeisphora, the reforms in the trirarchies, and the inability of the Athenian state to pay for military expeditions; the religious calendars fit into this context.

It is perhaps appropriate to conclude this section on other prices in the fourth century with a quote from Michell which summarizes the attempts that have been made to estimate the cost of living in the fifth and fourth centuries:

M. Glotz reckons 180 drs. for food, 50 for clothing, 36 for rent and 14 for sundries total 280 dr. (his fntn: Ancient Greece at Work, p. 286). Boeckh puts it at 396 drs. in the time of Socrates, for a year of 360 days, and at 486 in the time of Demosthenes (Staatshaushaltung, i. p. 141 ff.).
M. Mauri puts it at a slightly higher figure, 400 and 525 drs. (I cittadini Lavoratori dell' Attica, p. 78). M. Guiraud remarks that these are quite arbitrary estimates, and appeals to surer evidence in the Wasps of Aristophanes, written in 422. There we find a labourer married and with one child able to feed himself and family on 3 obols a day or 177 drs. a year of 354 days (Vesp. 300-1). If we add 45 drs. for clothing, 36 for rent, as Boeckh and Mauri agree, and 14 for sundries, we arrive at 272 drs. a year which would allow a workman to live, provided that unemployment did not cut his earnings down considerably (Main d'Œuvre, pp. 191-2. Busolt, Griech. Staatsk. p. 203, puts the minimum at 360 drs.).

In the fourth century when grain rose 50 5 drs. the medimnus and frequently higher, the cost of food for a family of four must have risen to nearly 300 drs. It does not appear, however, that other expenses had risen to any extent, and a workman could support his family on 450 drs. a year, if he earned 1 1/2 a day.

In conclusion it is interesting to note that Lysias in his speech against Diogeiton reckons 1000 drs. a year sufficient to support comfortably three orphans, an attendant, and a maid, and Demosthenes reckons about the same in his own case when prosecuting his guardians for embezzlement of his patrimony. These cases are, of course, for the wealthy; but the ratio between the incomes of the rich and those of the labouring classes is obviously a reasonable one (Lysias, in Dioq. 28: Dem. in Aphob. 1, 36).

Granted that these figures can only be rough estimates, they still serve their purpose; namely, the provide us with some definite idea concerning the cost of inscriptions.

The answer to the question, "Is 20 to 60 dr a large sum of money or not?" then, depends on your point of view. First of all, a drachma was not small change,
expenses were measured out in obols for the most part. At the same time a drachma is not an overly large sum. Nonetheless, the state kept track of the obols it spent.

A subsistence wage would be approximately half a drachma per day (more in the 330's and in the time of siege); a decent day's wage was one dr at the end of the fifth century, and twice that in 329.32

At the next step up in price, sheep and goats were to be provided for sacrifice at a cost of ten to fifteen dr. A full grown pregnant sow cost 40 dr, while kine cost between 70 and 90 dr, as we have seen from the religious calendars. A full grown slave was worth between 100 and 300 dr,33 while a small house cost 300 dr. The silver mines at Laureion were leased out at rates from 20 dr (per prytany for a new mine?) up to 1,500 dr (for a longer period of time on an already established, profitable mine?).34

The 20 to 60 dr paid for stelai then would support a man for one to three months. 20 dr would buy about 4 medimni of wheat in normal times and a little more than 1 medimnus in periods of price dislocation. This is anywhere from 48 days' rations (1 medimnus) to 196 days' rations (4 medimni). Most inscriptions had 20 or 30 dr allotted, i.e., about a month's wage, depending on the period under
consideration, which would probably amply cover a man's living expenses.
Notes to Chapter Four

1. 222 is dated to approximately that year by letter forms and historical context, but cannot be used as evidence in a discussion of a price scale because its length cannot be accurately determined.

2. Or earlier. 229 (Tod 116) from 386/5 is "the earliest clear evidence for the µερισμός," as Rhodes points out (Boule, 100 n. 6). He believes (ibid. 99), however, that the µερισμός was probably instituted in 403/2, and I agree.

3. See Mosse, Athens in Decline, tr. J. Stewart (London, 1973), 47, with reference to Pecirka, Enktesis. For the change in the secretaryship, see Ferguson, The Athenian Secretaries, Cornell Studies, VII.


5. Ibid., 55.

6. See remarks by S.V. Tracy (for a later period, but the situation must have been similar in the fourth century) in Hesp. 47 (1978), 245 and n. 4 with references to his earlier work.

7. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens (London, 1911), 42 with reff.

8. See Tracy, Hesp. Suppl. XV p. 15 and Plate IVa for a later example where the decorative wreaths on a funerary stele have been pared off and a text inscribed over them. Cf. also GRBS 11 (1970), p. 325 #35.


10. See Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 95 ff.

11. Ibid. 98-100.
12. The trade of being a mason must have been organized on an apprentice system, or on a father to son basis. The remarkable sameness of style in lettering through the fourth century argues that there was either a traditional way of lettering, a state "canon" (or guidelines of some kind), or a combination of both. Unfortunately, I can support none of these impressions as yet with hard evidence; I have simply not studied the lettering of the fourth century in adequate detail. I hope to do so in the coming years.

13. The ratio of inscriptions of Pentelic marble to those of Hymettian in the years 403 to 321 is more than 20 to 1 (from a rough survey of IG II^2). In the period from 321 to 302/1, the ratio drops to 4 to 1. Two of the first decrees of the oligarchy are inscribed on Hymettian marble (2376, 377). I doubt that this is coincidental. See also Austin, Stoichedon, 109 n.

14. It is also possible that the inscribers simply could be longer inscribe as well.

15. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 124 with reff. to Klio V, 155 ff. and 180.

16. Ibid. 130.

17. Ibid. 136. Johnson (AJP XXXVI, 436) and Tarn (Antigonos Gonatas, 415 ff., cited by Johnson) put the change to a board of administrators to 288/7.


19. The pattern of publication formulae in the 280's is set out by S. Burstein, "Bithys, Son of Cleon from Lysimachia: A Reconsideration of the Date and Significance of IG II^2 808," CSCA vol. 12, 44-45. There are also a few inscriptions of later date with a price specified (see Tables 4 and 5 above).

20. If Burstein is correct about his redating of IG II^2 808 (and I suspect he is), he neatly solves what had been a difficult question for me; viz., to explain a single inscription near the end of the third century with a stated price. If 2808 is redated to the 280's, the problem no longer exists.
21. All discussions of prices tend to range widely through time and space; that is, they draw conclusions based on prices from different locations and different times. There are no good classified lists which discriminate carefully with regard to time and location. The main reason for this is simply that the evidence is both scarce and difficult to use; one must therefore make comparisons from widely divergent times and places (e.g. citing grain prices in Roman times when discussing prices in fourth century Athens). An excellent and complete bibliography is to be found in Heichelheim, An Ancient Economic History, tr. by Mrs. Joyce Stevens, 3 vols. (Ceyden, 1964), 2:168-171, n. 8. I would be grateful to anyone who could inform me of the status or whereabouts now of the manuscript of Glotz referred to on p. 171.


23. For a discussion of the grain crisis of the 330's see Isager-Hansen, Aspects, 200 ff. They extend the crisis down to the death of Alexander. For a slightly different view (that the price remained fairly constant, but subject to great fluctuations within a short period of time—even a day), see Andreades, A History of Greek Finance (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), 240-241. Even if there was only a slight overall rise in price, this would have a serious effect on the poor of the city as Michell points out (The Economics of Ancient Greece, 133).


27. I have not given the specific references for each price; the interested reader is referred to the texts themselves. Most of the variation for a given kind of sacrificial animal seems to be related to the specific god or goddesses to which an animal is to be sacrificed; generally speaking, animals sacrificed to male deities seem to be slightly more
expensive; perhaps the lower priced animals were female, and the higher priced ones male? Dow and Healey in "A Sacred Calendar of Eleusis," Harvard Theological Studies, no. 21 (1965), 13, make too much, I think, of the possibility of inflation with respect to the 30 dr paid for a goat, in comparison with the 10 dr stipulated in the state calendar. The main difficulty is that the goat is included in a lump sum with ierosynē; we cannot know therefore how much the goat alone cost.


29. Ibid. 185.

30. Michell, Economics, 133-134.


32. See above, p.85, (Ch. III n. 10).


34. Austin and Vidal-Naquet, Economic and Social History, 315 n. 15.
V. Conclusions

I have left to the last a final consideration of the question, "What does the sum in the publication formula represent?" so that all the pertinent evidence could be considered; it is, I think, only after the examination of the various prices that the picture becomes clear. It seems to me that the sum in the publication formula, which is always in 10 dr increments, represents a standardized allotment of some kind for piece work; that is, the stele and the inscribing on it are considered to be a single piece of work (at least in Athens), for which standardized prices were allotted. Exactly how the price was determined is not clear—a combination of factors must have operated in determining the price: size of the stele, number of letters to be inscribed, whether there was to be a relief on the stele, or the stele was to be crowned by a molding or pediment. The financial condition of the state may also have influenced the allotments at any given time; if the state was short of money, less money may have been allotted for more inscribing. The allotment in some cases may have been more than enough to get a stele inscribed in which case the allotment may represent an upper limit for competing bids from masons; but we can only
speculate about this. In other cases, where a particularly splendid stele with relief survives, it is likely that some money (perhaps a sizeable sum, at least equal to what the state had allotted) was contributed by a private party. In any case, it seems clear that the allotment was meant to pay for both the stele and the inscribing of it.

Two concepts go far to explain the prices for inscribing: "standardized prices" and "piece work."

The prices are clearly standardized—the 10 dr increments attest to that. This means that the allotments bear only a rough correspondence to the actual work done; the sum does not represent a payment for the actual number of days worked in the making and the inscribing of a particular stele. Rather it is the standard amount for a decree of that approximate length. The term "piece work" also implies this: a given amount was allotted for a stele, no matter how long it might take a particular mason to work it.

However vague or standardized the prices may be, they got the job done. The sums are not capricious; they were clearly real and fluctuated with the times in an intelligible way. In most cases, the amounts allotted did in fact pay for the inscribing and were enough for a man to live on, else we would not have the inscriptions which are the subject of this study.
Notes to Chapter Five

1. For a discussion of these terms see Burford, Craftsmen, 138–140, 142; GTBE, 164–166; Randall, "The Erechtheum Workmen," AJA LVII (1953), 207 and Table 6 (for piece work), cited in Burford, GTBE, 111 n. 4.
PART TWO: THE INSCRIPTIONS
Part Two of this study is basically a catalog of those inscriptions crucial to the discussion of the price scale. Only those inscriptions specifically referred to in the text as being included in Part Two and those in which I have suggested new or corrected readings or have offered a new interpretation have been discussed (see in particular IG II² 107 and 140).

Each entry has been arranged as follows: the first line contains the standard reference number, and an indication of how I was able to examine the inscription. Most of the inscription numbers are references to IG II². If Tod includes the inscription in his Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, his number is given in parentheses. "O" indicates that I have examined the original, "Sq" that I have examined a squeeze of the stone, "Ph" that I have consulted a photograph. The inventory number to the Epigraphical Museum in Athens has also been given, where this was available, prefaced by the letters EM. Next, a bibliography for each inscription is given; I have not repeated bibliographical references given in IG or Tod, unless they are immediately important to the discussion. I have used the abbreviations of Kirchner and Tod when I have repeated their references. Most of the inscriptions studied are mentioned or listed in Rhodes, The Athenian Boule, or
prefaced by the letters EM. Next, a bibliography for each
inscription is given; I have not repeated bibliographical
references given in IG or Tod, unless they are immediately
important to the discussion. Most of the inscriptions
studied are mentioned or listed in Rhodes, The Athenian
Boule or Delaix, Proboleusis at Athens but I have not
given references in the bibliography to these works; the
reader is referred to the indices of both. Wherever possi-
brle, I have given SEG numbers or references to REG for
bibliographical notices, rather than repeat the whole
notice.

The date and measurements for each inscription have
been given; unless I have improvements or substantial dif-
ferences from the published measurements, I have simply
repeated them. The following abbreviations are used: h. =
height, w. = width, th. = thickness. l.h. = letter height,
stoich. patt. = stoichedon pattern. Comments on the preser-
vation of the inscription have been omitted, unless I have
something new to add. Sculptural decoration is described.

In some cases, I have included a brief discussion
of the quality of lettering, and in all cases have given
references to published photographs.

The commentary attempts to consider all pertinent
arguments not considered in the text concerning the cost
of the particular inscription. Drerup's treatment of the
Delaix, *Probusuleus at Athens* (University of California Publications in History, vol. 83, 1973), but I have not given references in the bibliographies to these works unless there is extended discussion; the reader is referred to the indices of both these works. Wherever possible, I have given SEG numbers or references to REG for bibliographical notices, rather than repeat the whole notice.

The date and measurements for each inscription have been given; unless I have improvements or substantial differences from the published measurements, I have simply repeated them. The following abbreviations are used: h. = height, w. = width, th. = thickness, l.h. = letter height, stoich. patt. = stoichedon pattern. Comments on the preservation of the inscription have been omitted, unless I have something new to add. Sculptural decoration is described.

In some cases, I have included a brief discussion of the quality of lettering, and in all cases, where possible, have given references to published photographs.

The commentary attempts to consider all pertinent arguments not considered in the text concerning the cost of the particular inscription. Drerup's treatment of the inscription is generally briefly summarized, and an alternative explanation is usually suggested.
Bibliography:  IG II 5, 14 c; II² add. p. 656; Drerup, 248; Binneboessel, #30; Svoronos, pl. CCXXX.

Date: 386/5

Measurements: h. 0.73 w. 0.40 th. 0.113 at top, 0.115 at bottom; l.h. 0.008 stoich. pattern. 0.0157 x 0.0143.

Sculptural decoration: The lower part of a relief remains above the inscription "portraying a female figure between two horsemen" (Tod GHI. p. 48).

Number of letters: 780 & X.

Publication formula:


Commentary: Drerup (p. 248) calls this stele unzweifelhafte private. His main reason for thinking this is the sculpture:

die prächtige Ausstattung der Stele muss uns auf den Gedanken bringen, dass uns auch hier eine private Abschrift erhalten ist, obwohl die Inschrift auf der Akropolis gefunden ist, wo das offizielle Exemplar aufgestellt war.
IG II² 31 (cont.)
The sculpture, however, is in low relief, and would not necessarily have taken very long to carve nor have been overly expensive (see above, p. 41, and comments below on Philiskos stele, ²133, p. 141).

Drerup also contends in the same paragraph that part of the decree must be missing, since all the sections do not follow smoothly one after the other. He maintains that the assembly's deliberations περὶ τῶν νεῶν, referred to in line 20 ought to have been included in detail earlier in the decree, before the ἑπαίνεσι of line 5, but that this part of the "official copy" was left out when the stele was inscribed. This, however, assumes "a definite, logical order for the original form of decrees . . . . This assumption has not been proved," as Billheimer pointed out in reference to a similar argument by Laquer (Billheimer, AJA XLII, "Amendments in Athenian Decrees," p. 466; Laquer in Epigraphische Untersuchungen, p. 57-8) concerning this decree. Billheimer rightly concluded "the decree yields a clear interpretation in its present, natural order." As for Drerup's suggestion that this is a copy erected on the Acropolis along with the original, it is simpler to assume that the stele we possess is the official copy, from the very fact that it was found on the Acropolis.
IG II² 31 (cont.)

The historical background to this inscription also suggests that it is an important state document. It honors King Hebryzelmis, from Thracian Odrysia, and was passed after the King's Peace in 386/5. Hebryzelmis' domain had significant strategic importance for Athens as Cary emphasizes in CAH VI. First, in mentioning some of the positive accomplishments of Thrasybulus, he notes (p. 53) that "by winning over Byzantium and Calcedon and securing the friendship of the Thracian chieftains on either side of the Gallipoli peninsula Hebryzelmis being one of them, he restored the free use of the Black Sea route to Athens" (my emphasis). Secondly, in discussing the Panegyricus of Isocrates, he puts the present decree in a larger context (pp. 72-3):

In 380 B.C. the claims of Athens to the hegemony of Greece were formulated, and made known to the entire Greek world in one of Isocrates' masterpieces, the Panegyricus. In this treatise the Athenian pamphleteer denounced the results of the King's Peace and indicated a new federation under Athenian leadership as the remedy for Greece's political ills. But before the publication of this treatise the Athenians had already taken the first steps toward realizing this programme. The ink was hardly dry on the King's Peace before they had commenced to resume those alliances which the Peace had forced them to abandon. In 386 or 385 they made a treaty with Hebryzelmis, king of the Odrysian Thracians on the Gallipoli peninsula. About the same time they came to a new understanding with Chios, and within the next few years made fresh pacts with Mytilene, Byzantium and Rhodes.
IG II² 31 (cont.)

Whether or not Athens was at that time contriving to lead the Greek world in the sense that Isocrates was to propose, the decree in honor of Hebryzelmis clearly reflects Athenian concerns in the North, concerns which must ultimately be related to their grain supply. The Athenians were simply using one of their normal methods to strengthen their position: flattery of a king by awarding him (and those associated with him) honors, and by doing what they could to answer his requests. Thus, we are dealing with a document which was important to the strategic purposes of the state. One supposes not only that the decree was pleasing to Hebryzelmis, but that the addition of the relief added to the desired effect.
IG II² 43 (Tod 123) EM 10397 0 Ph

Bibliography: IG II 17 & 883; SEG III 74, XVI 44, XXI 229, XXIV 80; partial photo in Imagine Insc. Att. pl. 23 # 50; also a photo in Accame, La lega ateniese.

Date: 378/7.

Measurements (from IG II²): h. 1.93 w. 0.44-0.47 th. 0.14 l.h. (in main decree) 0.009 stoich. patt. (from Austin) 0.015 x 0.015.

Number of letters: 2325 (approx.) in decree, about 550 in the list of names, for a total of about 2875.

Publication formula:

τὸ δ’ ἡ ψῆφισμα τὸδε δ’ γραμματεύς ὁ τῆς βολής ἀναγραφάτω ἐν στήλῃ λιθο-νησι καὶ καταθέτων παρὰ τὸν Ἀλκα τὸν Ἑλευ-θέριον· τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον οὖν εἶ πὴ τὴν ἀν-αγραφὴν τῆς στήλης ἔξηκοντα δραχμᾶς ἐκ τῶν δέκα ταλαντῶν τὸς ταμίλας τῆς θε-δ. εἰς δὲ τὴν στήλην ταύτην ἀναγρα-φεῖν τῶν τε οὐσῶν πόλεων συμμαχῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀλλη συμμαχος γρ–<γ>νηται

Commentary: see above, p.34. The text of the publication formula has been provided for the reader's convenience, since this inscription includes a list of names
appended to the decree, and the decree specifically enjoins (lines 69-72) that the list be inscribed along with the decree.
IG II² 106 (Tod 135)  EM 6947 & 6976  0 Ph Sq

Bibliography:  IG II 50, II 5 50; Drerup, 232.

Date:  368/7

Measurements:  h. 0.68 w. 0.43–0.45 th 0.105

l.h. 0.008 stoich. patt. 0.013 x 0.015.

Preservation and physical characteristics:  Two fragments which have been joined; the left edge is preserved and part of the molding at the top. There is a vacat of 0.187 between the molding and the first line of the decree. The back is preserved, and is rough picked. The stele was reused as a threshold block, which accounts for the wear on the right hand side of the inscribed face.

Number of letters:  723.

Publication formula:

τὸ δὲ [ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγραφόντω.


Commentary:  This inscription has been included because both Kirchner and Tod were able to read more from the stone than is now possible. The omega of ὅστῳ (1.18) should at least be dotted, if it ever was legible at all. The same holds for the first delta of the sum.
IG II² 106 (cont.)

Quality of lettering: I would rate this a poorly inscribed inscription. The letters are not particularly well formed (the beta particularly), and the inscriber seemed to have trouble with the stoichedon, especially near the end. The general impression given is of sloppiness.
IG II² 107 (Tod 131)  EM 7052  O Ph Sq

Bibliography: IG II add. 52 c; Kumanudis V 1876; Dittenberger SIG³ 164; cf. Miller, de Decretis p. 50; Dittmar, Coron. 192; Laquer, Epigraphische Untersuchen 102; Billheimer, AJA xlii, 474; Accame, Lega, 108 ff. See also the add. to IG II².

Date: 368/7

Measurements: h. 1.29 w. 0.45-0.475 th. 0.155 (at the dressed edge), c. 0.18 at molding; l.a. 0.007 in stoichedon portion of decree; stoich. patt. 0.015 x 0.0145.

Preservation: The original back of all fragments is preserved (rough picked). Fragment A has the right edge preserved and the molding. Fragment B has the left edge preserved, and breaks off just short of the right, which has been plastered over. Fragment C has both the right and left edge preserved. The stele is topped by a molding.

Number of letters: First decree, 1349; second decree, 806 + X; total, 2155 ﾃ X.

Publication formula:

\[
\text{ἀναγράφει ὃ [e t]δο-}
\text{[e to ψ]ή[φι]συμα τὸν γραμματέα τῆς [βου]λῆ[ς] ἐν στήληι}
\text{λιθίνη-}
\text{[i καὶ σ]τῆσαι ἐν Ἀκρωτίδει. [ἀν]αγράφει δὲ κα[ι]τ[ὸ]}
\text{ψή[φι]συ[μα]ε-}
\text{[ἲς τὴν α]ύτην στήλην θάκε[κρ]εντο ὁ δήμος τοῖς πρέσβεσι}
\]
IG II² 107 (cont.)


Commentary: The stele contains two decrees honoring the demos of Mytilene. The first decree on the stele was passed 368/7; the second in 369/8. Beneath the molding at the top of the stele is a superscript inscribed in large letters followed by a vacat of 21.5 cm. in which there may have been a painting. The first decree, apart from the superscript and line 7 (the ἔδοξεν clause), is inscribed non-stoichedon. The second decree, separated from the first by a vacat of 16 cm., is inscribed stoichedon.

The directive to inscribe the stele and the allotment for inscribing appear in lines 18-24 of the first decree (see text above), followed by praise for the ambassadors to Mytilene and a directive that they and the synedrion of Lesbos be called to dine in the Prytaneion, and an amendment by Autolycus praising by name the Athenian ambassadors to Lesbos:
IG II²107 (cont.)

ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς
[πεμφ] θέντας εἰς Μυτιλήνην καὶ καλέσαι ἐπὶ δεξιόν εἰς
[τὸ πρυ]τανεῖον εἰς αὐτοῖν. καλέσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς συνέδρον[ν]—
[ζ τοὺς] Μυτιληναίων ἐπὶ ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυταν[ε]το[ν] εἰς
αὐ[τὶ—
[ον. κ]αλέσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους τῷ Μηθυμναίων
[καὶ Ἄ]ντισσαιν καὶ Ἐρεσίων καὶ Πυρραίων ἐπὶ ξ[ένια]
[eἰς τὸ] πρυτανεῖον εἰς αὐτοῖν. Ἀὐτολυκὸς εἰκεν· τὰ μὲ [ν]
[ἄλλα] καθ[ά]περ τῇ βουλῇ. ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις
[τοὺς] πεμφθέντας εἰς λέσσον Τ[ι] μένῳν καὶ Ἀὐτολυκ—
[ον κ]αὶ Ἀ[ρ]τοπεθὴν καὶ καλέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ δεξιόν εἰς
τὸ πρυτανεῖον εἰς αὐτοῖν

By D rerup's account, there are 2130 + X letters on
the stele (p. 242), far too many for an allocation of 20
dr if Schöne's hypothesis is to hold. He therefore main-
tains that either the stonecutter erred, or the price
refers only to the main body of the first decree; viz.,
through line 24, which has 833 letters. He also suggests
the possibility that the inscription is a private copy,
rather than the actual official state copy because of the
non-stoichedon lettering of the first decree, the con-
spicuous appeal to the gods of Mytilene, and the splendid
execution of the stele.
However, in maintaining that the allotment refers only to lines 1-24 of the first decree, Drerup ignores the directive in lines 20-21:

[ἀν]αγράψαι δὲ κα[ὶ] τ[ὸ] ἐφι[σμα] ε-
[ὶς τὴν α]ὐτὴν στήλην ὁ ἀκε[ὰρ] ἵνα τὸ δῆμος τοῖς πρέσβεσι

This must refer to the second decree. Furthermore, the non-stoichedon lettering of the first decree is the result simply of a mistake, and is no indicator that the decree is a "private copy."

None of the previous editors of this inscription have noted that the whole non-stoichedon text (II. 8-34) has been reinscribed over a previous text which has been erased. This massive erasure runs to the beginning of the second decree. What seems to have happened is that amendments were tacked on to the first decree after the original proposal had been given to the mason. The decree was probably given to the mason as soon as it was passed in the assembly, perhaps even before, as a probouleuma which was expected to be rubberstamped by the assembly. In any case, the mason inscribed it originally without the amendments and failed to leave much room between the two decrees.

When the amendments were passed, and the secretary came to the mason with them, the mason had to erase all of
IG II²107 (cont.)

the first decree and squeeze in the whole decree and the amendments in the space originally required by the first decree alone. Since there was not enough space to use the same stoichedon pattern as before, the first decree and amendments were reinscribed non-stoichedon, crowding the letters together. The space above line 6 could not be utilized as there was a painting there. The original mason may have refused to do any more work, for the hands in the two decrees seem to be different. Certainty is impossible because of the poor condition of the non-stoichedon text.

The proof of the above reconstruction is quite simple and mathematical. The unerased letters of line 6 have the same spacing, are the same height, and are by the same hand as the letters of the second decree. Thus, I assume that the original first decree was inscribed in the same stoichedon pattern as the second decree, with a space of 1.5 cm. between the letters horizontally, and 1.45 cm. vertically. If the first decree as it now stands, amendments included, were to be inscribed with a stoichedon pattern of 31 letters per line, it would require a vertical surface 58 cm. in height (1243 letters/31 x 1.45). This is calculated by counting the number of letters in the decree (minus the prescript), dividing by 31 to get the total number of lines, and multiplying by 1.45, the space from
the top of one letter to the top of the next in the line below. But there are only 48 cm. between line 6 and line 35. If only Autolycus' amendment is subtracted, 52 cm. would still be required. If, however, only the letters up to the end of the publication formula are counted, that is, the first decree without amendments, the space required for it would be 37.65 cm. (805/31 x 1.45). This would leave a space between the two decrees of about 10 cm., which was the usual practice. This was also the usual place for the publication formula, at the end of the decree.

To recapitulate: the original decree probably ran up to the end of the publication formula (line 24), and was inscribed by the mason in the usual stoichedon pattern. After he had finished inscribing, the secretary came up to him with several amendments. The mason went back, erased all of the body of the first decree, except for the ἁμαρτήματος clause, and crammed the decree and amendments into the space formerly taken up by the decree alone.

This stele, then, reveals a good deal about how the Athenians had their decrees inscribed, and about how soon and how quickly the mason inscribed them. The decree was apparently given to the mason as soon as it was first passed in the assembly or even before. He inscribed it with reasonable speed, for it was completed before the
amendments were given to him. Thus it seems that the directives given in some decrees (most notably in IG II² 130 and 133 [restored]) that the decrees be inscribed within ten days of their passage (if this is what δέξα ἡμεῖς means) are to be taken seriously.
Bibliography: IG II 54; SEG XVI 47; Miller, De Decretis, 18, 51; Drerup, 234.

Date: 363/3.

Measurements: Fragment A: h. 0.145 w. 0.363
th. 0.133 at the bottom; at the dressed edge, c. 0.10.
Fragment B: h. 0.51 w. 0.383 at top, 0.40 at bottom;
th. of the right dressed edge 0.104, of the left dressed
edge 0.10 at top, 0.104 at the bottom, at the thickest
point, 0.14 stoich. pattn.: fragment A = 0.0104 x 0.0105;
fragment B = 0.0117 x 0.0105. l.h. 0.005.

Preservation and physical characteristics: The
left edge of fragment A is preserved, and probably the
right edge as well. Both edges of fragment B are pre-
served as is the rough picked back. I suspect that the
original bottom is also preserved: there is a visible line
on the inscribed face 8.5 cm. from the bottom apparently
caused by weathering (the setting line); the area below it
is also claw chiselled, whereas the rest of the inscribed
face has been smoothly dressed.

There is probably a large lacuna between the two
fragments. This can be determined by two methods: by
actual manipulation and measurement of the stones, and by
a rough rule of thumb for the size of the stele. The
latter can be inferred from Dow's table in Hesp. III (1943), 143 where the ratio of width to height in the stelae examined works out to approximately 1/2 (4.5 to 9.0 using the thickness as the basic units). The ratio of thickness to total height of stele is approximately 1:9. Using the width of the bottom of fragment B (0.40) the total height of 2109 works out to 0.80 m. This clearly is incorrect, since the preserved height of both fragments, assuming no lacuna, is 0.925. Better results are obtained using the thickness/height ratio. With this we obtain a total height of about 1.26 m.

A similar result is obtained by actually manipulating and measuring the stones. It is clear from the taper of the bottom fragment, and the width of the top fragment (assuming that the right edge is original, as I think it is) that there must be a sizeable lacuna. If two boards are placed against the bottom fragment, and the top fragment positioned so that it fits within the two boards, a lacuna of about 0.50 to 0.60 m. is measurable, which would then give the whole stele a height of approximately 1.35 m.

Number of letters: Decree, 1128 + X; amendment, 744; total, 1872 + x.
Publication formula:

\[ \tau \delta \varepsilon \psi \phi i s i m a \; t o d [ \varepsilon ] a [ \nu ] a y r a [ \psi a ] i \; t o n \; g r a m m a t e a \; t h e \; b o u l h [ \zeta ] e n \; [ s ] t h e l [ \iota \lambda i - \theta i n h [ \chi a i \; s t e \theta s i a i [ \varepsilon ] n \; ' A k r o p o d l [ e i ] \; e i \zeta [ \delta e ] t - \eta n \; a n a g r a f h n \; t h e s \; s t e \theta l [ \acute{e} ] s \; \delta n a i \; t o n \; t a [ \mu ] - \lambda n \; t o \; d \varpi m o \; \Delta \; o r a l a \; \chi m a s \; e k [ \tau ] \varepsilon n \; [ k a ] t a \; \psi \phi i - s i m a t a \; a n a l i s k o m e n n v \; t [ \delta i ] d \eta m w i . \]

Commentary: The decree honors Astycratis of Delphi and his companions. The amendment on fragment B adds to the honors, authorizes the publication of the decree, and specifies that 20 dr be paid for the inscribing of the stele. There are at least 1828 letters preserved in the amendment and decree combined, too many for Schöne's price scale (see above, Part I, p. 18). The amendment, on the other hand, has 744 letters, which is within the scale. Drerup (p. 234), therefore concludes the price must refer to the amendment alone. But the body of the decree does not have a publication formula preserved and Drerup's suggestion that it could have been in the lacuna is not likely, as has been pointed out above (p. 31). It certainly is not sound methodology. In sum, the price in the amendment most probably refers to the inscribing of the whole stele and not just to the amendment. (See also \textsuperscript{2}235 and \textsuperscript{2}373 below).

Date: 363/2.

Measurements: h. I obtained a measurement of 0.92 (IG II² gives 0.98), but some of the stele may be encased in the plaster at the bottom; w. just below the molding is 0.377; at bottom 0.40; th. 0.09 at molding; at the dressed edge on the left, 0.07, on the right 0.06; l.h. 0.005; stoich patt. 0.0085 x 0.0083-4.

Preservation and physical characteristics: Almost a complete stele; all that is missing is part of the bottom. The back is rough picked, and both edges are preserved. There is a blank pediment at the top of the stele.

Number of letters: Decree, 2365; oath, 1125 + X; total, 3490 + X.

Publication formula:

διὸν [ἐ]ν [καὶ] οἱ δροι καὶ συνεθήκας, ὡς συνέκοιτο Παρθένες δ ἐν τῆς γαλακτικής ἀλθείας ἡμῶν καὶ Κεραυνὸς τῶν Ἀρχαίων καὶ Κέραυνος τῶν τῆς ἐκδίδασκεν Ἀθηναίου πόλεως Κέραυνος καὶ τετεθαράττεος. Ἑρμής καὶ Ἀπόλλων τῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ καθαρᾷ σελήνῃ καὶ στήλῃ εἰς τὰς ἱερὰς τῶν Ἀπολλόων τῶν Πυθικῶν.
IG II² 1111 (cont.)

ἔπερ ἐν Καρθαλίᾳ ἀναγραμμέναι εἴσ' ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐς στήλης κατὰ ταβτὰ καὶ στήσαι ἐν Ἀκροπόλει, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν δῶναι τὸν τε- αμίαν-τὸ δήμο ΔΔ δραχμάς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλι- σκομένων.

Commentary: See Part I, p. 33. This stele contains the oaths that the citizens of Iulis were to swear to reaffirm their loyalty after recent unrest on the island. The decree imposing the terms Athens dictated to Iulis, in which the oaths are ordered, comes first on the stele, followed by the oaths. The publication inscriptions dictate that the Iuletai are to erect a stele with the oaths on Keos, and that the Athenians will do the same in Athens. 20 dr are allotted for the inscribing of the stele in Athens (see text above).

Drerup maintains that only the inscribing of the oaths was paid for by the state, and that the publication formula specifies this. He also contends that the mason must have made a mistake, for 30 dr, not 20, ought to have been inscribed if Schöne’s hypothesis is to work. But the formula does clearly specify that only the oaths are to be inscribed: neither ὑπαξι or συνθήκα are mentioned unambiguously as the object of ἀναγράφας though, to be sure, they can be understood from the previous clause.
IG II² 111 (cont.)

It can also as easily be argued that the psephisma is to be understood. The suggestion that the mason must have made a mistake is simply special pleading to make the evidence fit the hypothesis.

Again, the logical conclusion is that the sum in the publication formula is meant to pay for all the inscribing on the stele.
Bibliography: IG II 5, 59 b; SEG XXI 243
(Bengtson, Staatsverträge, #293, 255-7); Binnboesssel, 10, #38; Svoronos, 665, No. 434 (1) and Pl. CCIX.

Date: 361/0.

Measurements: h. 0. 70 w. 0.37-0.39 th. 0.085 at dressed edge, 0.115 at the fascia l.h. 0.008 (lines 2-4), 0.005 (lines 5 ff.) stoich. patt. 0.0087 x 0.0087.

Preservation and physical characteristics: Nearly a complete stele of pentelic marble, with the surface badly eroded. The bottom of the stele may be original; the sides and back are definitely original. There are the remains of a relief, broken off at the top. Only the feet remain of a horse advancing to the right. There was probably a warrior on the horse, as in the Philiskos relief (IG II² 133—see below).

Number of letters: 1804

Publication formula:

IG II² 116 (cont.)

Commentary: Bengtson following Köhler reads ΔΔυ in line 45. This is quite possible: the third delta is questionable. I think, however, that it is there, as did Drerup (p. 247): it was just visible on a squeeze I was able to examine at the Museum of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge University, England.

Drerup maintained that this decree was privately inscribed because of the relief. However, this is an important treaty. At the time that it was drawn up, Alexander of Pherae was causing problems for the Athenians—an alliance with Thessaly promised advantages for Athens, as Tod points out (GHI p. 146). The only reason for thinking that the inscription is a private copy is the presence of the relief. This is not enough; there is nothing more likely to be a public document than a treaty, adorned with a relief to make it more conspicuous.

Bibliography: IG II 61; SEG I 16, III 76, XVI 49; Hesp. VII 286; Drerup, 236.

Date: 353/2, see Hesp. VII 286.

Measurements: h. (as reconstructed in EM) 0.74 w. 0.53 th. (dressed right edge at top) 0.065, (as reconstructed) 0.09. The whole stele is encased in plaster, so I was unable to take accurate measurements l.h. 0.005 stoich. patt. 0.012 x 0.011.

Physical characteristics and preservation: The right and left edges are preserved.

Number of letters: Decree, 1333; inventory, 1290; total, 2623.

Publication formula:
IG II²120

Quality of lettering: The lettering is sloppily done and difficult to read even where the stone is not badly worn, as Köhler noted (cited in IG II²).

Commentary: Unfortunately the decree is not whole. 1333 letters are preserved in what is left in the decree and 1290 letters in the inventory for a total of 2623 letters, far too many for the 30 dr allotted if Schöne's hypothesis (see above p. 18) is to work. Drerup maintained therefore that the sum must refer only to the inventory, which he claimed had approximately the appropriate number of letters—but it too is broken off. Note, however, that line 20 specifically enjoins that money be given for the inscribing of the stele and not just the inscribing of the inventory. Furthermore, it is logical that the decree authorizing the inscribing of the inventory be included on the stele with the inventory itself and that the allotment for inscribing include it.
Bibliography: IG II 69; SEG XXII 91; Binneboessel #42, Svoronos pl. CV; Drerup, 232.

Date: 355/4.

Measurements (from IG II²): h. 0.92 w. 0.355 above, 0.375 below, th. 0.085 l.h. 0.005.

Preservation and sculptural decoration: The top part of the stele is complete, and possibly the whole stele. It is surmounted by a shallow relief, fully preserved but badly worn, of a large figure on horseback to the left, Athena Parthenos in the middle, and a smaller figure of a man (probably Philiskos, who is the honorand) on the right (Binneboessel, p. 11).

Publication formula:

καὶ ἀναγράψα]-

τὸ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ γραμματέα τῆς β]-

οὐλὴς ἐν στήλῃ λ[ιθόν καὶ καθαθεῖ]-

ναι ἐν τῇ Ἀκρο[πολίς ἀκιδέ θέτων, έλ]ς-

δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν[δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν τ]-

οῦ δήμου ΔΔ δραχμ[ὰς ἐν τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσ]-

ματα ἀναλίσκ[ὸ]μ[ένων.]

Commentary: ²133 is a proxeny decree honoring a certain Philiskos for service rendered to Athens, apparently concerning naval actions around the Hellespont during the
IG II² 133

Social War (for a discussion of the date and historical circumstances prior to the passage of this decree, see Pecirka, Listy Filologick, 87, 313-14). Drerup uses this decree as evidence that the price scale was determined by the number of letters in the decree, but maintains that Philiskos must have made a contribution for the sculpture (p. 232). As noted above (p. 41), this is not necessarily so. The sculpture is in low relief, and may not have cost a great deal to carve. There is also a plausible reason for suggesting that it could have been erected by the state, viz.: Athens may be attempting to recoup its losses after its defeat in the Social War or at least to consolidate its interests in the North—hence the honors for their ally, Philiskos, who was probably still living in the Hellespontine region, if not actually a native of Sestos, as Wilhelm would have it.
Bibliography: Eph. Arch. 1910, 1 ff. (photo);
SEG III 78, XXI 253 (Sokolowski, #13).
Date: 353/2 is mentioned (line 15), but not in the prescript.
Measurements: h. 0.65 w. 0.21 th. 0.076 l.h.
0.005 stoich. patt. 0.0125 x 0.0125.
Preservation: the left edge is preserved, and just less than half of the crowning pediment. The stele is of Hymettian marble (IG II², however, calls it Pentelic) and is smaller than most stelai from this date.
Number of letters: 980.
Publication formula:

τὸν ὅς γραμμα[τέα τῆς θουλής]
προσαναγράψαι τ[ὸν νόμον τὸν ὅς]
πρὸς τὸν κράτερο[ν τὸν Χαιρημον]-
 ἰδοὺ ε[ῖς τὴν στῆλ[ην τὴν ἐμπροςθ]-
 ε[ν τοῦ Μητρώιου, ε[ῖς ὅς τὴν ἀναγρ]-
 αφ[ὴν τῆς στῆλ[ῆς δ[οῦν ἄν τὸν ταμ[ή]-
 αν τοῦ ὄ[μου ὡς[ραχμ[άς ἐκ τῆν]
 ε[ῖς τὰ κατὰ ψηφ[ίς ματά].

Quality of lettering: The lettering is quite sloppy; similar to ²120, although the hands are not the same.
Commentary: This inscription is a puzzling one for several reasons. Contrary to the reading of every published text, only 10 dr were allotted for the inscribing of the law. Line 37 should read υΔυ ὅ[ραξμάς; the only letter in question is the dotted delta—the vacats on either side of the 10 dr sign are clear on the stone, on the published photograph, and on a squeeze. Oikonomos, in his editio princeps, citing Drerup, printed a sum of 20 dr. This mistake in methodology has been reprinted in every edition, from Dittenberger to Sokolowski (Dittenberger even reports that there are vacats around the two deltas of the sum).

Secondly, it is unusual that the stele is of what looks to be Hymettian marble. At this period, Hymettian marble was rarely used in making a stelai: the ratio of Pentelic to Hymettian in stelai is about 20 to 1, from a quick survey of the inscriptions in TG II². After 321, Hymettian marble is used somewhat more frequently (the ratio drops to 4 to 1). The physical appearance of the stele itself is different than most from this period: it is smaller, and the pedimental decoration seemed to me to resemble those produced after 307/6 (see²500). Perhaps the
IG II² 140 (cont.)

low allotment of 10 dr can explain the use of Hymettian marble, which was probably cheaper.

Thirdly, the language of the publication formula is unusual. The verb προσαναγράψατε . . . πρός . . . "to inscribe in addition to (?)" and the reference to an existing stele in front of the Metroon (lines 34-5) on which the text is to be inscribed are puzzling. The present text is clearly all there ever was and is clearly not part, in its present form, of a stele which also had on it the "earlier law of Chairemonides" (line 33).

All this suggests that this stele is a later copy. This would then neatly explain the lower allotment, the use of Hymettian marble, and the form of the stele.
IG II² 212 (Tod 167)  Glypta 1471 (Nat. Mus.)  0

Bibliography:  IG II 5, 109 b; SEG XVII 22, XXII 92; Mitchel, Hesp. XXXIII 1965, ..., pl. 65c; Hartel, passim (see index, x.v. 'Αθηναίοι IV. Band, S.133); Drerup, 245 ff.; Dittmar, 174; Binneboessel, 13, 60 ff. #53; Billheimer, AJA XLII 466 ff.

Date:  347/6.

Measurements (from IG II²):  h. 2.17 x. 0.55 th. 0.16 l.h. 0.007.

Physical characteristics and sculptural decororation: A complete stele, very large with a well preserved relief in a deep frame at the top of the stele. The relief depicts the three brothers named in the decree.

Number of letters: 2040.

Publication formula:

\[ \text{άναγ}[/p]-\text{άψει} \delta \varepsilon \tau \acute{o} \pi \acute{e} \sigma i \sigma m a \tau \delta o \delta e \tau o \gamma r a m m a t e a \tau \acute{e}[/s]\]

Bouleῖς ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι καὶ στήρισαι πλη[σ]-

[θον τῆς Σατύρου καὶ Λευκώνος, δὲ δὲ τὴν ἄν[α]-

γραφήν θοῦνα τὸν ναμαν τοῦ δῆμου τρία[κ]-

οντα δραχμᾶς.

Commentary: The decree was passed "in the spring or early summer of 346" (Tod GHI, p. 196) when Athens was in the midst of a heated debate over their policy toward
IG II² 212 (cont.)

Philip (CAH VI pp.236f.). The decree honors Spartocus, Paerisides, and Apollonius, sons of Lycus and rulers (the first two at least) of the Bosporan kingdom, in the Crimea near Scythia. The kings had promised to keep the grain supply to Athens flowing, as their father had done. With Thrace and much of that area no longer controlled by Athens, the Bosporan kingdom, and the grain it could supply was strategically vital to Athens. Even if an agreement had already been made with Philip, it must have been an uneasy one; hence the Athenians were concerned over the North and the grain route—a justifiable concern, considering that Philip's ships had harrassed the Athenians and captured a fleet of ships bringing grain to Athens off the south coast of Euboia in 352 (CAH VI pp.228ff).

The honors promised to the kings are quite lavish (to quote Tod's convenient summary, GHI, p.196):

the demos renews to them all the privileges once given to their father and grandfather; further, each one of them is to be crowned every four years at the Great Panathenaia . . . with a gold crown costing 1,000 dr . . . there is on each occasion to be a public proclamation of the grant, and the actual crowns are to be dedicated in the temple with an appropriate inscription . . . .

In view of the lavishness of the honors mentioned (costing several thousand dr every four years) I think it possible
IG II² 212 (cont.)

that the state paid for the making of this splendid stele to flatter even more these men, who were vital to Athens' grain supply. I do not maintain that this is necessarily so, just that it is possible, enough so to question Drerup's assumption, on which much of his argument is based, that a stele with sculpture on it was necessarily privately financed.

Drerup, following Hartel, maintained that irregularities in the prescript, the lack of a santions-formel (Σάντιών τῆς Βουλής καὶ τῆς δημοσίας), and the unusual overall form of the decree also indicated that the decree was a private copy. As discussed above (p. 40), this is not necessarily a reliable indicator of the private nature of a stele.

The question remains whether the 30 dr allotted was sufficient for the making of this stele. I think not--the total cost must have been considerably more. A deep relief such as the one on this stele probably cost as much again as a plain stele, as indicated above (p. 42). It is unlikely that 30 dr would suffice when stelai of similar size without reliefs were being allotted the same amount. In this particular case, then, either the state provided money, but it is not specified; or, a private party contributed money for the relief. This does
IG II² 212 (cont.)

not, however, confirm Drerup's assertion that all reliefs were privately funded.

Perhaps the best indication that this stele may not be the official copy is that it was found in the Piraeus and not on the Acropolis, since the great majority of inscriptions in the fourth century have at least one copy on the Acropolis (I would estimate nine out of ten--see IG II² iv, sermo publicus, p. 39, s.v. ἄναγγελος).
IG II²226 (Tod 173)  0 Ph

Bibliography:  IG II 115; II² add. p. 659; see also Tod.

Date:  about 342 (see Tod GHI, p. 216).

Measurements:  (from Tod):  h. 1.77 w. 0.62 th. 0.23 l.h. 0.012-0.014 stoich. patt. 0.027 x 0.027.

Preservation and sculptural decoration:  a large stele, broken at the top, with a band of relief "depicting a four-horsed chariot, on which is mounted a winged figure, probably Nike, moving slowly to the right, followed by a horse and rider" (Tod, GHI, p. 214). If Walter's association is correct, there was also a relief at the top, making this a very tall and impressive stele.

Number of letters:  924 + X.

Publication formula:

\[ \text{άνα-\gammaράψαι δὲ τὸ ἄνευ τοῦ ψήφισμα τὸν ὑγραμματέα τῆς θουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ λιθηνη καὶ καταβείναι ἐν Ἀκροπόλει, ἐὶς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δότῳ δ ταμίας τοῦ θήμου ΔΔΔ οραχής ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα} \]

\[ \text{μεριζομένων τῷ} \]
Commentary: It is likely that this stele was also privately financed, at least in part. Tod comments (GHI, p.217):

as Walter suggests, one of the reasons why Arybbas wished publicly to commemorate his agonistic victories by means of this magnificent stele (he himself had probably to contribute a considerable sum over and above the 30 drachmas (1.26) voted by the state) may have been that his unsuccessful competitors may have included his arch-enemy, Philip II of Macedon.

As was the case with 2212 immediately above, 30 dr could not have been enough to produce this stele, with all of its decoration. This does not, however, rule out the possibility that the state paid an amount over what is specified. Athens had reason for honoring Arybbas and providing for his protection: he was a claimant to the Molossian throne, had been driven out by Philip, and could prove to be a useful ally if he could be reinstated.
Bibliography: IG II 119; Drerup, 234.

Date: 340/39.

Measurements: h. 0.60 2. 0.21 th. ca. 0.11 at thickest point, 0.085 at dressed edge. 1.h. 0.008 stoich. patt. 10 vertical = 0.153, 5 horizontal = 0.10.

Preservation: Only the edge is preserve.

Number of letters: 600 + X.

Publication formula:

[άν]αγ[ρ]άψα[ι δὲ αβτωι τὴν π]-
[ρ]οξενιαν[τὸν γραμματέα]
[τ]ὸν κατὰ π[ρυτανείαν καὶ]
[στ]ῆσαι ἐ[ν Ἀκροπόλει, εἰς]
[δὲ τῇ]ν ἀνα[γραφὴν τῆς στῆ]-
[λ]η[ζ]δοῦνα[ι τὸν ταμιαν το]-
[ῦ] [δ]ῆμου Δ[Δ δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν]
[ε]ἰς τὰ κα[τὰ ἡγεσίματα ἄν]-

Commentary: Drerup also cites this decree as a parallel to IG II² 109, i.e., as another decree which might have had an allotment formula in both the body of the decree and the amendment. However, only a portion of the last three lines of the first decree is preserved, and there is no publication formula in them:
IG II² 235 (cont.)

_ --------- εἶναι δὲ κλ_.

[α] ἐ ὡ[τί τῆς ε[πεσθαι παρὰ τ]_.

There is, in short, no way to know the original length of the decree, or its contents. Furthermore, it is unlikely that there was a publication formula in the body of the decree since the usual place for a publication formula is at the end of the decree, and it does not occur there in this inscription. ²₂₃₅ then appears to be another case where the decree was authorized to be published and a sum allotted for the inscribing of the whole in the amend-
ment alone.
IG II² 237 (Tod 178)      EM 7138       0 Ph

Bibliography: IG II 121, SEG XVII 24, XXI 266, XXIV 95 (Pecirka, 49-51).

Date: 338/7.

Measurements: h. 0.54 w. 0.43 at top, 0.45 at bottom th. 0.111 at top, 0.118 at bottom (total thickness); the dressed edge measures 0.085 at the top and 0.95-0.10 at the bottom.

Preservation: Both edges are preserved, as is the back, which is rough-picked. The top and bottom of the stele are broken off.

Number of letters: 1548

Publication formula:


Commentary: The cutter seemed to have a problem with the crowns, as the two of them are off center and crowded to the right, and the last line of the decree is
IG II²237 (cont.)
crowded in above them (see PlateVII). The list referred
to in line 33 must have appeared below them. See above,
p.34 for discussion of the publication formula.
IG II² 240 (Tod 181)  EM 7154  0 Ph

Bibliography:  IG II 124, Hartel I 597, II 130;

Date:  336.

Measurements:  h. 0.958 w. 0.355 th. 0.11 l.h.
0.006-7 stoich. patt. 0.016 x 0.016.

Preservation: The left edge and back are preserved.
The stele had a molding; all that remains of it is the edge between it and the inscribed surface. The top of the stele also seems to be original.

Number of letters:  648.

Publication formula:

\[\text{\[να\]γ[ρ]\ά\ ν\ δ\ \ τ\ η\ ν\ προ\ ξε\ ν\ ι\ [ν\ ε\ λ\ η\ς\ στ]} - \]
[\[η\λ\η\] ιθ\ θ\ η\ ν\ κα\ ι\ στ\ η\ σ\ ν\ \[τ\ η\ ν\ γρ\ α\ μ\ ] - \]
[μα\ θ\ έ\ θ\ α\ [τ\] ο\ ν\ κα\ [τ\] ά\ π\ ο\ ρ\ η\ η\ ν\ [α\ ν\ η\ ] - \]
[ι\ ι\ η\ έ\ η\ [δ\ δ\] η\ τ\ η\ η\ η\ [ α\ χ\ η\ ] η\ [κα\ τά\ τ\ ο\ ν\ νό\ μ\ ν\ ] - \]

Quality of the lettering: The lettering is neither outstandingly good or bad. The letters are regular and well-formed, and are neatly laid out in the stoichedon pattern. They are not, however, of such outstanding
IG II² 240 (cont.)

quality so as to account for the discrepancy in the hypothesized price scale.

Commentary: This decree, the name of whose honor- and is not legible, has only 648 letters, yet 30 dr are allotted for the inscribing. Drerup follows Hartel in considering this to be a private decree because of the form and language of the decree: it has an abbreviated prescript ἑ φοίτης βουλῆς καὶ τῆς δήμου is missing), the usual formula proxeny decrees, προξενία τοῦ δείνος is missing, and the conclusion of the publication formula is unusual, being the only example of κατὰ τὸν νόμον in a publication formula. Drerup also suggests that the mason might have made a mistake in the publication formula: according to Schöne's hypothesis, only 20 dr ought to have been allotted for this decree. A mistake, however, is highly unlikely, for in this case the number was spelled out; ΕΙΚΟΣΙ and ΤΡΙΑΚΟΝΤΑ are not likely to have been confused.

Neither the abbreviated prescript nor the lack of the usual phrase προξενία τοῦ δείνος are reliable indicators of the private nature of a decree (see above, p. 40 ). 240 dates to a period when there was great flux and uncertainty in the wording of prescripts ( a point I owe to A.G. Woodhead).
SEG XII 87 = Hesp. XII #5, pp. 355 ff. I 6524 0 Ph Sq


Date: 337/6.

Measurements (from Hesp.): h. 1.57 w. 0.41 above, 0.43 below th. 0.10 above, 0.12 below l.h. 0.005 stoich. patt. 0.01 x 0.01.

Sculptural decoration: Above the text is a low relief probably depicting democracy crowning the seated Demos.

Number of letters: 1036

Publication formula:

διαγράψαι δὲ τὸν-
δὲ τὸν νόμον ἐν στήλαις λιθονοὶ δυοὶ τῶν γ-
ραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήσαι τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τ-
ῆς εἰσδέου τῆς εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον τῆς εἰς τὸ βο-
ὐλευθρίους εἰσίνθε, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἱκελησθα-
绁είς δὲ τὴν δαναγραφὴν τῶν στηλῶν τὸν ταιλαν
δοῦναι τοῦ δήμου: ΔΔ: δοραχμᾶς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψη-
φίσματα ἀναλυσκομένων τῇ δήμῳ.

Commentary: The publication formula directs that two stelai be ere- ted: one at "the entrance to the Areopagus, the one as you enter the Bouleuterion" (Meritt's translation), the other at the assembly; but only 20 dr
are allotted for the inscribing. Meritt remarks:

the sum of 20 drachmai seems remarkably little for two stelai (if the other was the twin of this one) both of which were adorned with handsome sculptured reliefs.

This suggests problems, but provides no answer to them. The first question to be asked is whether the 20 dr is to be paid for each stele; in this case we must assume that the mason omitted the phrase εἰς ἐκατέραυ, or something similar, as with IG II² 448 (see below). Merritt implies that 10 dr were paid for each stele. If 10 dr were paid for each, the mason received a mere 5 to 10 days wages for each (see above, p. 52). Was it possible for the mason to carve and inscribe two stelai within 5-10 days, and if so, was it profitable? I suspect not, on both counts, but there is no way of being certain. Even if the mason were paid 20 dr for each stele and we hypothesize a 10-20 day span for the working of each stele, the sum would scarcely have covered costs.

Perhaps, however, this stele gives some indication of the speed at which the masons worked. At most, 20 days wages (and probably less, considering the possibility of inflation from the fifth to the fourth century) were paid for each stele. This would tend to indicate that the
SEG XII 87 (cont.)

directive δέκα ἡμερῶν contained in IG II^2^130 and restored in 2133 is to be interpreted to mean that the whole stele, including the relief, was to be finished within ten days.

Regardless of how we interpret the allotment for inscribing, i.e., whether we say that it included the relief or not, the public nature of this stele is quite clear: it is a law of the people stating that whoever kills someone trying to set up a tyranny shall be blameless. It also enjoins the Council of the Areopagus not to meet if the democracy has been overthrown and establishes penalties for anyone disobeying that injunction. It is then difficult to conclude that this stele is anything other than one of the official copies, and certainly not a "private copy of a public law," especially considering the political situation in Athens when the law was passed, the political significance of the law, and the subject of the relief. This inscription, therefore, is perhaps the most useful counter-example to Drerup's assertion that a relief is a sure indicator of a privately inscribed document.
IG II² 330 + 445  EM 7136 + 7218  0 Sq

Bibliography: IG II 5, 128 b; Drerup 244 ff.; Hesp. VIII 14, n. 1, 43-44; Merritt, Ath. Year 11-15, 78-9; REG 1942, 32; Henry, Prescripts 43.

Date: 335/4.

Measurements and preservation: Since the allotment for inscribing is not preserved, I did not take the measurements of this inscription, and they are not given in IG II².

Number of letters: first decree, 1288; second decree, 864; third decree, 912; total, 3604.

Publication formula:

[ἀναγράψαι ὅ]-

ἐ τὸ ὑπὸ τὸ Ψήφισμα τὸν γραμμα[τέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανείαν έν ο]-
thλής λιθήνη και τὸ τῆς θου[λῆς ὃ ἔδεικνε Ἀγασίας καὶ τὸ τοῦ]
dήμου ὃ ἐδείκνε Ἰπποκόρης καὶ [στήσαι εν Ἀκροπολίς, εἰς δὲ τ]-

ην ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦ[να τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου .. δ]-

ραχιὰς ἐν τῶν κατὰ Ψήφισμα[τα ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ].

Commentary: Three decrees, all in honor of Phyleus, son of Pausanias, of Oenoe, are contained on the stele: two decrees of the people, and one of the Boule. There is only the one publication formula for the whole stele; unfortunately the price is not preserved, but there is space for two letters (l. 27). The whole stele contains 3054 + X letters (Drerup's count), for which Drerup says that at
IG I² 2330 + 445 (cont.)

least 60 dr would have been spent for the inscribing, according to the hypothesized price scale. There is, however, no attested example of ἸΑ in an allotment formula; 60 dr are expressed with the word ἐξηκόντα. The first decree contains 1287 letters; Drerup suggests that perhaps ΔΔΔΔ be restored for the inscribing of the first decree alone. This, however, requires that the three deltas be crowded into two spaces. Furthermore, by confining the allotment to the first decree, he ignores the specific directive that the other decrees be included on the stele (ll. 25-6).

However, since the sum is not preserved, it is perhaps best not to rely very heavily on this inscription for an argument one way or another.
Bibliography: Koehler, Ath. Mitt. 1883, 211 ff.; IG II 5, 179 b; Wilhelm, Rh. Mus. LVI 1901, 583; Drerup, 242 ff.; photo in Lambrechts, Proxeniedecreten, pl. XIII; SEG XII 40, Pecirka, Enktesis, 70 ff.; Rhodes, Boule, see index; DeLaix, Proboleusis, see index; Henry, Prescripts, see index; Merritt, Ath. Year, 102.

Date: 325/4.

Measurements: h. 1.03 w. 0.41 at molding, 0.37 just below molding, 0.405 at the bottom th. 0.103 at molding, 0.083 below molding, 0.098 at bottom 1.h. 0.004-5 stoich. patt. 0.0091 x 0.0091.

Preservation: a fully preserved stele, except perhaps at the very bottom, which I could not see because it is encased in plaster. The inscribed surface, however, is complete, except that the last few lines are illegible from erosion.

Number of letters: First decree, 1029; second, 663; third, 167; fourth, 559; fifth, 712 + c. 195 = 907; total, c. 3316.

Publication formula:

ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ἔτος
e τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρωτανεῖαν
καὶ τοὺς ἑλλοὺς ἐπαίνους τοὺς γεγενημένους αὖ-
IG II² 360 (cont.)

τῷ ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν Ἀκροπόλει, εἰς ἐν τὴν ἀναγραφήν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν ΔΔΔ δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματ' ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δῆμῳ.

Commentary: The stele contains a series of decrees honoring Heraclides of Salamis for providing grain to Athens during the grain crisis of the 320's (see Isager-Hansen, pp. 200ff.). This was signal service deserving public praise and a stele on the Acropolis (Pecirka, 71). The most recent decree occurs first on the stele: it is the operative decree of the moment and contains the cost formula for the entire stele, which is the normal procedure for honorary decrees (Ditt, SIG³, p. 517). Only 30 dr are allotted for the inscribing of the stele, which contains about 3300 letters. Drerup maintains (p. 242 ff.) that 70 dr would have to have been allotted if the whole stele were to be inscribed; he contends that the allotment of 30 dr covered only the first decree (1043 letters).

Once again Drerup dismisses this inscription as a private copy of a public decree on the basis of the language and form of the decree—arguments too familiar by now to deserve repetition and refutation. Of more interest, he attempts to maintain that the state would not have included
on a stele all documents pertaining to Heraclides and furthermore, that all the honors (ἐπαινοῦς as opposed to actual psephismata and probouleumata) are already mentioned in the first two decrees on the stele. Therefore, he argues the remainder are superfluous. But the phrase καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαινοῦς (line 23) can just as easily (if not more easily) refer to actual decrees in which the honors are mentioned, that is, to all the previous decrees in honor of Heraclides. This is in fact the way Dittenberger, citing Koecher, interpreted it: "Voce latius patente ἐπαινοῦς utitur rogator, quia promiscue ψηφίσματα et προ-

βουλεύματα inciduntur."
Bibliography: IG II 186; Hartel II 161, III 123-5, 135 f.; Miller, De Decretis 44; Dittmar Coron. 68 ff. 79; Wilamowitz, Hermes XII 1887, 240 n. 1, Wien. Stud. XXIX 1907, 1; Drerup, 234 SEG XXI 301; Pecirka, Enktesis 72-4.

Date: The second decree dates to 322/1. The date of the first decree is not known—see Commentary.

Measurements: h. 0.378 w. 0.365 th. 0.13 l.h. 0.005 (first decree), 0.005-0.006 (second decree) stoich. patt. (first decree): 0.009 x 0.0095, (second decree): 0.008 x 0.0085.

Number of letters: First decree, 462 + X; second decree, 1248 + X; total, 1710.

Publication formula:

έναγρ[α] -

ψαί τόδε τό ψήφισμα εν στήληι λιθίνηι τού γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ στήλας εν Ἀκρ-

[ο]πόλει, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης [δ] -

οὗ ναι τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου : ΔΔ : δραχμὰς δ[ ] [κ]

[τῶν] κατὰ ψηφισματὰ ἀναλισχομένων τῷ [δ] -

[ἡμ]ωτ.

Commentary: This inscription is adduced by Drerup (p. 234) as a parallel to IG II² 109 (see above, p.31 and p.132), contains one complete publication formula with an
IG II²373 (cont.)

allotment for inscribing (11.9-15) and the beginning of another at the end of the second section (1.33). It is not, however, a real parallel. What Drerup calls an amendment is in fact another decree, with its own prescript. This second decree of ²373 was inscribed later than the first decree, by at least ten years. The second decree is firmly placed in 322/1. The first may be plausibly dated to sometime before 332/1 according to Dittmar (p. 79). The allotment of 20 dr also points to this date (see above, p. 84). Moreover, the second decree is cut by a different hand and was probably inscribed in place onto the upright stele. Finally, the end of the publication formula is not preserved in the second decree: we cannot say how much was allotted for it, if in fact anything was allotted. For these reasons, then, it is not parallel to ²109 and should not be adduced as evidence.
IG II²448 Glypta (Nat. Mus.) 1482 (0 briefly)

Bibliography: IG II 5 231 b; Lolling, Delt. Arx. 1892 58 ff.; Drerup, 238 ff.; Austin, Stoichedon Style, 39; Binneboessels #68; Svoronos, plate CVIII.

Date: The stele was erected in 318/7, the date of the second decree. The first decree is from 323/2. See commentary.

Measurements (from IG II²): h. 2.35 2. above 0.60, below 0.66 th. 0.30 l.h. 0.007.

Sculptural decoration: The high relief which crowns this complete stele of pentelic marble depicts Athena and a god (Zeus Soter?) standing in the left half of the composition, while a smaller Euphran, with his groom bringing up a horse, make up the right half.

Number of letters: First decree, 1353; second decree, 2103; total, 3456.

Publication formulae:

First decree:

ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμ[α ἐν στήλαις λ] -


ήμων.
Second decree:

νῦν δὲ ἡπειδὴ ὁ τε δήμος [κατελ]-

ηλθεὶς καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀ[πελή]-

φε, ἀγαθεῖ τὰχεὶ διδόχθαι τῷ δήμῳ. εἶναι τὰ [ς ὅψε]-

ἀς κυρίας Εὐφρονί πάσας, αἷς ἔτιμησεν αὐτὸν δ [δήμο]-

ς δ Ἀθηναίων, καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐγγόνοις, καὶ τὰς σ[τήλας]

tὰς καθαρευθέσας, ἐν αἷς αἱ ὅψεαι ἱσαν γεγ[ραμμέν]-

αί καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα, ἀναγράψαι καὶ ἀναθέται τ[ὸν γρα]-

μ ματέ α τῆς θουλῆς τῆς μὲν ἐν Ἀκροπόλει τὴν ὅπε πα[ρὰ τ]-

ὸν Δία τὸν Σωτῆρα καθάρισεν δ ἰδίμοις ἔψηφίσασσα [πρὸτε]-

ρ ον, προσαγαγράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν ἀ[μφοτ]-

έραις ταῖς στήλαις, συνεπιμεληθήναι δὲ τῆς ἀν[αγρ]-

αφῆς τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους τοὺς Εὐφρο[νος]

...........................

eἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν στηλῶν δοθήναι τὸν ταμιᾶν

τοῦ δήμου : [2: δρ<α>χμάς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ.

Commentary: The stelai contains two decrees in honor of Euphrone of Sicyon. The second decree, which is the later of the two, dating to 318/7, renews honors previously awarded to Euphrone and authorizes that two stelai be set up, since the two previous stelai in honor of
IG II² 448 (cont.)

Euphron had been destroyed by the oligarchy of 321-18. The first decree on the stele contains the original honors awarded to Euphron, who had driven a Macedonian-supported oligarchy from Sicyon and had brought Sicyon into an alliance with Athens at the start of the Lamia war. Euphron was clearly an important person, whom the Athenians wanted to keep on their side: they needed all the support they could get at that time. There are good reasons therefore for the state to have honored him, and then to have voted to re-erect the stele after it was destroyed by the oligarchy.

The interpretation of the publication formulae presents problems. First of all, both decrees have 50 dr allotted for inscribing. Does this imply that 100 dr were to be paid, that is, 50 dr for the more recent decree, and another 50 dr for the previous decree whose stele had been destroyed? I think not; it is more likely that the sum in the first decree was simply copied verbatim from the archival copy, and only 50 dr were paid for the inscribing of the whole stele: the formula in the second decree does, after all, say ἐὰς ὀὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στῆλης and not ἐὰς ὀὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τοῦ ἔπεσοματος. However, it is also specified in each decree that two stelai were to be set up. Were 50 dr allotted for each stele, or were the 50 dr meant
IG II² 448 (cont.)

to pay for both? It is possible that the words etς ἔκατερα, or something similar was left out, as Drerup concluded (p. 230): other decrees, both from the fourth century and later (²204, 338, 648, 847, and other later examples) usually specify that the sum is for the inscribing of each stele. 50 dr could not have been sufficient to carve and inscribe two large stelai, even without reliefs. As it is, the surviving stele has a high relief on it. It is unlikely that 50 dr would cover the carving of the stele and relief (see above, p. 42).

The alternative is to assume that the state gave 50 dr toward the expenses of inscribing, but did not assume the whole cost, and that relatives and friends of Euphron were expected to contribute the rest. This is, in fact, specifically enjoined in the decree (lines 72-3):

συνεπιμεληθήναι δὲ τῆς ἀν[αγρ] -
αφῆς τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους τοὺς Θηρο[νος]

Drerup's treatment of this inscription is highly speculative and dubious. He contends that the sum in the first decree is a mistake: since the first decree has only 1360 letters, only 30 dr should have been allotted. The mason must have made a mistake. Drerup suggests that when a decree was passed it was put into the archives, but with
left blank. Later, when a private citizen (in this case the relatives) wanted to have a copy of the decree inscribed, he would go to the archives, get a copy, and have a mason inscribe it. The mason would have to add in the numerals for the price, either from the original stone (in this case destroyed), or by guessing, or by using the allotment of the second decree as an analogy, as Drerup suggests occurred with this stele (i.e., 50 dr were paid for the latest decree, therefore, 50 dr must have been paid for the first decree). This is not only so hypothetical and speculative as to be useless as an explanation, it is unlikely. The fact is that the overall responsibility for the inscribing remained with the secretary of the Boule (lines 68-9). If the price was determined by law, and the number of letters calculated in the Boule, or beforehand, and the price appeared in the probouleuma, as seems quite likely (see Billheimer, AJA XLII, 457), this could not have happened, and a blank could not have been left in the archival copy. A mistake by the mason is also unlikely in this case: it would not be easy to confuse fifty dr (Γ) with thirty dr (ΔΔΔ).

This inscription is very important precisely because it reveals that 50 dr were allotted for the inscribing of the original decree of 323/2. This
IG II² 448 (cont.)

presumably covered all or most of the cost (if 50 dr were allotted for each stele). Five years later 50 dr are again allotted, but this time for both decrees. Perhaps this was the maximum amount the state was permitted to allot at the time. It probably would not be enough for the extra letters, and certainly would not be enough for the relief, therefore the friends and relatives are enjoined to help with the inscribing.
Bibliography: IG II 167; Drerup 240; SEG XIII 42, XIX 58, XXI 333, XXV 78. Photograph in Maier, Gr. Mauerbaunschriiften (but too small to see letters).

Date: 307/6.

Measurements: h. 1.83 2. 0.98 th. 0.175 1.h. 0.007 in decree, 0.005–6 in suggraphai.

Preservation: The top is preserved, and both edges. See Hesp. IX #9 66–72 for a new fragment. The surface of the stone is badly weathered.

Number of letters: decree, 2338; suggraphai, 5680; total, 8018.

Publication formula:

Commentary: The stele contains the specifications for the rebuilding of the long walls of Athens, and the decree enjoining that they be submitted. Drerup maintained (p. 240) that the price could surely refer only to the decree, and that the inscribing of the specifications was probably paid for by the architects. There is, however, no indication that the architects are to pay; on the
IG II² 463 (cont.)

contrary, the paymaster is simply directed by the usual formula to disburse 50 dr for this purpose "the inscribing of the stele," which naturally means the whole stele.

Measurements (from SEG): Fr. A: h. 0.40 w. 0.36 th. 0.09. Fr. B.: h. 0.51 w. 0.38 th. 0.09. stoich. patt. 0.009 x 0.009 l.h. 0.005.

Preservation: Two sizeable fragments are preserved. Fragment A preserves the pediment with acroteria. The sides and back of both fragments are preserved. There is no join between the two fragments, so the space between them is determined by the amount of taper, and is likely to be sizeable.

Number of letters: 2477 + X.

Quality of lettering: Quite poor. Many of the strokes of the letters do not meet; the general impression given is that the stele was inscribed hastily and carelessly.

Publication formula:

IG II² 505

[τὸν τα]μίαν τοῦ δήμου [: Δ]ΔΔΔ : δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ
[κατὰ ψηφίσματὰ αναλισκομένων τῷ δήμῳ.]

Commentary: The decree, which honors two Ionians, originally contained at least 2500 letters. This is too many for Schöne's price scale, if 40 dr are read in the publication formula. Drerup, therefore, suggested a reading of 50 dr (p. 250); but this suggestion is impossible for the reading to be 50 dr, 5 deltas would have to be read, which is absolutely unparalleled.
Bibliography: IG II 297; SEG XV 297; Imagines #73.

Date: 299/8.

Measurements: h. 0.785 w. 0.29 at top, 0.315 at bottom th. ca. 0.075, i.h. 0.005 stoich. patt. 0.0125 x 0.011.

Preservation: Both edges and the back (rough-picked) are preserved.

Number of letters: 750

Publication formula:

άν-

αγράψας δὲ τὸδὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ-
ν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ κρυτανε-

θαν ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στή-

σαι ἐν Ἀκροπόλει, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἄν-

αγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸ-

ν ἐξεταστὴν καὶ τοὺς τριτυά-

ρχους ἠΔΔ ὑ δραχμὰς.

Quality of lettering: The letters are not particularly well-formed: the strokes often are not parallel, and they do not always meet. The circular letters are done with straight strokes. The inscription is, however, well spaced and carefully set out.
IG II² 641 (cont.)

Commentary: This inscription is one of two (the other being ²657) inscriptions with a 20 dr allotment occurring after 330. It was inscribed in a time of political change; the price scale goes out of use in the next year (298/7), with a brief resurgence in the late 280's. See Table 4 and discussion (pp. 75-6 above).
Bibliography: IG II 314, II 5, 314; Drerup, 249; Imagines #78.

Measurements: h. 1.88 w. 0.54 at top. 0.60 at bottom th. 0.15 l.h. 0.006 stoich. patt. 0.0135 x 0.0135.

Date: 283/2 (see Merritt, Hist. 26 1977, 173).

Number of letters: 2942.

Publication formula:


Commentary: The decree has far too many letters for 20 dr, according to Drerup (p. 249). He suggests that either the mason made a mistake or misunderstood what he was supposed to inscribe, or that the price scale was no longer really in use. The latter suggestion is probably closer to the truth: by 283, the price scale had changed considerably: inscriptions that had once cost 20 dr were now costing only 10 dr; in addition there were far fewer decrees with a specific price allotted in the publication formula--most used the vague phrase τὸ ἰδίον γράμματος ἀναλισκομένων τῇ δήμῳ.
IG II^2 657

(see p. 83)—this is noted by S. Burstein in his reconsideration of II^2 808 (CSCA v. 12, 39-50), who however accepts Drerup's thesis concerning the number of letters as the sole determinant of price (p. 44 and n. 34). It is likely that only 10 dr or 20 dr were allotted for inscribing during this period (283-0): 10 dr for shorter inscriptions and 20 dr for long inscriptions, of which we only possess this particular one.
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