



# TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer  
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 18, 2003

2003

HOLZHAUSEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

# TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

**Band 18**

**2003**

**H O L Z H A U S E N**

**Herausgegeben von:**

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

**Gemeinsam mit:**

Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme und Hans Taeuber

**Unter Beteiligung von:**

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

**Redaktion:**

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Bettina Leiminger, Georg Rehrenböck  
und Patrick Sängler

**Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:**

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1,  
A-1010 Wien. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.  
Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

**Auslieferung:**

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien  
maggoschitz@holzhausen.at  
Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in  
Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 2004 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

**Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der  
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind  
im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien. Herausgeber:  
Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,  
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.  
e-mail: [hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at](mailto:hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at) oder [Bernhard.Palme@onb.ac.at](mailto:Bernhard.Palme@onb.ac.at)  
Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien.  
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

## I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Herbert G r a ß l (Salzburg): Neue Beiträge zu den Stadtrechtsfragmenten aus Lauriacum .....	1
Demokritos K a l t s a s (Heidelberg): Aus den Archiven der Königlichen Schreiber Peteimuthes und Harchebis .....	5
Anne K o l b (Zürich): Caracalla und Raetien (Tafel 1–4) .....	21
Anne K o l b (Zürich): Phoebiana — ein Vorschlag zur Namengebung von Kastellen .....	31
Elizabeth K o s m e t a t o u (Leuven): Reassessing IG II <sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A: <i>Kathairesis</i> or <i>Eksetasmos</i> ? .....	33
Nico K r u i t (Leiden), Klaas A. W o r p (Leiden/Amsterdam): Eine Hausmiete aus der Zeit des Kaisers Mauricius (Tafel 17) .....	47
Nico K r u i t (Leiden), Klaas A. W o r p (Leiden/Amsterdam): Zur Auflösung der Kürzung ἐν Ἀρ/ in den Papyri .....	55
Peter K r u s c h w i t z (Berlin): Zu republikanischen Carmina Latina Epigraphica (III) (Tafel 5–7) .....	59
Ariel L e w i n (Potenza): The Egyptian <i>cunei</i> .....	73
Christa M a y e r (Wien): Ephesos: Die Schrift der „Großen Spenderliste“ aus der Zeit des Tiberius (IvE V 1687) (Tafel 8–12) .....	77
Mischa M e i e r (Bielefeld): Das Ende des Cremutius Cordus und die Bedingungen für Historiographie in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit .....	91
Noemi P o g e t K e r n (Genève): Encore un reçu pour l'impôt du διάγραφον .....	129
Claudia R u g g e r i (Wien): Zur Lokalisierung der elischen Landschaft Akroreia .....	135
Roland S t e i n a c h e r (Wien): Von Würmern bei lebendigem Leib zerfressen ... und die Läusesucht <i>Phtheiriasis</i> . Ein antikes Strafmotiv und seine Rezeptionsgeschichte .....	145
Meret S t r o t h m a n n (Bochum): Asebie und die Athener Jugend im 5. Jh. v. Chr. ....	167
Hans T a e u b e r (Wien): Graffiti vom Monte Iato (Tafel 13–16) .....	189
J. David T h o m a s (Durham): The <i>subscriptions</i> in PSI IX 1026 and P.Oxy. XLVII 3364 .....	201
Kurt T o m a s c h i t z (Wien): Iuliosebaste in Kilikien .....	207
Ruprecht Z i e g l e r (Duisburg): Kaiser Tetricus und der senatorische Adel .....	223
Franziska B e u t l e r, Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): <i>Annona epigraphica Austriaca 2003</i> :	
Text .....	233
Index .....	248
Konkordanzen .....	251

Bemerkungen zu Papyri XVI (Korr. Tyche 490–504) .....	255
Buchbesprechungen .....	261
Anneliese B i e d e n k o p f - Z i e h n e r, Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais. Formeln und Topoi der Urkunden, Aussagen der Urkunden, Indices (Göttinger Orientalforschungen IV. Reihe Ägypten 41), Wiesbaden 2001 (H. Förster: 261) — Lorenzo B r a c c e s i, <i>L'enigma Dorieo</i> (Hesperia 11), Rom 1999 (P. Siewert: 262) — Sarah J. C l a c k s o n, <i>Coptic and Greek Texts relating to the Hermopolite Monastery of Apa Apollo</i> , Griffith Institute Monographs, Oxford 2000 (H. Förster: 262) — Demokritos K a l t s a s, <i>Dokumentarische Papyri des 2. Jh. v. Chr. aus dem Herakleopolites (P.Heid. VIII)</i> (Veröff. aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung, NF. Phil.-Hist. Kl. 10), Heidelberg 2001 (C. La'da: 264) — Wolfgang K u l l m a n n, <i>Realität, Imagination und Theorie. Kleine Schriften zu Epos und Tragödie</i> , Stuttgart 2002 (B. Leiminger: 268) — Bernhard L i n k e, Michael S t e m m l e r (Hrsg.), <i>Mos maiorum. Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik</i> (Historia Einzelschriften 141), Stuttgart 2000 (G. Dobesch: 268) — Ioan P i s o, <i>Die Inschriften</i> , in: Werner Jobst (Hrsg.), <i>Das Heiligtum des Jupiter Optimus Maximus auf dem Pfaffenberg/Carnuntum I</i> (Der römische Limes in Österreich 41), Wien 2003 (F. Beutler: 272) — Hans-Albert R u p p r e c h t (Hrsg.), <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, Bd. 24 (Nr. 15875–16340)</i> , Wiesbaden 2003 (A. Paphomas: 274) — Christoph S c h ä f e r, <i>Eumenes von Kardia und der Kampf um die Macht im Alexanderreich</i> (FAH 9), Frankfurt am Main 2002 (P. Sänger: 277) — Hans Martin S c h e n k e, <i>Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittellägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Schøyen)</i> , Oslo 2001 (H. Förster: 280) — Phillip V. S t a n l e y, <i>The Economic Reforms of Solon</i> (Pharos. Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike 11), St. Katharinen 1999 (P. Siewert: 281) — Strabon, <i>Geographica</i> Bd. 1: Prolegomena, Buch I–IV. übers. u. eingel. v. Stefan R a d t, Göttingen 2002 (M. Rathmann: 283) — Christian W a l l n e r, <i>Soldatenkaiser und Sport</i> (Grazer Altertumskundliche Studien 4), Frankfurt am Main 1997 (P. Sänger: 286)	
Index (B. Leiminger) .....	289
Eingelange Bücher .....	293
Tafeln 1–17	

Reassessing IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A: *Kathairesis* or *Eksetasmos*?<sup>1</sup>

The interpretation of the fragmentary, partially published IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A, has been no easy task for scholars, all of whom have plausibly associated it with Lykourgos' reforms in the 330's BC but still debate on the particulars including its meaning. This article will take a fresh look at the evidence by reviewing the original stele's contents and some of its restorations, and by placing it in the context of similar surviving documents from the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

The four fragments were probably first associated with the same stele by A. M. Woodward whose notes Diane Harris used for her 1992 conservative republication of the inscription. He also joined a fifth piece, the unpublished E.M. 4619, to the known pieces<sup>2</sup>. Harris also raised some doubts about Kirchner's restorations, especially of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498, some of which are indeed bold and could be accepted at best as *exempli gratia*<sup>3</sup>. Nevertheless, other restorations, several of which Harris chose not to accept, are fairly certain given that standard formulas are used throughout the inventory.

The contents of this tantalizingly fragmentary document make at least one thing clear, and this is that it consisted of two parts: first came a list of *stelai*, all probably dating to the last decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498A, ll. 1–22). They were issued by the two boards of treasurers of Athena and of the Other Gods and were in all likelihood inventory lists or accounts. The list of inscriptions is followed by a group of dedications and heirlooms ([τάδε χρήματ?]α καὶ κει[μήλια]) including presumably bronze statues (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498A, ll. 23–41; B, ll. 42–81; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1499; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1500A, B; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1501A). No reference to the location of these items survives, but

<sup>1</sup> Thanks are due to Antonio Chavez y Reino and Willy Clarysse for discussing with me problems related to this paper.

In discussing IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A I am mainly following Kirchner's text although I have reservations about some of his restorations. At the same time I find Harris' republication of the text too conservative because it rejects restorations that are certain, a fact that was first noted by Chaniotis. Cf. D. Harris, *Bronze Statues on the Athenian Akropolis: The Evidence of a Lycurgan Inventory*, *AJA* 96 (1992) 637–652; SEG 42 (1992) Nr. 128.; A. Chaniotis, *Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion* 1992, *Kernos* 9 (1996) 374, Nr. 90, where additional restorations are proposed; D. Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues, Shattered Illusions: Mimesis and Bronze Body Parts on the Akropolis*, in: C. C. Mattusch, A. Brauer, S. E. Knudsen (Hrsg.), *From the Parts to the Whole*, Volume 1: *Acta of the 13<sup>th</sup> International Bronze Congress, Cambridge Massachusetts, May 28–June 1, 1996*, Portsmouth, RI 2000, 135–141, where none of Chaniotis' comments and concerns are addressed. Tracy has convincingly argued that the stele in question was produced by his "Cutter of IG II<sup>2</sup> 334" who was active from ca. 345 to ca. 320 BC. Cf. S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters from 340 to 290 BC*, Berkeley 1995, 85.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 639, Nr. 7, 9.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498; Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 646.

Harris has made a convincing case for their having once been set up on the Akropolis where at least one piece of the stele was discovered<sup>4</sup>. However, her further suggestion to narrow down the exact setting for some of the sculptures, associating the statues of children with the shrine of Artemis Brauronia cannot stand to scrutiny. All children's statues that are mentioned in the inventory are those of boys, and, as Chaniotis has rightly observed, one would expect girls<sup>5</sup>. It is also obvious from the text that several items were damaged to varying degrees which led Harris to propose that the inventory under discussion lists items destined for the melting pot (καθαίρεσις)<sup>6</sup>. Taking note of the state of preservation of the text, as well as the fact that parts of it appear to be inconsistent with the process of "deaccession" Mattusch observed that the purpose of the stele is no longer evident and proposed that IG Π<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A is an ordinary inventory of statues and *stelai* that existed in the Sanctuary of Athena in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC<sup>7</sup>. Decades earlier D. Burr-Thompson made a case for interpreting the inventory in question as a list of objects, among which statues that had suffered as a result of robber activity<sup>8</sup>.

A closer look at the text suggests that both Thompson and Mattusch's interpretations have probably merit, and we must therefore reassess the implications of this important, puzzling document which may reflect the situation on the Akropolis in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. The first 22 lines of IG Π<sup>2</sup> 1498A list at least 26 *stelai*<sup>9</sup> of varying sizes, and they are reproduced below with the restorations I accept, among which a few of my own:

IG Π<sup>2</sup> 1498 A, lines 1–22

stoichedon 40

[.....±18 .....]ησ . θ [.....±18 .....]  
 [.....±17 .....] χαμα[ι . ]σι [.....±15 .....]  
 [.....±14 ..... τῶ]ν ταμιῶν τῶν [.....±14 .....]  
 [.....±13 ..... τῶ]ν ταμιῶν τῶν ἄλ[λων. . . ±10 .....]  
 5 [.....±12 ..... τῶ]ν ταμιῶν [τ]ῶν τῆ[ς θεοῦ . . . ±9 . . .]

<sup>4</sup> There is no information on the archaeological context of the other fragments.

<sup>5</sup> Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 643, 645; Chaniotis, *Epigraphic Bulletin* 1992 (s. n. 1) 374, Nr. 90. On girls performing as bears at Brauron see T. C. W. Stinton, *Iphigeneia and the Bears of Brauron*, CQ 24 (1976) 11–13; M. L. Bernhard, *Les fillettes à Brauron*, Meander 34 (1979) 283–294; C. Montepaone, *L' Arkteia à Brauron*, SSR 3 (1979) 343–364; L. Kahil, *Le sanctuaire de Brauron et la religion grecque*, CRAI 33 (1988) 799–813; K. Waldner, *Kulträume von Frauen in Athen: das Beispiel der Artemis Brauronia*, in: Th. Späth, B. Wagner-Hasel (Hrsg.), *Frauenwelten in der Antike: Geschlechterordnung und weibliche Lebenspraxis: mit 162 Quellentexten und Bildquellen*, Stuttgart 2000, 53–81.

<sup>6</sup> Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 637–652; D. Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 135–141.

<sup>7</sup> C. C. Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes. The Art and Craft of Greek and Roman Statuary*, Ithaca 1996, 101–102.

<sup>8</sup> Harris has not considered Thompson's theory. Cf. D. B. Thompson, *The Golden Nikai Reconsidered*, Hesperia 13 (1944) 203–205.

<sup>9</sup> At least 26 *stelai* are mentioned in the text, rather than 17 as Mattusch suggests. Cf. Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 7) 101.



- [ . . . . ±8 . . . . ἐπ' Ἀν]τιγένους· στήλη πλ[αγία χαμαὶ παρα-]  
 [δοδομένη ὑπὸ] τῶν τε{ρ}τάρων ἀρχῶ[ν . . . . . 12 . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . στ]ήλη ταμιῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ Δ[ιοκλέους ἄρχον-]  
 [τος χα]μαὶ πλαγία· στήλη ταμιῶν τῶν [ἄλλων ἐπὶ Γλ-]  
 10 [αυκίπ?]που ἄρχοντος χαμαὶ πλαγία· σ[τήλη ταμιῶν τῆ-]  
 [ς θεο]ῦ ἐπὶ Διοκλέους· στηλίδια τα[μιῶν τῶν ἄλλων κ-]  
 [αὶ τῶ]ν ταμιῶν τῆς θ[ε]οῦ ἔχομεν, ὄντα [δύο . . . . ±8 . . . . , τ-]  
 [ρί]τον ταμιῶν τῆς [θε]οῦ, [τέ]ταρτον [ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, π-]  
 [έμ]πτον ταμιῶν τῆς θε[οῦ], ἔκτον τα[μιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, ἔβδo-]  
 15 [μον] ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, ὄγ[δ]οον ταμ[ιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, ἔνατο-]  
 [ν ταμ]ιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, δέκατον ταμ[ιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, ἐνδέκα-]  
 [τον τ]αμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, δωδέκατ[ον ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ, τρ-]  
 [ίτον] καὶ δέκατον ταμιῶν τῆς [θεοῦ, τέταρτον καὶ δέ-]  
 [κατον] ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ· διάλι[θον . . . . . ±14 . . . . . ]  
 20 [ . . τῶν] ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ ἐπὶ [ . . . . ±11 . . . . . · στήλη ταμ-]  
 [ιῶν τῆ]ς θεο[ῦ κ]αὶ τῶν ἄλλων [ . . . . . ±19 . . . . . ]  
 [οντος· σ]τήλ[η τ]αμιῶν τῶν ἄ[λλων . . . . ±8 . . . . ]ε[ . . . ±7 . . . . ]

6–7: Kirchner's restoration, which I retain here, is plausible given the nature of the documents issued by the treasurers. Harris remains sceptical about it without citing any reasons.

7: τε{ρ}τάρων: There is a superfluous ρ. Kirchner restored Glaukippos as the archon of the year the four administrators published the stele in question (410/409 BC)<sup>10</sup>. The restoration is possible, though uncertain, given the fact that the text preserves references to *stelai* dating to the last years of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, and there is enough space for the name of that archon. Following Harris I have deemed it prudent not to adopt it.

9–10: Kirchner's restoration of the name of the archon Glaukippos (410/409 BC) here is probably correct, but Harris doubts it<sup>11</sup>.

11–12: Woodward convincingly disputed Kirchner's restored στηλίδια [ἡ]λε[φαντωμένα], while Harris saw a vertical *hasta* of Kirchner's presumed restored *eta*, as well as a *lambda* (IA)<sup>12</sup>. The letters are not preserved well, but the traces that Harris saw, and which are confirmed by my own reading of the squeeze suggest to me the following restoration: στηλίδια τα[μιῶν τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τῶ]ν ταμιῶν τῆς θ[ε]οῦ. The context agrees as well: a group of fourteen small *stelai* follows, most of which are clearly stated to have been commissioned by the Treasurers of Athena, while others were issued by the Treasurers of the Other Gods.

13–19: Harris doubts Kirchner's restorations, even though they are as good as certain: the context, structure of the text, as well as the number of missing letters allow us to restore all *lacunae* with certainty.

<sup>10</sup> On the clause τάδε παρέδωσαν οἱ τέτταρες ἀρχαί see IG I<sup>3</sup> 325, l. 2 (422/421 BC).

<sup>11</sup> Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 646.

<sup>12</sup> Woodward apud Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 639, n. 7. It is indeed hard to imagine how and why a stele would be inlaid with ivory.

Most of the presumably larger *stelai*<sup>13</sup> were placed oddly: χαμαὶ πλαγία, a description that Harris renders in English as “lying on the ground”, but which is more accurately translated as “on the ground, sideways” or “slanting, on the ground”. This clause can probably be juxtaposed to the clause ἐν πλινθείῳ ὀρθία, and we may imagine these inscriptions perhaps removed from their original base and lined up against a wall sideways, or indeed placed slanting against the wall much in the same manner that surviving large inventories are stored in modern museums<sup>14</sup>. Conversely, the presumably smaller fourteen στήλιδια were not placed in the same way, judging from the fact that they are merely listed without any further reference as to the manner in which they were positioned.

The material of which these *stelai* were made has also been the subject of some discussion. Harris, interpreting the entire inventory as an example of *kathairesis*, suggested that they may have been made of bronze<sup>15</sup>. Regrettably, the surviving text does not supply any information on the material of which the majority of the objects listed were made. As Chaniotis has observed, surviving portions of the text preserve references to the fact that certain objects were indeed made of bronze. This would lead then to the logical conclusion that the inventory lists votives that were made of a variety of materials which the officials found important to differentiate. In this context, the inscriptions listed at the beginning of the preserved portion of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498 were almost certainly made of stone rather than bronze, as Harris suggests<sup>16</sup>.

Bronze *stelai* are epigraphically attested, and references to them have survived in the ancient literature, but they appear to have been reserved for special occasions. The bronze copy of an important decree dating to 266/265 BC and honoring Ptolemy II for his assistance to Athens during the Chremonidean War, was reportedly set up on the Akropolis, next to the Temple of Athena Polias<sup>17</sup>. Three Delian inventories also record that a bronze decree granting *proxenia* to king Nikokreon of Cyprus in the late fourth century BC, was among the holdings of the sanctuary’s Chalkotheke; it may have been sponsored and dedicated to the sanctuary by the honoree himself<sup>18</sup>. Evidence

<sup>13</sup> I am assuming that the term στήλη denoted a normal-size inscription, while στήλιδιον referred to small-sized *stelai*. On the various uses of diminutive in inventory lists see C. Prêtre, *Imitation et miniature. Étude de quelques suffixes dans le vocabulaire délien de la parure*, BCH 121 (1997) 673–680.

<sup>14</sup> For a random example see R. Hamilton, *Treasure Map. A Guide to the Delian Inventories*, Ann Arbor 1999, 182, illustrating ID 154 side B. Several large Delian inventories are stored in the store-rooms of the Museum of Delos placed sideways on shelves or slanting against the wall.

<sup>15</sup> Harris, *Bronze Statues* (s. n. 1) 639.

<sup>16</sup> Chaniotis, *Epigraphic Bulletin 1992* (s. n. 1) 374, Nr. 90. Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498 A col. I, ll. 6, 8–10; 1498 B col. II, l. 66; 1501 A col. II, l. 13.

<sup>17</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 686, ll. 42–44. Cf. H. Hauben, *Arsinoe II et la politique extérieure de l'Égypte*, in: E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, W. van Gucht (Hrsg.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1982* (Studia Hellenistica 27), Leuven 1983, 99–127; C. Habicht, *Athens and the Ptolemies*, *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992) 68–90.

<sup>18</sup> IG XI (2) 196, ll. 7–8 (300–275 BC); IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 87 (273 BC); IG XI (2) 219, B, l. 87 (ca. 265 BC). Cf. IG XI (2) 161, B, ll. 54, 90 (279 BC). Cf. also ID 1409, B,

from the ancient literature also corroborates the picture that the epigraphical record illustrates: Thoukydides mentions that the Athenians signed an important hundred-year treaty with Argos, Mantinea, and Elis in 420 BC. Three identical stone *stelai* bearing the text of the decree were set up on the Akropolis of Athens, in the Temple of Apollo at Argos, and in the temple of Zeus at Mantinea respectively. A fourth copy of the same decree in bronze was jointly set up by all contracting parties at Olympia<sup>19</sup>. According to Aristotle, annual ephebic lists were similarly set up in his time outside the Bouleuterion, next to the Eponymoi Monument<sup>20</sup>.

Even though certainty is impossible, it would appear that at least the larger *stelai* mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A belong to the same class of inscriptions as the inventory lists that have been published in IG I<sup>3</sup>, the overwhelming majority of which was found on the Akropolis, presumably not far from their original context. Additionally it may be possible to identify several of these latter texts with some of the inscriptions that are mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A, although certainty is impossible because of the decree's fragmentary state and selective information. It is therefore hard to imagine why the two boards of treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods would go to the significant expense of publishing both stone and bronze inventories every year and set up both copies on the Akropolis<sup>21</sup>. Both the surviving epigraphical record and what is known about their functions suggests that both boards employed writing in the administration of their duties, especially of the funds of Athena and the Other Gods, as well as the state of the gods' holdings in votive offerings<sup>22</sup>. The slanting stones that were placed on the ground, were probably then large stone inventory lists of past years, rather than pieces of relatively thin bronze which might have been piled up one on top of the other on the ground, and the information provided by IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498A on their date probably reflects their preambles that included the Athenian archon's name. From time to time the treasurers may also have issued dedicatory plaques recording extraordinary expenses or dedications. A surviving early such bronze tablet, originally about 1.75 m. in height, was commissioned by the Treasurers of Athena; it

---

col. II, ll. 113–114 mentioning another bronze decree granting *proxenia* to king Pnytagoras of Salamis.

<sup>19</sup> Thoukydides, 5.47. A fragment of the Athenian copy has been discovered. Cf. IG I<sup>3</sup> 83.

<sup>20</sup> Aristotle Ath.Pol. 53.4. For further references to bronze *stelai* see Demosthenes Phil. 3.41.5; Deinarchos Arist. 24.8; Plutarch Vitae Dec. Orat. 834B. I have not included a discussion of the evidence of the Roman period.

<sup>21</sup> Even though Kirchner's restorations are conjectural it is not impossible that the larger *stelai* were indeed inventory lists of consecutive years representing the last ten or fifteen years of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC. At any rate, he convincingly interpretes the stele in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498A, ll. 6–7 as a *paradosis* document.

<sup>22</sup> The duties of the treasurers of Athena were more extensive. For overviews of the functions of these two boards see D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion*, Oxford 1995, 11–19; T. Linders, *The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions*, Meisenheim am Glan 1975, 66–71; Hamilton, *Treasure Map* (s. n. 14) 247–276; J. P. Sickinger, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*, Chapel Hill, London 1999, 39–41, 66–67.

recorded the “gathering together” of bronze objects sometime in ca. 550 BC<sup>23</sup>. Finally, the fourteen στηλίδια mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498 may also have been smaller inventories that were probably made of the same material (stone) as the larger ones preceding them in the list.

The position of the *stelai* group in the text may also be significant in our attempt to draw conclusions as to the material of some of these. If this stele were indeed a *kathairesis* of bronze objects, including decrees, there would be little logic in separating the inscriptions from the rest of the items that were destined for the melting pot and even placing the groups under separate headings. This is inconsistent with what we know from surviving inventories that have been convincingly associated with the process of *kathairesis*<sup>24</sup>. Indeed, the group that follows the *stelai* is mixed and includes statues, at least a lustral basin, and an oinochoe (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1500B, col. I, ll. 31-32; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1501A, col. II (?), l. 1). This second group starts under the heading [---]α καὶ κει[μήλια τῶν ταμιῶ]ν τῆς [θεοῦ]. Kirchner restored [τάδ’ ἀναθήματ]α in the first *lacuna*, which, along with his other conjectures would bring l. 23 to an unlikely length of 42 letters:

[τάδ’ ἀναθήματ]α [κ]αὶ κει[μήλια τῶν ταμιῶ]ν τῆς [θεοῦ· παί-]  
[ς χῆνα ἔχει ἐπ]ὶ τῆς [ἀριστερᾶς, οὗ ὁ] μηρὸς ὁ σ[---]

Taking note of this problem Harris proposed the following version based on her own study of the inscription:

[τάδ’ ἀγάλματ]α καὶ κει[μήλια τῶν ταμιῶ]ν τῆς [θεο-]  
[ῶ . . . . . ±14 . . . . .] | τῆς | [ . . . . . ±11 . . . . .] μηρὸς ΟΣ [ . ±3 . . ]

Her restored [τάδ’ ἀγάλματ]α was based on the assumption that the majority of the objects that follow were larger-sized statues<sup>25</sup>. In my opinion, the state of preservation of the stone under discussion, missing both its ends, makes the restoration of the text in many respects an exercise in speculation. For this reason the rest of Kirchner’s conjectures in this and the following lines are possible but by no means certain. Depending then on where we wish to end l. 23, several restorations are possible, and even though I cannot pretend to hold the solution to this problem, the clause [τάδε χρήματ]α καὶ κει[μήλια] (possessions and heirlooms) seems preferable to me, seeing that *ex votis* that were under the care of the two boards of treasurers are sometimes referred to in inscriptions as *χρήματα* of the gods<sup>26</sup>.

23 IG I<sup>3</sup> 510. Cf. A. Raubitschek, L. H. Jefferey, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC* (SIA 7), Chicago 1999, 352; Sickinger, *Public Records* (s. n. 22) 40; Harris, *Treasures* (s. n. 22) 14, both of whom list earlier bibliography.

<sup>24</sup> For a review of the existing evidence see below.

<sup>25</sup> The clause ἀγάλματα καὶ κειμήλια appears in Philo Virt. 5.8.

<sup>26</sup> Χρήματα is also used to describe votives in a *paradosis* of the Treasurers of Athena dated to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. Cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1492B, ll. 98-99. The clause χρήματα καὶ κειμήλια is also found in Philo Legat. 232.4; Plutarch Pomp. 32.8; and Kallinikos Vita Sanct. Hyp. 52.6.4.

The interpretation of the rest of the text is equally problematic, and once more Kirchner's restoration is highly conjectural at points. It lists an unknown as yet number of objects that are described in some detail: there are an odd lustral basin and oinochoe, but also more than thirty presumed statues of bearded and beardless men<sup>27</sup>, youths, and children, several of which were holding objects or attributes that are often missing<sup>28</sup>. Details of their appearance seem to be related mostly, though not exclusively, to their state of completeness or disrepair. Unlike Harris, I do not get the impression that the inventory under discussion lists "body parts" and statues that are so broken that "they were lying on the ground like piles of corpses". A number of them stood on a base. Nor is it absolutely certain that all were necessarily large bronze figures that were manufactured considerably earlier than the date of the decree and were falling apart<sup>29</sup>. What is certain is that, if these dedications were set up in the sanctuary of Athena, they were probably produced after 480 BC, postdate the Persian destruction of Athens, and could therefore be 150 years old at most. We know of older statues that successfully braved time and the elements and were never removed from their original position in sanctuaries<sup>30</sup>. The language of the text does not always allow us to draw conclusions as to the types, iconography, and meaning of the dedications in question, but a closer analysis, comparison with similar surviving documents, as well as the historical setting may lead us to reconstruct the wider picture in general terms.

The first question that has to be addressed then is what sort of figures are listed. Surviving descriptions can be a guide to some extent; we may be fairly certain, however, that the term *ἀνδριάς* describes a statue of slightly under- to over-life size. Harris sees the term as an additional iconographic marker, stating that it cannot refer to deities and can therefore only be used interchangeably with the term *ἄγαλμα* when the subject is human<sup>31</sup>. As a matter of fact, *ἀνδριάς* is a well-attested term referring to any statue, human or divine<sup>32</sup>. Similarly, its derivative *ἀνδριαντοποιός* signified

<sup>27</sup> The correct descriptions in Greek are obviously *ἀνδριάς γενειῶν* and *ἀνδριάς ἀγένειος* respectively, rather than *ἀνδριάς γενεῖος* and *ἀνδριάς ἀγενεῖον* in Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 136.

<sup>28</sup> See for example IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498B, l. 78. Harris estimates at least 25 statues, but these are associated with IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498 alone. Combined references from the entire stele refer to many more than that. Cf. Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 136.

<sup>29</sup> Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 135–137.

<sup>30</sup> These include famous works of art that were preserved in their original setting for centuries, to the end of antiquity.

<sup>31</sup> Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 136. Cf. also Prêtre, *Imitation et miniature* (s. n. 13) 674.

<sup>32</sup> Examples are too numerous to list, but I will only cite *ἀνδριάντες* of deities that are known from authors of the Archaic and Classical period: Pindar Pyth. 5.40 (wooden statue of Apollo); Herodotos 1.183 (golden statue of Zeus); 6.118 (gilded image of Apollo); Aristophanes Pax 1183 (statue of Pandion); Plato Euthyd. 299c (statue of Apollo at Delphi); and Aristotle (statues of Apollo and Herakles). An *ἀνδριάς* of Apollo Alexikakos is also epigraphically attested at the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos. Cf. T. Ritti, C. Simsek, H. Yildiz, *Dedicato e καταγραφαί dal santuario frigio di Apollo Lairbenos*, EA 32 (2000) 1–88. The term *ἀνδριάντιον* or *ἀνδριαντίδιον* is also found in inventory lists from Delos in connection with figurines representing deities: cf. ID 396, B, l. 81, one of the many references to a dedication by Kleino, daughter of Admetos of two figurines representing Apollo and Artemis; ID 1423, Ba, col. II, l. 13 (figurine of Herakles); ID 1442, B,

the creator of any kind of sculpture. The vocabulary then only suggests that the works listed in this case would rather refer to the type and size of figure with no further indications as to the subject that was represented.

Determining the size of the rest of the figures is unfortunately not as straightforward. To begin with the inventory under discussion lists at least four Palladia which, according to our sources, could only have been sculptures of small to modest size. Of course, the term itself is a diminutive, but we also know that at least in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC a Palladion was definitely considered to be a small sculpture: in his famous depiction of the Rape of Kassandra Polygnotos painted his heroine seated on the ground holding the Palladion of Troy. Elsewhere, Apollodoros sets the Palladion's height at three cubits (τρίπηχυ), while the Suida describes it as a wooden figurine (ζώδιον μικρὸν ξύλινον)<sup>33</sup>.

The impression that the assemblage in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A comprises figures of all sizes is further accentuated by other size markers. There is a bronze sculpture (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498B, l. 66) that is specifically described as εὐμεγέθης (large), perhaps because it was placed among presumably smaller sculptures. Another figure, perhaps a Palladion (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498B, ll. 60–61), is described as bearing a small helmet (κρανίδιον). Finally, studies of the language of inventories suggest that nomenclature usually associated with size is often ambiguous, while the term for an object is interchangeable with its diminutive form<sup>34</sup>. The examples are numerous, but suffice it to say that, as a rule of thumb, recorded weights are often the best factors for size discrimination of objects<sup>35</sup>. Of course, the use of diminutive form can be relevant to size as well, and I would therefore suggest that sculptures that are referred to in the inscription under consideration as παῖς were probably larger than the ones that are identified as παιδίσκος which may have been figurines<sup>36</sup>.

The description of the condition of the recorded sculptures provides an additional size marker. There is little doubt that a large number of these were damaged in one way or another, while others were in good condition, the term used in this case being

l. 44 (a figurine of Agathe Tyche). Hesychios (*s.v.*) states that ἀνδριάς was used interchangeably with ἄγαλμα. Cf. also E. Kosmetatou, *Zoidia in the Delian Inventory Lists*, *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004) [forthcoming].

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Pausanias 10.38.5; 10.26.3; Suida, *s.v.*; Apollodoros 3.12.3.3; Tzetzes, Schol. ad Lyc. 355; Konon apud Photius 186.34 (FGrHist 26 F 1). On Palladia and xoana see A. A. Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*, Atlanta 1988, 15, 119; J. B. Connolly, *Narrative and Image in Attic Vase painting: Ajax and Kassandra at the Trojan Palladion*, in: P. J. Holliday (Hrsg.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, 88–129; J.-M. Moret, *Les pierres gravées antiques représentant le rapt du Palladion*, Mainz am Rhein 1997.

<sup>34</sup> Prêtre, *Imitation et miniature* (s. n. 13) 674.

<sup>35</sup> See for example a votive silver gilt eagle from Delos which weighed 40 drs. (ca. 173 gr.) and could therefore have only been a figurine.

<sup>36</sup> In her discussion of the interpretation of figures described as παῖς and παιδίσκος Harris contradicts herself. In the text she states that “Of the 25 statues listed, three are children (παῖς), and two are small children (παιδίσκος)”. She then refers to footnote 7, where she states that “The difference between a *pais* and a *paidiskos* may have been the size of the statue, rather than the relative age of the figure”. Cf. Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 136.

ὕγις, which is frequently encountered in inventories in the negated form οὐχ ὕγις as reference to damaged votives<sup>37</sup>. A closer study of the damaged parts is revealing: there are figures that once held objects, possibly also attributes, and offerings. Depending on their size, these could have been pieces that were soldered and jointed to their respective separately-cast statues that could vary in size, or have formed part of a single-cast figurine<sup>38</sup>. Protruding pieces, such as feet, arms, objects they held, and heads, were equally vulnerable in both cases, as it was easy for them to be simply broken off even in the case of figurines<sup>39</sup>. Even more likely is the loss of loose offerings that sculptures may have once held: we hear of coins that were attached with wax on the hands of figurines<sup>40</sup>.

Missing limbs are also good discriminators of size: several of the figures listed in the decree must have been on the small side, as it is hard to imagine how large statues that presumably stood on pedestals outside could lose entire limbs, especially their legs, or any large piece for that matter. At any rate, descriptions of their condition may also assist in solving the riddle of the figures' perils in the sanctuary of Athena. Taking note of information in the inventories of the Akropolis and the literary sources Thompson made a convincing case for thefts in the second quarter of the fourth century, while descriptions of the damaged statues in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498 were consistent, according to the same scholar, with the kind of objects that interested robbers: seeing that temple robbery was perilous, the crime serious, and punishment swift and strict, robbers simply removed small items and cut off any extremities they could, including fingers, jewellery, or the edges of the wings of Nikai statues and of garments. Inventories that mention the Golden Nikai of the Akropolis report a substantial loss of weight and indicate repairs that restored these specific areas<sup>41</sup>. Figurines could also lose limbs, as is obvious from Delian inventories: a damaged gold figurine missing an arm and a leg was kept at the Artemision at least from 279 to 241 BC<sup>42</sup>. The eyes of bronze statues were also vulnerable being either delicate or easy prey for their precious materials<sup>43</sup>.

Determining the original location of these figures presents us with a challenge. Harris and Mattusch believe that these were dedications that were set up on the Akro-

<sup>37</sup> For one out of numerous examples see IG II<sup>2</sup> 120, l. 53. The term ὕγις is used in this case as synonym to κατεαγός (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1415, l. 20), κατεφθαρμένος (cf. IG II<sup>2</sup> ID 1442, B, l. 64), πεπονηκός (cf. ID 442, B, l. 211), and σακνός (cf. ID 161, C, l. 45).

<sup>38</sup> For a description of techniques see Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 8) 8–18.

<sup>39</sup> For examples see Archaic bronze statuettes in Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 7) 22–23, figs. 15–16.

<sup>40</sup> See for example a silver figurine from the Delian Artemision on whose hand two Attic drachms were attached. Cf. ID 104, l. 95. It weighed 23 drs. or ca. 100 gr.

<sup>41</sup> For robber activity on the Akropolis see Aristophanes Vesp., v. 1447–1449; Lucian Timon 53; Demosthenes 24.121; 129 (on thefts of relics from the Persian wars); Thompson, *The Golden Nikai* (s. n. 8) 203–205; R. Parker, *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1983, 171; E. Kosmetatou, 'Taboo' Objects in Attic Inventory Lists, *Glotta* 80 (2004) [forthcoming].

<sup>42</sup> Cf. IG XI (2) 161, B, ll. 60–61 (279 BC).

<sup>43</sup> Seeing that teeth were sometimes made of silver they too should be considered especially vulnerable to robbery. Cf. Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 7) 24–25 (especially n. 26) and 26 which list important relevant bibliography.

polis. In my opinion we may safely conclude this for the recorded *stelai*, especially the larger ones that were presumably made of stone, and which were set up in the open air. The location of the rest of the votives is not easy to determine, however. Of course, a setting in the sanctuary for a group of objects such as the ones mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A was not impossible, and there are parallels for it. Four inventories of the Delian Gymnasion<sup>44</sup>, all dated in the mid-150's BC, list bronze statues of varying sizes, including figurines ('Απολλωνίσκον ὡς ποδιαῖον, ἀνδριαντίδιον ὡς δίπουν, ἀνδριαντίδιον πεντασπίθαιμον)<sup>45</sup>. Some of the votives that were set up at the peristoion are described as in perfect condition (τέλειον, ἐντελήην), while others were damaged (ὕδρια οὐκ ἔχουσα καὶ τὸν τράχηλον διαβεβρωμένον<sup>46</sup>). The only difficulty in accepting this possibility unreservedly, however, lies in the vocabulary used in introducing this Delian group of objects: their location is mentioned and has been verified by excavation, while the Athenian material under discussion is described in association with their keepers.

The various sculptures that are mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A are also consistent with items, complete or damaged<sup>47</sup>, that were housed in temple treasuries. Evidence from inventories suggests that figurines were certainly encountered in temples, but larger statues, including ἀνδριάντες, were by no means strangers to these depots. Apart from Athena's cult statue, we know of a gilt *kore* that was set up on a base in the Parthenon, similar to statues mentioned in the decree under study (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498B, l. 55; 1499, l. 11)<sup>48</sup>. Another *kore* that was either made of gold or merely gilded was also set on a base in the Hekatompedon, while we hear also of a chryselephantine Palladion<sup>49</sup>. Finally, a statue that is described in much the same way as the sculptures of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A, was housed in the Erechtheion. We hear that it held an object in its right hand about which we know nothing because of the fragmentary state of the text, and a bronze box on its left<sup>50</sup>.

At the current state of the evidence, we may therefore not exclude the possibility that the votives under discussion may have simply been housed in temples under the care of the Treasurers of Athena as is the case in other inventories. Their dedicants are sometimes acknowledged, presumably on the basis of tags that were attached to the objects, rather than dedicatory inscriptions that would be usually inscribed on their base<sup>51</sup>. Last, but not least, the vocabulary of the decree is of particular interest: ob-

<sup>44</sup> ID 1412, a, ll. 13–14; ID 1417, A, ll. 118–154; ID 1423, Ba, II, ll. 1–8; ID 1426, B, I, ll. 43–51. See also J.-C. Moretti, *Les inventaires du gymnase de Délos*, BCH 121 (1997) 125–152.

<sup>45</sup> A five-span long statuette had a height of ca. 1.14 m.

<sup>46</sup> ID 1417 A 140.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. damaged items in the Delian Samothrakion: ID 1417, A, col. I, ll. 5–6 (155/154 BC).

<sup>48</sup> The *kore* occurs in several inscriptions including IG I<sup>3</sup> 351, l. 11. Cf. Harris, *Treasures* (s. n. 22) 89, IV.20.

<sup>49</sup> Pheidias' chryselephantine statue is mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1407, ll. 5–6. See also IG I<sup>3</sup> 317, l. 5 (for the gold or gilt *kore*) and IG II<sup>2</sup> 1388, ll. 67–69 (for the Palladion). Cf. Harris, *Treasures* (s. n. 22), 130–131, 134, V.89; V.90; V.97.

<sup>50</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1456, bA, ll. 34–35. Cf. Harris, *Treasures* (s. n. 22) 210, VI.22.

<sup>51</sup> M. N. Tod, *Letter-Labels in Greek Inscriptions*, BSA 49 (1954) 1–8.



jects are described as *κειμήλια*, a term that is usually associated with precious, even cherished heirlooms, usually smaller in size and kept in a secluded spot. It is frequently encountered in ancient authors, inscriptions, and papyri from the age of Homer to the end of antiquity<sup>52</sup>.

In seeking to interpret the decree under discussion, Mattusch correctly observed that there is no reason to suppose that pedestals would be present and recorded in association with statues that were being readied for the furnace<sup>53</sup>. Nor would there be any reason for recording damages in such great detail if this were a *kathairesis* decree, as the same scholar has also convincingly argued. Documents belonging to this class have survived from antiquity and can be divided into two groups. First there are inscriptions that report decisions to melt down small precious objects that are in excellent condition in order to make new votives. This is the case in IG II<sup>2</sup> 839 and 840 with which a number of small reliefs are sacrificed for the production of silver vessels in honor of Heros Iatros<sup>54</sup>. Interestingly, the objects are listed under a heading that specifically referred to the process of *kathairesis*: τὰ καθαιρεθέντα εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα or τάδε μετακατεσκευάσθη<sup>55</sup>. The second group comprises decrees that record the *kathairesis* of damaged objects for the production of new votives, most notably parts of ID 442, B (ll. 118–125) and ID 1442, B (ll. 63–72)<sup>56</sup>. While information on dedicants and often also weights is given, no details of the actual damage are ever furnished, as they were probably superfluous.

On the other hand, temple treasuries are known through the inventories to have housed damaged votives for a long time. *Kathaireseis* can be sometimes deduced when damaged votives disappear from inventories in coming years, and it is possible that assemblages of *ex votis* that were to end up in the furnace some time in the future were created from time to time. My own study of the Delian inventory lists suggests that the sanctuary's Chalkotheke housed mainly bronze items for destruction in the near future, while the Artemision became the depot of damaged silver vessels that were organized in weighing lots<sup>57</sup>. On the other hand, objects that were probably identified as relics remained at the sanctuary however damaged they were, as is obvious in the case

<sup>52</sup> Examples are too numerous to list. Cf. Homer II. 6.47; 9.330; 11.132; Herodotos 3.41; Philo Plant. 57.1; Strabo 12.3.31; 15.3.21; Plutarch Pomp. 32.8; Apophth. 98C; Josephus, AJ 14.4.10; BJ, 1.153; Athenaios 11.16; P. Charneux, *Inscriptions d'Argos*, BCH 109 (1985) 357–375; SEG 35, 267 (late 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC); P.Oxy. 16, 1832, r. 3. The term retained its meaning in the Early Christian period as well. Cf. P.Prag 2.178; Chrest. Wilck. 135.

<sup>53</sup> Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 7) 101–102.

<sup>54</sup> The fragmentary IG II<sup>2</sup> 841 probably also belonged to that category. Cf. S. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*, Amsterdam 1989, 104–105.

<sup>55</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 839, ll. 54–55; IG II<sup>2</sup> 840, l. 38.

<sup>56</sup> For references to older *kathaireseis* that are otherwise not attested see IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 64; IG XI (2) 203, B, l. 29.

<sup>57</sup> See for example IG XI (2) 161, B, ll. 120–129; C, ll. 1–108 (Chalkotheke) and ID 399, B, ll. 144–154 (from Artemision).

of the figurine of an eagle that is described as “ancient” in the inventories of the Delian Artemision<sup>58</sup>.

Despite the above considerations, the purpose of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A remains elusive. Its association with the activities of Lykourgos on the Akropolis and his reorganization of the sanctuaries of Attica is a safe conclusion, but further links with plans to melt down the objects listed cannot be established with certainty. I would also hesitate before placing this decree in the context of its contemporary presumed ideas on *mimesis* which is a very complicated question that has occupied ancient philosophers and historians, as well as modern scholarship for a long time, and to which no short article can do justice<sup>59</sup>. Nevertheless, seeing Greek art as one entity is dangerous, and our best approach to it should be through the study of the development of ideas on art in antiquity. One would also hope that we have now abandoned earlier, romantic, 19<sup>th</sup> century notions which viewed the Greeks as ideal creatures more interested in beauty and philosophical discourse and less concerned about practical matters such as putting food on the table and balancing the budget. Temples and sculptures could sometimes be left unfinished, at worst robbed, while their piety notwithstanding, the Greeks did not hesitate to borrow from their gods and even trick them into “dining” with the mortals’ sacrifice left-overs. It is in my opinion unlikely that the ancients were easily mortified at the sight of the slightest damage on their statues, including removed or otherwise damaged inlaid eyes that could be easily repaired without leaving much of a trace. It is also doubtful that “shattered illusions” immediately sprang to mind at the sight of more significant destruction, as there is undeniable evidence that even more serious repairs took place<sup>60</sup>.

In conclusion then the following interpretation is offered for IG II<sup>2</sup> 1498–1501A: the decree lists objects of varying sizes which were presumably made of different materials. A number of large and smaller decrees in stone and/or in bronze were followed by statues, figurines, and perhaps other objects that may have been made of bronze, and which were under the care of the Treasurers of Athena. Some of these were in good condition, but their majority was probably not. A possible explanation for the commissioning of the decree may have been an *eksetasmos* that was associated with Lykourgos’ controls over the sanctuary of Athena and its holdings, and which was carried

<sup>58</sup> ID 101, l. 28. It remained in the sanctuary from at least 367 to after 145 BC and is often described as ἀετὸς ἀργυροῦς τῶν ἀρχαίων διαπεπρωκῶς. The possibility that this is a relic is based on its proximity to other presumed relics. For more on relics in inventory lists see E. Kosmetatou, ‘Persian’ Objects in Classical and Early Hellenistic Inventory Lists, *Museum Helveticum* 61 (2004) 117–148.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Harris-Cline, *Broken Statues* (s. n. 1) 138–141. For a recent overview on ancient discourse on *mimesis* in art and a summary of the bibliography see E. Kosmetatou, *Vision and Visibility. Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippus’ Andriantopoiika*, in: B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, M. Baumbach (Hrsg.), *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus*, Cambridge, Mass. 2004, 187–211. I obviously do not claim that my own article has tackled the very complicated issue of *mimesis* in ancient Greek art and historical discourse.

<sup>60</sup> Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes* (s. n. 7) 93, 104–107, 117–118, 205–209.

out in accordance to the new law *περὶ τῆς ἐξετάσεως* that was passed at the time<sup>61</sup>. Stone decrees may have been moved to different locations, hence their reported odd positioning, while bronze objects may have been assembled in order to determine to what extent they had fallen victim to the passage of time and robber activity. Whether some were eventually removed from the sanctuary and melted down in order to produce new votives is unknown. It cannot be excluded, but it cannot be proved either. At any rate, a comparison of the vocabulary of this inscription with *kathairesis* texts suggests that this inscription mostly resembles inventories of *eksetasmos*.

Departement Klassieke Studies  
Afdeling Oude Geschiedenis  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Erasmushuis  
Blijde Inkomststraat 21  
B-3000 Leuven

Elizabeth Kosmetatou

<sup>61</sup> Cf. D. M. Lewis, *The Last Inventories of the Treasurers of Athena*, in: D. Knoepfler (Hrsg.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cite grecque*, Neuchâtel 1988, 297; Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* (s. n. 1) 10, n. 16, where he reviews previous bibliography. For the law *περὶ τῆς ἐξετάσεως* that was passed as part of Lykourgos' reforms see Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion* (s. n. 54) 105–106.