

Tekmeria

Vol 8 (2003)



The Prytaneion Treasure and the Paradox of the Delian Inventories

R. HAMILTON

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.189](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.189)

To cite this article:

HAMILTON, R. (2003). The Prytaneion Treasure and the Paradox of the Delian Inventories. *Tekmeria*, 8, 7–25.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.189>

RICHARD HAMILTON

THE PRYTANEION TREASURE
AND THE PARADOX OF THE DELIAN INVENTORIES¹

While Delos was under Athenian control, the inventories listing the dedications in the various temples conformed to the simple 5th cent. Athenian model of repeating the previous year's list of objects with additions (*epeteia*) placed at the end. When Delos obtained independence in 314 BC, Delian officials took control of the temple treasures and adopted a totally different system, which, once it became «fully operational»², involved regularly reweighing and reordering the objects³. So, instead of a list plus additions followed the next year by the same list plus more additions, now the arrangement of each list was totally different. This new system continued for half a century or more, but then the quantity of items being added each year became too great and the system collapsed--reweighing disappeared and the order no longer changed. When the Athenians again took control of Delos in 166 BC, the 5th cent. Athenian model of repeated lists with additions at the end reappeared⁴. The question is why the Delians reweighed and reordered the dedications.

To begin answering that question we must decide which was more important, reweighing or reordering. It seems reasonable to assume that the reordering of

1. I am grateful to Elizabeth Kosmetatou and her Leeuven colleagues for inviting me to their Colloquium on «Archives and Inventories in Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean (23-24 January 2004)», which allowed me to revisit the Delian temple inventories and think about the larger issues I neglected. This is also the chance for me to correct my earlier dismissal of the brief archons' inventories of the Prytaneion treasure, which seem never to have been studied as a group. I am grateful as well to Clarisse Prêtre for commenting on an early draft of this essay and to Jie Yuan for commenting on the penultimate draft.

2. For the stages leading to this system see the summary of Tréheux's analysis in Richard Hamilton, *Treasure Map: A Guide to the Delian Inventories*, Ann Arbor 2000, 26, which will be abbreviated hereafter as *Treasure Map*.

3. Even items mounted on the walls, such as the gold crowns in the Athenian Temple, are reweighed in the Independence period (and 81 of the 104 weights there differ).

4. The only difference is that in this last period the officials list *every* movable object in a sanctuary, including statues and doors, with the result that these latest, most careless and least legible inventories tell us far more than the others about the look of a sanctuary.

objects was an incidental by-product of the reweighing--each object or group of objects would have been brought out to the scale for weighing and after weighing each object would have been brought back. It is less easy to imagine how reordering would entail reweighing, and there is no obvious other action, like temple cleansing, that would have led to both at the same time.

If the reweighing is primary, we need then to ask why the objects were reweighed. The answer seems intuitively obvious to anyone who has read about Enron, Parmalat and other recent accounting scandals: to insure the objects had not lost weight through wear-and-tear or theft⁵. And elsewhere we find some evidence of discrepancies in weight being noted, particularly in Athens. In the inventories of the Athenian Asclepieion, we read about the priest Diokles being required to repay the 3 drachmas missing from the 10 that Mnesarete had dedicated (III.3), about Polyxenos paying back the 4 drachmas missing from the 12 dedicated by Onasos (III.6) and about three objects that were short in weight and therefore kept by the priest (IV.119-121), one explicitly said to have been «weighed against silver» (IV.121)⁶. An Acropolis inventory speaks of lacks in five weights (*IG II² 1440.30-45*) and another speaks of at least five lacks in weights of hydriai revealed by an *exetasmos* (*IG II² 1463.13-21*) while a third lists necklaces lacking gold (*IG II² 1524A58*).

In the Delian inventories, on the other hand, we hardly ever find notes about errors in the weight listed in an inventory. The one case I have found occurs in the fragmentary part of a late inventory, during the Athenian period, where the weight of an object given as 8 drachmas is said to be short 3 obols (*ID 1444Aa40*). What is

5. So, recently, B. Dignas has argued that «the striking accuracy in reporting dedications surely emphasizes accountability» (*Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002, 17). Another possible explanation for reweighing would be for borrowing but, though that was occasionally done in Athens (see e.g., D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*, Oxford 1995, 28-29), it seems not to have been done in Delos. The Delian temples had sufficient income through property rentals, and this is what we find extensively described in the accounts published along with the inventories. See now C. Prêtre, *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions de Délos: Lois, comptes et inventaires* (Études Épigraphiques 4, Athens, 2003) 258-62.

6. The Asclepieion inventories are cited from S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion*, Amsterdam 1989, who notes «it was apparently common practice for dedications about which some discrepancy existed in the record of *paradoseis* to be placed in the keeping of the priest» (240). The closest I can come to such activity in the Delian inventories is *ID 1432AbII26-27*, where it is said the priest Philon restored (*apokatestêsen*) one of the two kotylai.

more often noted, instead, is a discrepancy between inscribed weight and actual weight, in the case of the crowns in the Athenian treasure on Delos (*ID* 161B108-14), or the lack of (presumably precious decorative) nails in a door (*ID* 1403AbII84 etc.) or table (*ID* 1441AII61 etc.) or ornaments on Leto's chiton (*ID* 1428II54)⁷. But these are simply more precise renderings, mostly by the obsessive later Athenian officials, of what we commonly find in the earlier Delian inventories when an object is said to be «unsound»⁸. That is, what these notes of missing elements record are visible defects in the objects themselves (the labels belonging to the objects not the lists) not deficiencies in the listing. And these remarks are confined to the latest inventories, when there is no reweighing.

It is not as if there were no discrepancies. We can observe hundreds of them in the Delian inventories, especially during Independence, where fully a third of the

7. These lacks are marked by the word *ell(e)ipei* (or *enteipei*); interestingly *endei* is common in Athens but never found in Delos. (Other terms like *ouk echei* and *ouk hygiês* describe missing parts of statues or vessels.) I think the 2 tetradrachmas missing from Diophantos' deposit of 4500 dr. (*ID* 1421AbI15) are objects rather than weights. I continue here my practice of identifying the Delian inventories in *IG* XI.2 as *ID* (see *Treasure Map* xii).

8. Linders claims that these descriptions of damage are not done systematically «as it ought to be if the exoneration should be effective» because «the fragments of gold and silver which from time to time came off the precious objects are regularly recorded, but rarely related to their origin... the hieropoioi only seldom made attempts to follow the «history» of the objects» (T. Linders, «The purpose of inventories: A close reading of the Delian inventories of the Independence», in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque*, Neuchâtel 1988, 40). Hence the act of handing over the treasure, the *paradosis*, rather than «an exhaustive and correct inventory», was the proof that the officials had performed their office correctly. But this is to conflate *paradosis* and *audit* (*exetasmós*): *IG* II² 120 makes it clear that in Athens the previous inventories (*paradoseis*) were to be compared to the present examination (*exetasmós*) to see what was missing and the officials in charge of those previous inventories were to be present. Obviously, an item missing from the present treasure would be traced back until it could not be found and the officials in whose inventory it could not be found would be liable. The same would be true of objects that had become damaged, hence the importance of noting *all* damaged items. As C. Vial notes, «il n'y a qu'un point sur lesquelles hiéropes ont constamment montré de la précision: ils signalaient le objets abîmés, incomplets ou brisés» (C. Vial, *Délos Indépendante*, *BCH* Supp. X, Paris 1984, 220). The history of the fragments of gold and silver is irrelevant until there is an audit, and in anticipation of an audit each official will want to be sure the *present* inventory accurately describes what is presently in the treasure, damage and all.

weights recorded differ (324 of 901 weights)⁹. But these differences are almost impossible to find without tedious analysis since reordering makes it very difficult to compare one inventory with another: «if it is required of inventories that it must be possible with their aid to check the objects and compare the lists, it is clear that the Delian inscriptions do not fulfill these conditions»¹⁰. So, we have on the one hand careful reweighing every year and on the other a listing that makes comparison virtually impossible. Hence my title, «the Paradox of the Delian Inventories».

It looks as if the question should be what is the point of weighing, not what is the point of reweighing.

I think we can get a useful perspective on this question by looking at the inventories of the Prytaneion treasure, which show a remarkable variety of arrangements and a very selective use of weighing, a use that suggests that the crucial factor is size of the treasure rather than reweighing.

The Prytaneion treasure is described in two dozen often fragmentary inscriptions as part of a larger record the archon made each year. The record includes the choregoi for various festivals (Apollonia; Dionysia) and the various competitors in aulos, kithara-singing, kithara, comic (acting), comic writing, tragic (acting), and magic tricks (*thaumatopoiios*)¹¹. For the first years this is all that we find, but, beginning with *ID* 110, dated to 268 BC, there is also a list of silver, with the explanation «I gave over the following silver» (*ID* 110, 111)¹². Our first example that includes the Prytaneion treasure dates to 268 BC and our last to 170 BC so they are roughly contemporary with the inventories made by the hieropoioi during

9. During the Amphyctyonic period before Independence none of the 32 weights in the Delian treasures differs; after Independence 105 of 487 differ. Details in *Treasure Map*, 22-23.

10. Linders (above n.8) 40.

11. These are oddly displayed: *ID* 105/6/7/8/10/11/13 are all carved on the same column, though they cover thirteen years. *ID* 112 (pre-263) and *ID* 116 (254) are carved on the same stele. *ID* 109 and 114 are carved on their own stelai. (*ID* 114 may be a multiple year listing).

12. Later the next year's archon is named as recipient. «I gave over the following silver to x» (*ID* 113, 115, 116) and then with an even fuller formula, «I took over the following silver from x and I gave (it) over to y» (*ID* 122, 124). Thereafter the addition of a gold item (Philip's gold phiale) seems to have caused various accommodations: first, «I took over the following cups from x in accord with the decree of the demos» (126); then, with the gold phiale isolated at the end, simply «I took over the following silver» (*ID* 128); and finally «I took over the following from x and gave (it) over to y» (*ID* 134).

Independence, the earliest of which is 279 BC (*ID* 161) and the latest 169 BC (*ID* 461)¹³.

The key question here is how the form of the archon inventories maps onto that of the hieropoioi inventories and whether weighing plays the same role. In the appendix I have given translations of the complete archon inventories, arranged chronologically and divided into four self-evident groups («types»).

In Type A each of the first three inventories repeats the previous list with virtually no additions and in the same order. In the appendix the objects are listed and numbered in the left column and then given their order in the following inventories in the remaining columns. (If there is more than one of an item I have put the quantity preceded by a slash, so for instance #8 in *ID* 110, «another rhodiakon», becomes «three rhodiakai» in *ID* 111 and 112, five in *ID* 113 and six in *ID* 115, 116.) We can see that the order shifts only once, in *ID* 113. As for additions, it may look as if there are yearly additions but many of them are re-groupings: #21 «another skyphos» has been joined to #14 in *ID* 111 so that there are two skyphoi and #12 «another plateia» has been joined to #11 in *ID* 111 in the same way. *ID* 112 actually loses an object. In *ID* 113 #18a apothereutes *could* be the spondochoe #16 that disappears at the same time, and #1a kanoun looks like a new item, but it may well have been produced by melting down the manes, plateia, two antipatrides, skyphos, hedypotis and aparustron, that go missing at the same time. If we look at *ID* 124 in Type B we can see that the second item is a kanoun with precisely the number of archons (7) as would be represented by these seven missing vessels. As Tréheux long ago noted, multiple archons listed for one object *not* in chronological order could only be the product of a melting¹⁴. This melting, representing the first «rationalization» of the treasure, would explain the one major shift in order we find in this whole series. That would leave only four true additions over these 15 years, an oinochoe and three rhodiakai. In any case the total hardly changes, as one can see, and objects are identified simply by shape.

Of the B type only one complete example remains, *ID* 124, but we can still see that the form changes completely. We begin with objects found in the A list, thymiaterion, kanoun, kados and oinochoe, presumably all products of meltings given their non-chronological grouping of archons, who are not consecutive and not

13. Before 279 BC, the hieropoioi inventories are very irregular (see *Treasure Map*, 25-29).

14. J. Tréheux, «Études d'épigraphie délienne», *BCH* 69 (1945) 280. These non-consecutive lists are to be distinguished from cases where two years' funding is required for a dedication and so two consecutive archons are listed.

in order except for those listed on the thymiaterion. They are followed by further vases with multiple archons (only once consecutive) and then several chronological runs of vases (mostly skaphia, though one set is of phialai), increasingly short and increasingly complete, and the list ends with what look like *epeteia*. Two of the three runs are easily identifiable: skaphia dedicated by Philonis and phialai dedicated by Gorgias. We know from *ID* 320B79 that a man named Gorgias established an endowment of 6730 dr in 229 BC, and we can see from the end of *ID* 124 that the endowment is producing a phiale a year¹⁵. If we consider for a moment the Type D lists, we can see in *ID* 133 annual dedications not only of gorgeian phialai but also of vessels from three other endowments, philonideian and mikytheian and stesileian, and it is clear that in *ID* 124 we have not only the gorgeian but, right before it, a list of philonidean vessels, again annual. Since the vessels from the much older stesilean endowment, begun around 300 BC, were kept elsewhere, it is likely that the first chronological run is of the mikytheian vessels¹⁶. It is striking that the dates for the vessels with multiple archons at the beginning of the inventory mesh chronologically almost perfectly with this mikytheian list, and that led Tréheux to argue that the *whole* first part listed mikytheian dedications and that the mikytheian endowment went back to the beginning of Delian Independence in 314 and so we have here a complete list from 307 to 225. The list does begin with the thymiaterion dedicated by Mikythos, which seems to support Tréheux, but there are several problems, most obviously a number of gaps in the chronology and the double and sometimes triple occurrence of some archon names¹⁷. It seems more likely that the mikytheian list

15. The phiale for 224 BC was presumably one of the two gorgeian phialai listed at the end of the inventory, the other being the new phiale for the year.

16. There is a separate heading for «Stesileia from the Aphrodision» in *ID* 226 and 253, and this group is later listed at the end of the Apollo treasure (*ID* 287, 298, 313, 320). Another endowment, established by the trittys Mapsidikai, exists already in 240 BC (*ID* 298A70) but these, like the stesileia, do not seem to stay long in the Prytaneion treasure.

17. The chronological gaps are: 296, 294, 293, 286, 278, 273, 267, 265, 261, 259, 258, 253, 245, 240, 236 BC; the doubling of archons includes Demeas, Kyrbelion, Theoprotos and the tripling Antigonos and Elpines. Tréheux (above note 14) thought that gap and doubling cancelled out: where there was a gap, it was covered by a doubling the next year, but this works only for Demeas, Kyrbelion, and Theoprotos. Tréheux also argued that we can see the two therikleioi of *ID* 124 labelled as mikytheion in *ID* 127, but I am fairly certain there are three therikleioi in *ID* 124 not two; and, in any case, the archon names do not fully match. The thymiaterion, which begins the inventory and is the only multiple-archon dedication with the archons arranged chronologically, suggests that the mikytheian dedications started in 289 BC,

begins after the multiple-archon dedications but includes the thymiaterion at the beginning of the list. In any case, Type B inventories are totally different from Type A in description (by date) and arrangement (by endowment).

If we turn next to Type C, the inventory of 216 B.C., *ID* 126, and its fuller mate of 201 BC, *ID* 128, we can see that the format is again quite different. Whereas the B and D inventories gave most or at least much of the inscription on an object but no description of it, here we have only description, primarily weight¹⁸. It looks as if the object is described beyond weight only if it is defective, and so the Type C inventories best illustrate the efficiency and compactness of using weight for description¹⁹. In addition, whereas the A and D inventories had hardly any gatherings and B inventories had none at all, in *ID* 128 half of the objects have been gathered in standard lots of 5 or 10 (or once 25), and these are weighed. The inventory ends with epeteia but here given with weights as well as date and the name of the epistates; these epeteia are clearly only one year's worth, since the previous item is the gold phiale of Philip which we see already in *ID* 126²⁰. Just before the epeteia in *ID* 128 we can see a number of familiar items that have been in the treasure from the very beginning (libanotis, kanoun, thymiaterion), though the order is clearer in *ID* 126 where after Philip's gold phiale we have a list very much like that of Type A: thymiaterion (= Type A #1), libanotis (= #2), kados (= #5), and

but we cannot make the remaining anonymous dedications fit. Even the more limited assumption that all the dedications from Kallimos to Anektos are mikytheia must acknowledge that the series includes a phiale whereas mikytheian dedications are otherwise cups and skaphia and that the epeteia in *ID* 128 apparently include three mikytheian skaphia for the year whereas the list in *ID* 124 works out to only one a year.

18. *ID* 127 is extremely fragmentary but looks like a Type B inventory, even though it is dated after 209 BC. There are no weights but simply object and date (not in chronological order), and v.5 can be restored on the basis of v.45 of *ID* 124, which has no parallel in the C inventories.

19. Even if two weights of similar objects are the same, an auditor will still know if one of the objects is missing, and it seems that the presence of the object is more important than its condition and that notes about condition are probably simply for identification. But clearly weighing is not simply for identification because then all objects in a treasure would be weighed, or at least all objects of a certain class (e.g. «silver»), and this is hardly ever the case on Delos, except for the very small, very short-lived treasure of the Temple of the Delians.

20. In *ID* 128 alone do we find extensive descriptions describing appearance (with handles and bases, with nail) and condition (broken, handles fallen off).

oinochoe (= #6), though the overlap is not perfect²¹. Thus Type C appears to be the original A treasure plus endowment vessels (mikytheian skaphia, gorgeian phialai, philonideian skaphia) grouped either before it (*ID* 128) or after it (*ID* 126), plus epeteia at the end. Type C, then, has quite a different format than A and B: only here are the objects weighed and their inscriptions (except for the epeteia) ignored.

By the time of our last inventories, there are quite a few items added each year, from the various endowments that have started up. In the appendix we can see that Type D lists are simply gatherings of annual epeteia, with *ID* 133 giving the epeteia for each year from 179 to 171 BC. They are preceded by the one gold item and a gathering of the gorgeian phialai²². Here we have *only* epeteia, and we can see what happens to them by looking at the inventory of the Temple of Apollo for 179 BC (*ID* 442B 142ff). There we find record of a paradosis of objects received from the archon of 181 BC (Telesarchides) containing 15 gorgeian phialai dating 196 to 182 BC, 15 philonidean trays dating 196 to 181 BC and 13 mikytheian trays and kylixes dating from 197 to 181 BC²³, and it looks like *ID* 133 is a similar gathering, perhaps the next in line²⁴. The items in the first archon inventory of 268 BC and still traceable in part in the inventory of 216 BC (*ID* 126) have disappeared. For our purposes the more important point is that the format is a year-by-year listing for the most part, and the objects are identified by inscription (archon, epistates, sometimes hieropoioi) rather than description.

21. There are no epichytai, hypotis (a mistake for hedypotis?), statos, or therikleioi in the A list; and, conversely, a number of A list objects are apparently not found in (fragmentary) *ID* 126: kanoun, psykter, dinos, arysas, apothereutes, 2 teiourge, chiourges, 2 kapelika (though both kanoun and psykter are found in *ID* 128).

22. It is not clear why these alone are gathered, perhaps to join Philip's gold phiale (though the latest gorgeian phialai have not yet been added).

23. The listing ends with three years' worth of epeteia for Apollo (181-179 BC). It is slightly mysterious why about half the objects are dated to the decade before--perhaps that was the first shift after they gave up grouping by weight. One might want to see the group of 12 gorgeian phialai in *ID* 126 becoming the group of 26 gorgeian phialai in *ID* 442 (Apollo C269 in *Treasure Map*) but the numbers do not quite match. If we add the 26 of C269 and the 15 of C322 we get 41 which, at one a year, should take us back only to 220 or so whereas the gorgeian endowment starts, as we have seen, in 229 BC (320B79). The 12 gorgeian phialai of *ID* 126, on the other hand, match precisely since the inscription dates to 216 BC. and another gorgeian phiale is listed in the epeteia. In *ID* 128 the gorgeian phialai number 25, one more than expected (plus one in the epeteia).

24. As Vial (above n.8) already suggested (205-207).

So, what can we say about the formal development of the Prytaneion inventories? First, we have to separate off the D inventories from the others since as far as we can tell they are only of epeteia²⁵. Possibly the permanent treasure was judged already adequately marked by the earlier inventories and so omitted, perhaps under financial constraints, though whatever the constraints, the endowments continued to produce vases. Or the permanent treasure could have already been absorbed into the Apollo treasure, though there is virtually no trace of it in the Apollo inventories²⁶. If we consider the other three types of archon inventory we find that, though there is a base treasure visible in all three, there are three quite distinct formats within half a century:

A= no weight, arranged by object, few epeteia, order has one major shift

B= no weight, arranged older vases first, followed by newer vases arranged by endowment and date; no obvious shift in order.

C= by weight, often grouped; order shifts.

Does this development fit with that of the hieropoioi inventories? Here is a diagram giving an overview of the different inventory formats in the two series:

Hieropoioi Inventories

date	367-341 BC	279-234 BC	194-140 BC
format	same weight same order	changing weights changing order	same weights (mostly) same order

25. *ID* 133 is complete, and it seems unlikely there is another stone that lists the permanent treasure since we find in *ID* 133 both the full paradosis formula and the usual other lists, choregoi and contestants.

26. The one exception is the arysas of Klazomenian Metrodoros, fully described only in *ID* 442.97 but found as the arysas of Metrodoros in *ID* 124.61, the something of Metrodoros in *ID* 118.8, the something of the Klazomenian in *ID* 117.18 and simply the arysas in the Type A archon inventories. None of the «permanent» items in Prytaneion treasure shows up in the Apollo treasure as far as I can tell.

Archon Inventories

	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
date	268-254 BC	236-221 BC	216-200 BC	169-166 BC
format	no weight same order	no weight same order?	weight changing order	no weight same order
arrangement	by position	by endowment / date begin with old epeteia at end	in lots begin with old epeteia at end	by date epeteia only
description	by object	by object, endowment, date	by object, endowment, weight, condition	by object, endowment, date
total number of objects	34-39	70+	148	41

We see first that, though reweighing was being practiced by the hieropoioi from at least 279 BC to at least 234 BC, the archons do not avail themselves of that possibility during that whole period. So, there was no single decision on the island to change the way of doing inventories.

It is only later that the archons resort to weighing, and this is the period in which we see a tremendous jump in the size of the treasure and also the period in which we can see other efforts to impose order besides weighing: similar objects are arranged in weighed lots; objects are described not only by form, weight, endowment but also by condition. We may speculate that the influx of dedications led to chaotic storage and random location and this led to identification by weight as a means of quickly describing objects as they were brought out, often in lots in the case of endowment vessels. So, rather than reweighing leading to reordering we might wish to conclude that disorderly storage led to weighing in the first place²⁷.

27. Since there is no apparent overall logic to the reordering, we can assume that the repositioning of the objects was somewhat random and that they were stored in a way that would allow them to be shuffled. Certain objects are consistently grouped together and were presumably stored together: for instance, in the Artemision B #17-31 the unweighed phialai have variable order but are always the same objects, and the miscellaneous unweighed items (#14-16) can occur before (*ID* 161/162) or after (*ID* 164/199) them but are not mixed with them and themselves are a unit («broken silver»?). For these objects see the relevant charts in

The situation is quite different in the inventories of the hieropoioi. There the huge increase in the treasures caused the collapse of the system of reweighing, and there it seems that a vessel on first entering the treasure has its weight recorded. We almost never find an initially unweighed object later getting weighed, though, conversely, a weighed object is sometimes not weighed in a later inventory²⁸.

This is perhaps the most interesting revelation, that in the archon inventories the weighing does not exist from the beginning. The weight of endowment vessels is recorded only in the Type C inventories, and that is where the weight of the recast vessels, like the thymiaterion, kanoun and kados, is recorded.

Comparison of the two sets of inventories, then, reveals that there is no single answer. One must allow for historical factors ranging from the size of the treasure over time down to the presence or absence of an inscription recording an object's weight. The most we can say about the weights in the various Delian inventories is that they are never used for banking, rarely for audit, at least sometimes for description.

Bryn Mawr College

Richard Hamilton

Treasure Map. Indeed, in the one case we know of an audit on Delos, the officials in charge of the annual inventory complain that order of objects has been totally destroyed by the audit: «these we did not present in this way but as the groups had been inscribed on account of the fact that the men were sent ... to examine the material in the sanctuaries according to the paradosis of Mikion and once they had placed (them) as they had earlier been told we were no longer able to find the placement of the bronze in the Opithodomos» (*ID* 1403BbI.26-28).

28. See *Treasure Map*, 409 n. 3 and 410. One might think that the Prytaneion treasure was essentially temporary storage, like the Hieropoion/Andrian treasure, but the latter shows radical shifts virtually every time we have complete listings: *ID* 199 (274 BC) shows no overlap with *ID* 154 (296 BC), and by 250 BC (*ID* 287) the contents have again changed almost entirely. The earliest lists (*ID* 154, *ID* 224) have weighing; *ID* 287 weighs only the gold and the later lists (*ID* 336-461, 207-169 BC) have no weights.

Appendix: Archon Inventories of the Prytaneion Treasure

(^b= beginning extant, ^e= end extant; @= added [epeteia]; objects underlined)

Type A *ID* 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116 (268-254 BC): unweighed with same order; arranged by object; regrouped in 263 BC; described by object only (quantity after slash)

<i>ID</i> 110 ^{bc} (268 BC)	<i>ID</i> 111 ^{bc} (265 BC)	<i>ID</i> 112 ^{bc}	<i>ID</i> 113 ^{bc} (263 BC)	<i>ID</i> 115 ^b (259 BC)	<i>ID</i> 116 ^b (254 BC)
1 <i>thymiaterion</i>	1	1	2	2	2
@ 1a <i>kanoun</i>			1	1	1
2 <i>libanotis</i>	2	2	7	6	6
3 <i>psykter</i>	3	3	4		3
4 <i>dinos</i>	4	4	5	4	4
5 <i>kados</i>	5	5	3	3	
6 <i>oinochoe</i>	6	6	6/2	5/2	5/2
7 two <i>rhodiakai</i>	7/2	7/2	12/2		11/2
8 another <i>rhodiakon</i>	8/3	8/3	13/5	11/6	12/6
9 two <i>manai</i>	9/3	9/3	18/2		
10 two <i>teiourge</i>	10/2	10/2	14/2	12	13/2
11 five <i>plateiai</i>	12/6	12/6	16/5	13/5	15/5
12 another <i>plateia</i>					
13 two <i>antipatrides</i>	13/2	13/2			
14 <i>skyphos</i>	11/2	11/2	17	14	16
15 <i>kapelikon</i>	14/3	14/2	19/2		
16 <i>spondochoe</i>	17	17			
17 <i>chytris</i>	18	18	20		
18 <i>arysas</i>	19	19	9	8	8
@18a <i>apothereutes</i>			10	9	9
19 two <i>kyathoi</i>	20/2	20/2	8/2	7	7/2
20 <i>kapelikon</i>					
21 another <i>skyphos</i>					
22 <i>hedypotis</i>	15	15			
23 <i>phiale</i>	22	22	11	10	10
24 <i>chiourges</i>	16	16	15		14
25 <i>aparustron</i>	21	21			
26 another <i>rhodiakon</i>					
vase total: 35	38	37	34		

Type B *ID* 118, 119, 120?, 121, 122, 124, 125 (236-221 BC): unweighed, with same order(?); arranged by endowment and date, beginning with old treasure and ending with epeteia; described by object and date²⁹

ID 124^{be} (221 BC)

(25) *thymiaterion* Mikythos ded. archons Theodotos (289), Aphthonetos (288), Timothemis (287), Aristokritos (284), Poseidikos (283), Kleostratos (282)

kanoun w. three cylinders in (year of) Demonax (299), Antigonos (274), Demeas (277), Glaukiades (281),

Phillis (275), Antigonos (274), Polybos (264)

(30) *kados* archons Demokritos, Lysixenos (301), Ktesikles (300), Kleokritos (298), Pyrrides (297), Telemnestos (271), Meilichides (270), Kyrbelion (272), Archepolis (313-308)

oinochoe archons Onomakleides (309-3), Stesileos (309-3), Timothemis (309-3), Demeas (277), Kyrbelion (272)

---Antigonos (274)

(35) ---Kokon (290)

another wi[thout inscription]

oinochoe in Kalliphon

another [in . . .] Elpines (262), Prostatos (313-08)

another in Androthalos (292), Olympiades (291)

hedypotis in Diodotos (295)---Philius (285)

kapelike in Charmos (280)

hedypotis in Hypsokles (279)

(40) another in Sosimachos (276)

manes in Melichides (270), Echemantis (266)

another in Antigonos (274), Anaxithemis (253)

antipatris in Elpines (262), Theoprotos (257), Phillis (275)

skaphion in Elpines (262)

29. *ID* 117 is anomalous: it seems to have the same order as the others of this group (117.14=124.53; 117.17-18=124.60, though the order of the two arysai is reversed) and the contents are described by object and date, but it has weights and some of the items do not fit: the ethmos of Pr[okles] in v.11 is not found in *ID* 124 and the three archons listed in vv.9-10 with a gap are found consecutively in v.32 of *ID* 124 and nowhere else. We should note also the explicit reference to fabricating a dedication (*kateskeuas*[-] v.15), suggesting old dedications have been melted down.

therikleioi two in Artysileos (251), Sosithenes (250), Ankitheides (241), Prokles (264), Archedamas (263)

(45) another in Antichares (256), Badros (248), Paches (254), Archias (249), Amphikles (260)

another without archon

skaphion in Kallimos (268) (mikytheian cups and skaphia?)

rhodiake without inscription

skaphion in Theoprotos (257)

rhodiake in Phanes (252)

manes in Parmenion (247)

skaphion in Eidokritos (246)

(50) another in Xenokrates (244)

plateia in Dionysios (243)

manes in Orthokles (242)

rhodiake in Agatharchos (239)

skaphion in Dorieus (238)

rhodiake in Timagenos (237)

skaphion left over from the cups [vac.]

skaphion in Sosikos (235)

(55) another in Anaxithemis (233)

rhodiake in Dexikles (232)

phiale in Philoxenos (231)

skaphion in Skyllichos (230)

another two in Menethales (229)

another in Amphoterios (228)

another in Lykades (227)

another in Polybos (226)

another in Anektos (225)

another [two] in Phillis (275) and--- (part of old treasure?)

(60) skaphia two of the Mapsichidai in---

arysas of Metrodoros

another of Herakleides

thymiaterion Delians ded.

spondochoidion insc. hieron of Hestia

skaphia two Philonis ded. in Anaxithemis (233) (philonidean skaphia)

another in Dexikles (232)

(65) another in Philoxenos (231)

another in Skyllichos (230)

another two in Menethales (229)

another in Amphoterios (228)

another two in Lykades (227)

another in Polybos (226)

phiale Gorgias ded. in Amphoterios (228)

(gorgeian phialai)

another in Lykades (227)

another in Polybos (226)

another in Anektos (225)

(70) skaphion of Philonis in Anektos (225) and in Timoxenos (224)

(epeteia?)

skaphion ded. Philonis in Timoxenos (224)

phiale Gorgias ded. in arch. Xenomedes (223)

[kad?]os ded.

Mikythos ded.

(75)---Gorgias ded. in ---

---phiale Gorgias---

[vac.]

in Mennis---[vac.]

[vac.]

Type C ID 126, 128 (216-200 BC): weighed with changing order; often grouped in lots, beginning with old and ending with epeteia; described by object and weight (with defects noted); rubric changed to reflect gold phiale

ID 126^b (216 BC)

(11) gold phiale of king Philip, *thymiateria* 2, *libanotis*

kados, *oinochoai* 2, kyathos, manai 2, statos, therikleioi 2, rhodiakai 6, epichytai 2

manai 2, plateiai 9, epichyte, spondochoidion, hedypotis, mikytheia s[kaphia,

others small 12? PALMATE skaphia 8, others small 13

(15) ---small 2---phiale of Mikythos, mikytheios(?), kana 5

---73 dr, others 5 weight 380 dr

---oinochoe whose weight 169 dr

---weight 237 dr, rhodiakai

---weight 430, thymiaterion

(20) ---105+ spondochoidion, chytris, epichytai

---102, weight 290+
 ---weight 722 dr, philonideia skaphia
 ---phialai of Gorgias 12 weight 1000+
 ---weight 38+---
 (25) ---in my arche @skaphion philo[nideion
 ---@phia]le of Gorgias, @mikytheion with epistates Hedy---

ID 128^{be} (201 BC)

(25) mikytheia skaphia 5, weight 464 dr
 another 5, 468 dr, another 5, 462 dr
 another 5, 464 dr, another 5, 468 dr
 another 5, 472 dr, another 5, 456dr
 philonideia 5 weight 464, another
 (30) 5 weight 464, another 4 weight 370 dr
 gorgieioi phialai 25 weight 2328 dr
 another 2 weight 198 dr, and mikytheion 1
 weight 97 dr, *psykter* with handles fallen off
 without base, *kados* with handles, without
 (35) base, weight of these both 1140 dr
 argyris weight 241 dr, another 274 dr, skaphia
 small philonideia 10 weight 407 dr, others small 10
 weight 440 dr, another 4 weight 181 dr, other
 mikytheia small 7 weight 323 dr 2 1/2 ob, of the Mapsichidai
 (40) 2 weight 80 dr, small crowned weight 96 dr
 another small 92 dr, another small weight 115 dr 1 ob
 another with one handle weight 116 dr, therikleioi 4
 two of these with handles and bases
 one without embolion and two with
 (45) bases and broken off handles
 weight 880 dr, rhodiakai 8 with bases
 and handles broken off weight 792 dr
 plateiai 6 one without base
 weight 496 dr, karchesion
 (50) without base weight 73 dr, arysas
 weight 33 dr, escharis weight 46 dr, *libanotis* weight
 72 dr, kyathos broken without head

weight 28 dr, *kanoun* broken with pieces
weight 520 dr, *thymiaterion* with
(55) the bronze nail weight 656+ dr
and phiale gold which king Philip dedicated
and in my arche hieropoioi Polyxenos, Sokritos
@philonideion skaphion 100 dr and @gorgieion
phiale 100 dr, @skaphion arch. Telemnestos (202)
(60) epist. Echekratides 100 dr, @another mikytheion epist.
Aristokudos wt 100 dr, @another mikytheion epist.
Leothalos 100 dr [vac.]

Type D ID 132, 133, 134: no weight, same order; epeteia only, arranged by date, with full inscription (archon, epistates, hieropoios)³⁰

ID 133^{be} (170 BC)

(15) gold phiale which king Philip dedicated
(17) 7 gorgieioi silver phialai arch. Telesarchides (181) Phokaieus (180), Demares (179), Xenotimos (178), Oineus (177), Phokaieus (176), Polyxenos (175)
(20) cups of Boule arch. Demares (179), *stesileion* arch. Demares (179), hierop. Synonymos and Kritias, philonideion arch. Demares (179) of Boule arch. Phokaieus (176) Diaktorides epist.
(25) mikytheion arch. Xenotimos (178) epist. Meilichides, mikytheion arch. Xenotimos (178) hier. Amphoterios Polyxenos Silenos Philippos
(28) philonideion arch. Oineus (177) epist. Philonymos, mikytheion arch. Oineus (177) hierop. Demetrios Meilichides, philonideion arch. Oineus (177) hier. Amnos, Charkleides, Agorallos, Charilas, philonideion arch. Oineus (177)
(33) mikytheion epist. Apatourios of Boule arch. Phokaieus (176), mikytheion epist. Anaxandros arch. Phokaieus (176), mikytheion epist. Mnesikleides arch. Phokaieus (176) hierop. Lysos, Aristoboulos, Demochares, Demodokos, philonideion of Boule arch. Phokaieus (176), *stesileion* arch. Phokaieus (176) hierop. Euboeus, Parmenion

30. The text shows signs of carelessness: v.61 Demokritos son of Demokratos is presumably a mistake for Demokritos son of Timokratos, as in v.59; several times one dedication will have two archon-dates, either by dittography (v.48 Parmenion/Parmenion; v. 57 Periandros / Periandros) or separated by several years (v.22 Demares / Phokaieus; v.55 Polybos / Theodoros), never separated by one year as we find when two years' funding is required for a dedication.

(41) philonideion arch. Polyxenos (175) hierop. Timoxenos, Theodoros, philonideion of Boule arch. Polyxenos (175)

(44) two stesileia of Boule arch. Polybos (174), stesileion arch. Polybos (174)

(46) mikytheion epist. Diaktorides arch. Parmenon (173), mikytheion epist. Peisikrates, stesileon cup of Boule arch. Parmenion (173) hierop. Glaukon, Andromenos arch. Parmenion (173), philonideion epist. Empedos, phiale gorgieion epist. Hieron, mikytheion cup (mikytheion) epist. Xenokritos, philonideion cup, gorgieion phiale hierop. arch Polybos (174) arch. Theodoros (171)

(56) stesileion cup of Boule in arch. Periandros (172) arch. Periandros (172), mikytheion cup epist. Demokritos s. Timokratos, hierop. Phokion and Charistios arch. Periandros (172), philonideion cup epist. Demokritos s. Demokratos, gorgeion phiale epist. Diogenos s. Nikanor

(63) handed over in my arche: cup of Boule arch. Theodoros (171), stesileion epist.[vac], another mikytheion epist. Mnesikleides s. Euandros, hierop. Epitrophon Alexikos, arch ---, philonideion epist. A[ris]tol[ochos? gorgeion phiale epist. Phillakos s. Euphragoros

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Ο ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΥΤΑΝΕΙΟΥ

Οί κατάλογοι του θησαυρού του Πρυτανείου που συνέτασσαν οί άρχοντες της Δήλου άκολουθοϋν τρεις διαφορετικούς τύπους κατά τὸ δεύτερο μισὸ τοῦ 3ου π.Χ. αἰώνα. Μόνον ὁ τρίτος τύπος ἀναφέρει τὸ βάρος τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, παρὰ τὸ γεγονός ὅτι στὸ πρῶτο μισὸ τοῦ αἰώνα οί ἱεροποιοί, στοὺς δικούς τους καταλόγους, ζύγιζαν τακτικὰ τὰ ἀντικείμενα καὶ τὰ ἀνακατέτασσαν. Ἐφόσον οί ἄρχοντες ἀρχίζουν νὰ καταγράφουν τὸ βάρος τῶν ἀναθημάτων τὴν ἴδια ἐποχὴ πού παρατηρεῖται καὶ αὔξηση στὸ μέγεθος τοῦ θησαυροῦ, μπορούμε νὰ ὑποθέσουμε ὅτι ἡ αὔξηση τῶν ἀναθημάτων ὀδήγησε σὲ χαοτικὲς συνθήκες ἀποθήκευσης, μὲ ἀποτέλεσμα νὰ εἶναι ἀπαραίτητη ἡ πλήρης ταύτιση τῶν ἀντικειμένων μὲ βάση τὸ σχῆμα, τὸ βάρος καὶ τὴν κατάστασή τους. Ἀκριβῶς τὸ ἀντίθετο ἰσχύει στὴν περίπτωση τῶν ἱεροποιῶν, ὅπου τὸ σύστημα τοῦ ἐτησίου ζυγίσματος τῶν ἀντικειμένων, μᾶλλον γιὰ λόγους ταύτισης, ἐξαφανίζεται ἀκριβῶς τὴν ἐποχὴ πού τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐξάνει δραματικά. Ὅπως φαίνεται, δὲν ὑπάρχει κάποια ἀπλὴ ἀπάντηση στὸ ἐρώτημα γιατί οί Δήλιοι (Ξανα)ζύγιζαν τὰ ἀντικείμενα τῶν διαφορῶν θησαυρῶν τους.

