

## Vol 18 (2024)

Tekmeria 18 (2024)

NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH  
SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY

*Selene E. Psoma*

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.38341](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.38341)

Copyright © 2024, Selene E. Psoma



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](#).

**To cite this article:**

Psoma, S. E. (2024). Deconstructing a Prussian Myth: The Athenian Standards Decree (IG I3 1453a-g). *Tekmeria*, 18, 231–282. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.38341>

SELENE E. PSOMA

## Deconstructing a Prussian Myth: The Athenian Standards Decree (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453a-g)\*

Es ist dringendes Bedürfnis das ein ordentlicher Philologe eigens darum Numismatik lerne, daß er die Münzen des fünften Jahrhunderts geschichtlich verarbeite.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aus Kydathen* (Berlin 1880) 31 n. 56

à Olivier Picard (1940-2023)

The Athenian Standards Decree (ASD) is one of the most controversial pieces of evidence for fifth-century BC Athens and its hegemony. It has been widely discussed by epigraphists, numismatists and historians. The bibliography on the decree is enormous: as a PhD student I tried to collect all the references to the decree in *SEG* and filled an entire notebook. In this article I propose to adopt a reading and understanding of the decree as a technical financial measure, following others.<sup>1</sup> This interpretation takes into consideration (a) the very limited evidence from coin hoards, as it has already been pointed out,<sup>2</sup> (b) the absence of serious numismatic evidence (i.e. evidence from mints) for a break in coinage in the allied cities, (c) the way monetary units are mentioned in epigraphic documents from Athens, such as the *Athenian Tribute Lists* (ATL) and other documents, and (d) the clauses of the decree, as well as those of IG I<sup>3</sup> 90. I will begin with the story we all know about the decree and turn to these four points afterwards.

In a passage from Aristophanes' *Birds* (1040-1041), produced in 414 BC, the decree seller presents a decree according to which χρήσθαι Νεφελοκοκκυγιάς τοῖς αὐτοῖς μέτροισι | καὶ σταθμοῖσι καὶ ψηφίσμασι καθάπερ Ὀλοφύζιοι ("The Cloudcuckoolanders are to use the selfsame measures, weights, and decrees as

---

\* For very useful discussions I wish to thank Alain Bresson, Edward M. Harris and Olivier Picard (†), and those who attended the Paris 2018 Conference, the Athens Numismatic Seminar (13/01/2020), Postgraduate Seminars at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, and the ANS Long Tables.

1. Schönhammer 1993; Figueira 1998, *passim*; Picard 1999; Samons 2000, 330-332; Kallet 2001, 218-226. Cf. Cataudella 1986.

2. Konuk 2011.

the Olophyxians”).<sup>3</sup> Bergk in the Teubner edition of 1857 suggested emending ψηφίσμασι to νομίσμασι, which was adopted by Blaydes, van Leeuwen, and Del Corno,<sup>4</sup> but not by Sommerstein, Henderson and Dunbar.<sup>5</sup> It was on the basis of the emendation of Bergk that von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf hypothesized the existence of such a decree well before it “started surfacing in the form of epigraphic fragments”.<sup>6</sup>

The passage appears to allude to a clause in a decree issued by the Athenians for their allies, but comic distortion makes it risky to reconstruct the actual provisions from these lines. A fragment of a decree allegedly discovered at Smyrna and containing language similar to that found in the Aristophanes’ passage was published by Baumeister in 1855.<sup>7</sup> Other fragments from Siphnos, Syme, Cos, Aphytis, Olbia and, possibly, Hamaxitos have been published since.<sup>8</sup> The texts of the fragments appear to overlap in certain places, making it possible to reconstruct the main clauses of the decree(s) and their sequence.<sup>9</sup> The

3. Ar. Av. 1040-1041, trans. by J. Henderson 2000, 161.

4. Blaydes 1882; van Leeuwen 1902; Del Corno 1987.

5. Sommerstein 1987, 269; Dunbar 1995, 571; Henderson 2000, 161.

6. Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 252, with reference to von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1877. Cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1880, 30: “der Staat selbst gab natürlich nur attisches Geld aus, und es leuchtet ein daß durch die fortwährende Umprägung eine ganz unverhältnismäßige Masse attischer Münze in Umlauf kam, die denn auch weit über die Grenzen der civilisirten Welt cursierte, zumal es an einem Hinweis nicht fehlt daß der vorort auch auf Einheit in Mafs gewicht und Münze bei den Städten hinarbeitete”. At this point, in n. 56, Wilamowitz adds: “Belegen kann ich das nur mit dem Gesetzesfragment bei Aristoph. Vög. 1040, wo νομίσμασι, wie ich sehe, schon Bergk aus ψηφίσμασι verbessert hat”.

7. Baumeister 1855, 196-197 no. 22; *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453g. For this copy of the decree, see Pazarkadas, Santini 2023.

8. For Siphnos (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453e), see Wilhelm 1897, 180 [= 1898, 43]. For Syme (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453a, d), see Hiller von Gaertringen 1923. For Cos (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453b), see Segre 1938. For a date of the fragment of Cos in the 440s BC, see Figueira 1998, 431-465. For the two fragments from Aphytis (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453c, *SEG* 51, 55), see Hatzopoulos 2000-2003 and 2013-2014, with previous publications and bibliography. For Olbia (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453f), see Braund 2005. For Hamaxitus (*SEG* 39,2), see Mattingly 1993. Figueira (1998, 347-348) rejected the assignment of the fragment from Hamaxitus to the Athenian Coinage Decree.

9. Full discussion in Hatzopoulos 2013-2014.

composite texts of David Lewis in *IG I<sup>3</sup>*, M. B. Hatzopoulos, and Osborne and Rhodes contain fourteen clauses, but the first and last are so fragmentary that any restorations are inevitably speculative.<sup>10</sup>

The way the decree was interpreted is well known to all of us. The leading Prussian scholar Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf proposed the interpretation we all learn, from school books to postgraduate seminars: the decree banned the minting of coinages of the city-members of the Athenian alliance, i.e. the cities of Euboea, the islands of the Aegean Sea, Thrace and Western Asia Minor.<sup>11</sup> Given the impact of Wilamowitz in Classical studies, his interpretation of the decree became canonical. Wilamowitz was obviously influenced in his interpretation of the decree by the recent creation of a common coinage for the German Empire and found a Classical precedent for the monetary unification of 1871. Epigraphists comparing letter shapes from different cities –which is a methodological mistake–, followed by numismatists searching for a firm *terminus ante quem* to date coin series, adopted the same interpretation, and the debate concentrated on the date.<sup>12</sup>

Such a measure, allegedly revealing the imperial character and policy of Athens, was first associated with Callias, Cimon's brother-in-law, the richest Athenian of his day. The three-bar *sigma* of the fragment from Cos was the main argument, as it was believed to have disappeared from Athenian official documents by 447 BC.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, a date in the early 440s BC was proposed.<sup>14</sup> There were several objections to this early date, summarized by M. B. Hatzopoulos in his third article on the new fragment from Aphytis.<sup>15</sup> When hoard evidence (the Decadrachm hoard) showed that this date was untenable and had to be lowered, a date in 425 BC, previously also proposed,

---

10. *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453a-f and the new Aphytis fragment published by M. B. Hatzopoulos. For this new fragment, see Hatzopoulos 2000-2003 (SEG 51, 55); Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 239-240 (SEG 64, 53); Osborne-Rhodes 2017, 329-337 no. 155. Cf. Maltese 2021, 5-6.

11. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1880, 30; 1913, 52 (*non vidi*).

12. Full discussion in Hatzopoulos 2013-2014. Cf. Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 329-337 no. 155.

13. This was the date proposed by Meritt (*ATL* II 6364). Cf. Segre 1938, 167-169 n. 8; Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 252-253; Maltese 2021, 15-16. For a date in the 440s BC for the fragment of Cos, see also Figueira 1998, 431-465.

14. Retained also in *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1453 (D.M. Lewis). Cf. Robinson 1949.

15. Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 251-257.

was adopted.<sup>16</sup> With a date in 425 BC, it seemed obvious that Cleon and his friends, well known for their views about the allies, were behind the decree.<sup>17</sup> One recalls that his relative Thoudippos was involved in the assessment of the same year which imposed an increased tribute upon members (and members in revolt) of the Empire.<sup>18</sup>

Harold Mattingly wrote a number of articles to support a date in 425 BC, which was also retained by all participants –with one exception– in the Oxford conference of 2004, which remains unpublished.<sup>19</sup> In this conference, Lisa Kallet, following Cavaignac, supported the date she proposed in 2001, i.e. 414 BC, and the association of the decree with the introduction of the *eikoste*.<sup>20</sup> According to Kallet, the decree was quickly revoked and left no traceable impact on the coinages of the cities of the so-called Athenian Empire.<sup>21</sup> Kallet was followed by Kroll in 2009, and partly by Osborne and Rhodes in 2017.<sup>22</sup>

---

16. For the numismatic evidence from the Decadrachm hoard, see Fried 1987; Kagan 1987; Price 1987. For a date for the decree in 425 BC, see Hiller von Gaertringen 1923, 116. He was followed by Tod (1933, 67) and Robinson (1935, 151-152). In 1957, H. Mattingly began “his unremitting onslaught against Meritt’s elevation of a single letter to error-proof criterion for dating fifth century Attic epigraphic documents” (Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 253-254). For the long discussion on the so-called Athenian Coinage Decree and the low chronology, see Mattingly 1957, 31-32; 1993, 99-102; 1996; 1999, 120-122; 2000, 261-263.

17. Mattingly 1961, 148 n. 1 with previous bibliography. See also Eich 2021, 66-70; Matthaiou 2010, 11. Cf. Hiller von Gaertringen 1923, 116. Cf. Maltese 2021, 16.

18. For the assessment, see *IG I<sup>3</sup> 71*. For a Κλέων Θουδίππου, see the accounts of the *tamiai* of Athena: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1410*, ll. 1-2 (377/6 BC) and 1411, ll. 506 (376/5 BC). This reveals that Cleon and Thoudippos were or became relatives.

19. The only paper of the conference that was published is the one by M. B. Hatzopoulos (Hatzopoulos 2013-2014). For the ideological framework of the decree, see Finley 1985, 168-169, followed by Will 1988, 419-420 [= Will 1998, 849-850]; Le Rider 2001, 255; Hatzopoulos 2000-2003, 40-43 and 2013-2014, 258-259.

20. Kallet 2001, 218-226. Cf. Cavaignac 1953, 6-7. For the *eikoste*, see Thuc. 7.28.4; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.9. For the date of its introduction (413 BC), see Kallet 2001, 218 n. 135 (Mattingly 1979, 320; *HCT IV ad loc.*); Kallet 2013, 55; Lazar 2024, 90-92. For a date between 421 and 418 BC see Maltese 2021.

21. See previous note.

22. Kroll 2009, 199-201; Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 337.

Recent scholarship cast doubt on the traditional interpretation of the decree. Maria Schönhammer in a summary of her unpublished thesis on this decree proposed the interpretation of νομισμασι in the relevant clause of the decree as coinage standard.<sup>23</sup> For Thomas Figueira, the allied states paid their *phoros* in Athenian coins. This procedure presented “practical advantages over the complexity in exchange and awkwardness of making payments in a variety of local currencies”.<sup>24</sup> Olivier Picard also interpreted the decree as a technical financial measure.<sup>25</sup> Samons rejected the view that the decree represents a crucial stage in the transformation of the league to empire. According to Samons, the decree had little impact on the way Athenian imperial finance actually functioned.<sup>26</sup> Lisa Kallet, followed by Maltese and Lazar, considered the decree not as an oppressive political weapon but as a measure to facilitate exchange and transactions in the commercial realm.<sup>27</sup>

Let us turn now to the four (4) points I mentioned at the beginning.

### Hoard evidence

In his 2012 article on the presence of Athenian owls in Asia Minor, Koray Konuk stressed that owls are found in only very limited numbers in hoards and single finds discovered within the *arche* in Asia Minor.<sup>28</sup> The so-called Decad-rachm hoard from Elmali, Pamphylia (CH VIII 48), and a new hoard which contains hundreds of Athenian coins and comes also from Asia Minor do not challenge this view, because they were both buried in territories under Persian control.<sup>29</sup> All specialists of Macedonia and Thrace know that “there is practically no hoard-evidence to show that Athenian coins played an important

---

23. Schönhammer 1993.

24. Cf. SEG 48, 63 and Figueira 1998, 259-295.

25. Picard 1999; cf. Picard 1986, 160-163. For the economic purpose of the decree, see Cataudella 1986.

26. Samons 2000, 330-332.

27. Kallet 2001, 205-226. Cf. Maltese 2021, 7-13; Lazar 2024, 90-92.

28. Konuk 2011.

29. For the Elmali hoard, see various contributions in *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (1987). The new hoard from Asia Minor was presented by G. Kakavas in the XVI International Numismatic Congress (INC 2022), 11-16 September, Warsaw, Poland. For other hoards with Attic currency buried outside the Athenian *arche* see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 156-157.

role in the North Aegean at any period in the second half of the fifth century BC".<sup>30</sup> The 2006 hoard from the excavations of Methone was buried well before Methone became a member of the Athenian League in the early 420s.<sup>31</sup> There are no hoards of Athenian coins from the islands of the Aegean Sea with the exception of Euboea, whose cities minted coinage during the early decades of the fifth century and later stopped.<sup>32</sup>

However, two passages in Thucydides and one in Xenophon, as well as all mentions of the money Lysander sent to Sparta, reveal that during the last decade of the Peloponnesian war Athenian owls played a significant role as a means of payment to soldiers and those who rowed in the Athenian and Peloponnesian fleets.<sup>33</sup> This is also reflected in Aristophanes' lines in his *Frogs*.<sup>34</sup> Athenian coins had a good reputation due to the purity of their metal. This was the reason they were preferred by Greeks and barbarians. The story narrated by Claudius Aelianus, about an Attic drachm being the prize for the man who catches the king of the whelks at Byzantium, might also refer to this period.<sup>35</sup> As owls circulated in the Aegean during the last years of the war, to explain their absence from hoards buried within the territories of the *arche* (with the exception of Euboea), one needs also to take into account

---

30. Howgego 1998, 48. There were no Athenian tetradrachms in the Scione 1991 hoard (*CH* VII 63 and IX 4), which contained silver staters of Acanthus, Mende, Scione and Potidaea on the Attic-Euboean standard. Part of the hoard was published by Tselekas 2009, 321-329.

31. It contained 15 Athenian tetradrachms and 9 staters of Alexander I and its burial dates from the late 460s / early 450s BC; see Gatzolis, Psoma forthcoming. For the erroneous restoration of the ethnic of Methone in *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 280, l. ii 67, see Piérart 1988. Methone's ethnic appears for the first time in *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 282, l. ii 53 of 429/8 BC.

32. For the silver coinages of the cities of Euboea (Carystus, Chalcis, Eretria), see Price, Waggoner 1975, 53-56 nos. 250-258. For their end in ca. 465 BC, see Picard 1999, 209. For 5th-cent. BC hoards with Athenian coins buried in Euboea, see *infra*, Appendix (list of hoards).

33. Thuc. 8.29.1-2 and 8.45.2; Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.4; cf. Plut. *Lys.* 16.2; Diod. *Sic.* 13.106.9. See also von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1880, 30-31: "(...) es ist artig zu hören, wie die würdigen Staatsmänner Spartas, der sittenstrengen Stadt, die überhaupt die Wertmetalle als Teufelswerk verbannt, ihre Bestechungen in den laureotischen Eulen einstreichen".

34. Ar. *Ran.* 721-726.

35. Ael. *NA* 7.32.

a number of facts. What comes first is the huge amount of money Lysander sent to Sparta at the very end of the Peloponnesian war.<sup>36</sup> Thus, owls moved from Western Asia Minor and the Aegean to Sparta. Second, it cannot be excluded that owls entered the *gaza* of the satraps of Asia Minor as well as the royal Persian *gaza* and in this way found their way to the territories of the Achaemenid Empire from a much earlier date, well before the final years of the war.<sup>37</sup> It is tempting to explain in this way the significant hoards that were buried within the territories of the Persian Empire (the Decadrachm hoard and other unpublished hoards).<sup>38</sup> Third, Athenian coins of good silver might have been melted down to provide metal for the production of local coinages.<sup>39</sup> It has been proposed to link this with the decision of the Athenians to impose the decree and their wish “d’enrayer la raréfaction de leur monnaie”.<sup>40</sup> Metal analysis might provide more evidence about this hypothesis.

What comes at the very end is the most significant. During the fourth century BC Athenian owls were not legal tender outside Athens and had to be exchanged for local coins, as we learn from both Apollodorus of Acharnae, the son of Pasion, and Xenophon, who also mentioned their good exchange rate.<sup>41</sup> It seems difficult to admit that things were different during the fifth century BC and that Athenian coinage was legal tender within the *arche*. The evidence we have for two members of the League, Phocaea and Mytilene, indicate the opposite. These two proceeded to the minting of an electrum coinage in alternation and created a monetary zone through a monetary pact between the two cities (IG XII 2, 1), which was still valid ca. 360 BC.<sup>42</sup> Thucydides (4.52.2.-3.6)

---

36. Four hundred seventy (470) talents: Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.8-9; Plut. *Lys.* 16.1; one thousand five hundred (1,500) talents: Diod. Sic. 13.106.8; three hundred (300) talents were stolen by Gylippus: Diod. Sic. 13.106.9.

37. Konuk 2011, 60-61. Cf. van Alfen 2012 and 2016. For a list of hoards see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 156-157.

38. For a prepublication of the Decadrachm hoard, see Carradice 1987. For the Karkemish hoard, see Wartenberg 2015, 359-360. For some other hoards, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 156-157.

39. This is most probably what happened in the Macedonian kingdom under Archelaus: Psoma 2015a, 4 with n. 16.

40. Flament 2011, 50.

41. [Dem.] 50.30; Xen. *Vect.* 3.2.

42. This is revealed by an anecdote attributed to the 4th-cent. BC historian

mentions that in 424 BC “the citizens of Mytilene and of the other cities of Lesbos who were in exile, the majority of them setting out from the mainland, hired some mercenaries from the Peloponnesus, gathered still others on the spot, and took Rhoeteum; but they restored it again to its citizens without having done any damage, with a ransom of 2,000 Phocaeen staters” (trans. C. F. Smith).<sup>43</sup>

Thus, hoard (and literary) evidence does not at all support the hypothesis of a wide circulation and extensive, let alone exclusive, use of Athenian owls within the frontiers of the so-called Athenian Alliance. One cannot make a study of the numismatic circulation of owls without owls.

### Mints

As far as mints are concerned, two phenomena need to be taken into consideration in the discussion and the interpretation proposed here for the so-called Athenian Coinage Decree: (a) the end of production of local coinages and (b) a change in weight standard of local coinages.

On the basis of an early date in the 440s for the decree and its interpretation as imposing a ban on local coinages, Robinson’s famous article published in 1949 proposed an end for almost all coinages minted in the cities that were members of the Athenian Alliance ca. 449 BC.<sup>44</sup> Barron, writing in the 1960s about the coinage of Samos, proposed a gap in the early 430s for Samos in relation with the end of the Samian revolt, “when Athens conquered Samos and obliged her to observe the Currency Decree”.<sup>45</sup> As the publication of the Decadrachm hoard in 1987 refuted this early date for the end of a number of coinages,<sup>46</sup> dates in the mid-420s for an eventual end of these coinages began to be adopted, as had been previously proposed by Erxleben and Mattingly.<sup>47</sup>

---

Callisthenes involving the poet Persinos and Euboulos, the tyrant of Aeolian Atarneus (*FGrHist* 124 F4 [*apud* Poll. 9.93.4-9]). See also *infra* n. 62.

43. In the fourth century, Mantitheus claims that when he was on military service and had collected mercenaries, Apollonides, the Athenian *proxenos* at Mytilene, and the friends of Athens provided him with 300 Phocaic staters, which he spent on these troops: [Dem.] 40.36-37.

44. Robinson 1949.

45. Barron 1966, 92.

46. Price 1987, 47. Cf. Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 259.

47. Erxleben 1969; 1970; 1971; Mattingly 1957; 1996; 1999; 2000.

In the early 1990s, Hardwick followed the same path and proposed a break in the coin production of Chios in ca. 425 BC as a result of the decree.<sup>48</sup> Mattingly made a similar assumption for Acanthus, Maroneia and Mende, and Chryssanthaki-Nagle for Abdera.<sup>49</sup>

The evidence from mints has been exploited by Thomas Figueira and further discussed by Jack Kroll and more recently by Lisa Kallet and Jack Kroll.<sup>50</sup> We will briefly go through evidence from some mints for which we have more recent studies. The coinages of the Cycladic islands on three different standards (Euboean-Attic, Aeginetan and Milesian) came to an end at a date which is independent from the decree, mostly during the first half of the century.<sup>51</sup> This was also the case for the silver coinages (on the Euboean-Attic standard) of the three cities of Euboea, ca. 465 BC, as well as for a number of mints in the Chalcidic peninsula (Aineia, the Chalcidians of Thrace, Scione, Potidaea, Sermyleia, Stageira and Torone), also on the Euboean-Attic standard, and the cities on the coast opposite Thasos (Berge / Datos, Eion, Galepsos, Dicaea), on a local standard.<sup>52</sup> The interruption –if there really was one– of Aegina’s numismatic

---

48. For the conclusions of his still unpublished thesis, see Hardwick 1993. For the break between 425 and 412 BC, see Hardwick 1993, 216.

49. For Maroneia and Mende, see Mattingly 2000. *Contra* Psoma 2000, 32–33 (Mende) and 2008, 165–166 (Maroneia). For Abdera, see Chryssanthaki-Nagle 2007, 111–117: period IV (450–430/25 BC), which runs parallel to Maroneia period III: Wartenberg 1992, 195–198. For Acanthus, Mende and Abdera, see also Mattingly 2014, 16–17.

50. Figueira 1998, 21–197; Kroll 2009, 201–203; Kallet, Kroll 2020, 39–72. Cf. Maltese 2021, 31.

51. Sheedy 2006: the three cities of Ceos (Carthaea, Ioulis and Corhesia) ca. 470 BC; Cythnus ca. 460 BC; Siphnos ca. 455 BC; Melos (not a member of the League until 425 BC) down to 416 BC; Thera (not a member of the League until 425 BC) ca. 500 BC; Anaphe, Delos and Paros ca. 470 BC; Tenos ca. 500 BC; Naxos ca. 490 BC. For fractions from Siphnos on the Attic weight, which continued to be minted after 460 BC, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 51–52; Kagan 2022, 3–4. For the Cycladic islands and the Athenian Empire, see Bonnin 2015 and 2019.

52. For Euboea, see *supra* n. 32 and Kallet, Kroll 2020, 48–49. For Olynthus, see Psoma 2001, 253–261. For Scione, see Marathaki 2014; Kagan 2014. For Potidaea, see Alexander 1953. For Sermyleia and Stageira, see Psoma 2000, 27 and 29. For Torone, see Hardwick 1998. For Argilus, see Liampi 2005. For the coinages of Berge / Datos, Eion and Galepsos, see Psoma 2006, 66–67, 72, 73, 74–75, and 2016b, 83. Cf. Kroll 2009, 200.

production was considered as the immediate result of Athenian intervention in 431 BC: the Aeginetans were expelled and found their way to the Peloponnese while the Athenians established a cleruchy on the island.<sup>53</sup> Different explanations have been proposed for the end of these coinages.<sup>54</sup>

While working on the silver coinage of Olynthus, the Chalcidian League and other silver coinages emanating from cities of the Chalcidic peninsula, I did not take the ASD under consideration simply because the Chalcidians of Thrace were the enemies of Athens in this area from 432 to, most probably, the end of the war.<sup>55</sup> For the needs of this war, they minted their silver coinage on the standard of their ally, Perdiccas II of Macedonia.<sup>56</sup> In a short 1997 publication I proposed to explain the change of standard of Acanthus in relation with the need of this new ally of all enemies of Athens to pay for Brasidas' soldiers, together with the Chalcidians and Perdiccas II of Macedonia.<sup>57</sup> Later, I proposed on the basis of style the continuation of the silver coinage of Mende after Cleon's intervention, and Jonathan Kagan provided more evidence to strengthen my arguments.<sup>58</sup> In my study of the excavation coins from the two sites of Maroneia, which included a chapter on the silver coinage of this city, I paid no attention to the decree, because it already seemed obvious to me that all attempts to posit a break in silver coin production at any date were based on preconceived ideas about the decree and its date.<sup>59</sup> Like Abdera and Ainos, Maroneia issued on a non-Attic standard.<sup>60</sup> There is no reason to assume that they stopped issuing coinage as a result of the decree. On the contrary, the three cities of Aegean Thrace continued to mint their silver coinages down

---

53. Thuc. 2.27.1-2; 8.69.3; cf. 4.57.1. For Aegina's 5th-cent. BC coinage, see Sheedy 2012, 108-109: "The final phase of the island's fifth-century BC coinage is often placed in the years between 445 BC and the Athenian expulsion of the Aeginetans in 431 BC". See also Houghtalin 2015; Kallet, Kroll 2020, 75-77; Psoma forthcoming b. For the *eikoste* and Aegina, see Ar. *Ran.* 362-364. For the return of the Aeginetans to their island and for Lysander after the end of the Peloponnesian War, see Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.9.

54. Sheedy 2006, 125: impoverishment; cf. Konuk 2011; see also Kallet, Kroll 2020, 70.

55. Psoma 2011a, 120.

56. Psoma 2001, 173; Kagan 2014, 13.

57. Psoma 1997.

58. Psoma 2000, 32-33. Cf. Psoma 2008, 165 with n. 33; Kagan 2014, 16-23, and 2022, 10.

59. Psoma 2008, 165-166.

60. For Ainos see also Kallet, Kroll 2020, 58-59.

to the fourth century BC.<sup>61</sup> The electrum coinages of Cyzicus and Lampsacus, Mytilene and Phocaea that were not included in the discussions about the decree, continued during the *Pentecontaetia*.<sup>62</sup> The silver coinages of Lampsacus, Abydos, Parion, Selymbria and Cyzicus were minted on the Persian standard.<sup>63</sup> Samos continued minting on its own standard.<sup>64</sup> Chios made payments to the Spartans with its own currency in 412 BC (and also later).<sup>65</sup> Although there are only a few *corpora* of coinages of Greek cities of Western Asia Minor,<sup>66</sup> cities within the *arche* issued “small-denomination coinages whose chronologies cannot be pinned down”.<sup>67</sup>

Let’s turn now to changes of standard. Olynthus / the Chalcidian League and Aineia adopted a local version of the Milesian standard in the 430s BC, following their ally in the war against Athens, Perdiccas II of Macedonia.<sup>68</sup> Aineia revolted in 432 BC but joined the *arche* later. Olynthus became a member and the administrative capital of the Chalcidian League and never issued its own

---

61. For the monetary production of Maroneia during the 5th century BC, see Psoma 2008, 166–167. During the last quarter of the 5th century BC Maroneia issued double staters (13.9–14.05 g), staters (6.71–6.90 g), trihemibols (0.62–0.84 g), obols (0.32 g) and *tetartemoria* (0.9–0.21 g). For the early 4th century BC, see Psoma 2008, 170, with Ellis-Evans, Kagan 2022.

62. Bodenstedt 1981; Kroll 2009, 200. By issuing their electrum sixths Mytilene and Phocaea created their own monetary zone, which survived into the 4th cent. BC: Bresson 2009. Cyzicus was a special case, and perhaps also Lampsacus: Kroll 2009, 200; Psoma 2020b. For electrum at Athens during the 5th cent. BC, see also Lewis 1987, 62–63.

63. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 59–60.

64. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 62–63.

65. Thuc. 8.101.1; Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.12. For the electrum staters of Mytilene, Chios and Lampsacus on the Chian standard, see Ellis-Evans 2016.

66. In the 2012 *Oxford Handbook of Greek Coinage* there is no chapter on cities of Asia Minor after 480 BC. For the years before this date, see Konuk 2012.

67. Kroll 2009, 200. See also Kallet, Kroll 2020, 39–72. Kroll also stressed that “with the possible exception of Ephesus and Teos, the sixteen minters of higher-value coins in the later fifth century were city-states whose economies were characterized by some exceptional circumstance or initiative”. These cities are Ephesus, Teos, Samos and Chios, Thasos, Abdera, Maroneia, Ainos, Mende, Acanthus, Aspendos, Celenderis and the four cities that minted electrum coinages (Cyzicus, Lampsacus, Mytilene and Phocaea).

68. Psoma 2016a, 104.

coinage again. The Chalcidian League also adopted the Milesian standard for its coinage, which emerged together with the Chalcidian state, i.e. after 432 BC, the date of the *anoikismos* and the beginning of the *Potidaiaitika*.<sup>69</sup> It served to pay for the war and later for Brasidas' soldiers.<sup>70</sup> This was the reason Acanthus stopped minting on the Euboean-Attic standard and turned to the Milesian standard of the Chalcidians in 424/3 BC.<sup>71</sup> Mende, which previously minted its coinage on the Euboean-Attic standard, revolted in 423 BC, was later recaptured, and continued to strike its silver coinage on a reduced Attic or other standard during the last two decades of the fifth century BC.<sup>72</sup>

Moving to the east of the Strymon River, the Thasian stater underwent successive reductions to achieve the weight of 8.6g, the weight of the Attic stater, by its latest phase, i.e. during the years of the war.<sup>73</sup> Samothrace and Calchedon minted on the Attic standard,<sup>74</sup> while Apollonia and Mesambria seem to have adopted a weight standard that strongly recalls the Attic.<sup>75</sup> Siphnos continued to strike drachms also on this standard after 460 BC.<sup>76</sup> After the failed revolt of Mytilene, this city, as well as fourteen more cities on the mainland opposite Lesbos minted their silver coinages with their own types and on a reduced version of the Attic standard.<sup>77</sup> Two of these cities, Gergis

---

69. Psoma 2001, 173-174, 177-179. For the standard, see Psoma 2015b, 171-172.

70. Psoma 2001, 156.

71. Psoma 1997, 426 and 2001, 156.

72. Psoma 2000, 32-33; 2008, 164 with n. 167 (reduced standard); Kagan 2014, 16-23 (Euboean).

73. SNG Cop. 1017. See also Picard 1982, 420 and 2000, 304-305.

74. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 59, 60.

75. Psoma 2016a, 99. For a new hoard with staters (Attic weight tetradrachms of Apollonia), see Draganov, Paunov 2017, 422. They propose for these staters dates parallel to Ainos II (435/4-405/4 BC: May 1050, 70-99) and Maroneia V (436/5-411/10 BC: Schönert-Geiss 1987, nos. 85-153) and Athenian tetradrachms dated to 454/3-405/4: Kroll 1993, 5-7, pl. 1, 8a-h. The new dates proposed for Maroneia V (430-400 BC: Psoma 2008, 167-173) fit better the dates Draganov and Paunov proposed. They also proposed to link the decision of the city to issue this coinage on the Attic standard with the payment of the *phoros*.

76. Kagan 2022, 3-4; Kallet, Kroll 2020, 70.

77. Ellis Evans 2019, 189-196: Mytilene, Neandreia, Gergis, Myrina, Pitane, Pergamon, Gargara, Lamponeia, Assos, Dardanos, Kebren, Scepsis, Larisa, Antandros and Porosilene.

and Pergamon, were not members of the Athenian League.<sup>78</sup> This indicates that the Attic standard “spread to the mainland mints through the commercial network of which Mytilene was a major part”.<sup>79</sup> Methymna moved from the Euboean to the lighter Samian standard, while Tenedos adopted what we can consider a reduced version of the Attic standard.<sup>80</sup> During the last decade of the war Samos issued a coinage with its own types but on the Attic standard to fulfill the needs of the ten Samian warships engaged in the war against Sparta and her allies.<sup>81</sup>

Two findings need to be retained from this analysis of silver coinages issued by members of the Athenian Empire:

(a) Numismatic scholarship felt the need to associate the decree with presumed breaks in coin production, thus facilitating the task of dating different periods and finding firm *termini ante quem*.<sup>82</sup> All attempts to locate interruptions in the monetary production of this or that city as a result of the decree, however, remain highly speculative and are almost always based on preconceived ideas about the impact of the decree on the production of different mints. As David Lewis pointed out more than thirty years ago, “I am not sure how, in the circumstances, we really expect that the Decree can do anything to date any coinage”.<sup>83</sup>

(b) Changes of standard did occur, but these do not always concern the Attic standard (Aineia, Olynthus, the Chalcidian League, Acanthus), and are related to historical circumstances deriving from war expenditure (Aineia, Olynthus, the Chalcidian League, Acanthus and Samos), to trade networks or to a change of the gold / silver ratio.<sup>84</sup> There are also cases of cities that strike coinages on the Attic standard, such as Acanthus down to her alliance with Brasidas in 424/3 BC, Mende down to the late 420s BC, Thasos, Mesambria, Apollonia,

---

78. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 95–98.

79. Ellis-Evans 2019, 196.

80. For these coinages, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 61.

81. Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.25, 29; 1.7.30; Diod. Sic. 13.97.2. For the coins, see Barron 1966, 100–101; Kallet, Kroll 2020, 63. For Camirus and Cos, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 64, 66. For Cos see also Sheedy 2019; Kallet, Kroll 2020, 67.

82. Psoma 2008, 164.

83. Lewis 1987, 63.

84. Ellis-Evans, Kagan 2022.

Mytilene and fourteen cities of the mainland opposite Lesbos down to the end of the war.

### Athenian financial documents

From the second half of the fifth century BC, we have various financial documents from Athens. In these documents, the Athenian tribute lists included, money is recorded without a reference to an issuing authority, with very few exceptions.<sup>85</sup> These are: ἀργύριον and staters of Acanthus,<sup>86</sup> νόμισμα of Eretria,<sup>87</sup> ἀργύριον of Boeotia,<sup>88</sup> Phocis<sup>89</sup> and Taras,<sup>90</sup> obols, drachms and staters of Aegina,<sup>91</sup> staters of Corinth<sup>92</sup> and Corcyra,<sup>93</sup> drachms of Chios,<sup>94</sup> ἡμίεκτα of Samos.<sup>95</sup> There are also gold coins (χρυσίου στατήρες),<sup>96</sup> Croesids<sup>97</sup> and darics (δαρεικοῦ χρυσίου στατήρ / στατήρες),<sup>98</sup> electrum coins of Cyzicus, Lampsacus

---

85. For the exceptions, see following notes and the *indices* of IG I<sup>3</sup> III pp. 1031-1942 (II. *Civitates et ethnica. Populi. Loca* s.v. Αἰγινᾶιοι στατήρες, δραχμαί, ὀβολοί, [Ἀκάν]θιοι στατήρες, Βοιωτίο[v] ἀργύριον, Κορίνθιοι στατήρες, [Κορκ]υραῖοι στατήρες, Ταραντῖνον (ἀργύριον), Χιά[ι] δραχμαί [ἀργυρ]αί, Σάμια ἡμίεκτα (ἀργυρίου)), and 1057-1150 (IX. *Index verborum* s.v. ἀργύριον, δραχμή, ἔκτη, ἡμίεκτον, ὀβολός, στατήρ). There is no need to discuss IG I<sup>3</sup> 83, ll. 23, [24], the treaty between Athens, Mantinea, Argos and Elis of 420 BC, which mentions Aeginetan drachms and obols as daily allowances for *hippeis* and *hoplitai*.

86. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, ll. 31, 178 (429/8 BC).

87. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 130 (429/8 BC).

88. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 101 (429/8 BC).

89. IG I<sup>3</sup> 384, l. 5 (450 BC).

90. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 34 (429/8 BC).

91. Staters: IG I<sup>3</sup> 380, l. 32 (404/3 BC); 383, ll. 25, 89, 180 (429/8 BC). For obols, see IG I<sup>3</sup> 386, l. 7 (408/7 BC); 387, l. 6 (408/7 BC). For IG I<sup>3</sup> 83, ll. 23, [24] of 420 BC, see *supra* n. 85.

92. Staters: IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 33 (429/8 BC); 380, ll. 29, [95] (404/3 BC).

93. Staters: IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 91 (429/8 BC).

94. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 27 (429/8 BC).

95. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, ll. 33, 93 (429/8 BC).

96. See IG I<sup>3</sup> III (*Indices*) p. 1147 s.v.

97. IG I<sup>3</sup> 458, l. 29 (440/39 BC), *rationes Minervae statuae*.

98. IG I<sup>3</sup> [379, l. 59] (405/4 BC); 383, ll. 18, [43], 111 (429/8 BC); [386, l. 48] (408/7 BC); [387, l. 55] (408/7 BC); [388, l. 5] (420-405 BC); 389, l. 6 (post 408/7 BC).

and Phocaea.<sup>99</sup> In a restricted number of cases there is mention of ἀργύριον ξενικόν,<sup>100</sup> which is grouped together with ἄσημον in a document from Eleusis of 450 BC.<sup>101</sup> The term ἀργύριον ἐπίσημον (σύμμεικτον) of the *traditio* of the *tamiai* of All Other Gods of 429/8 BC, and the *ratio Eleusinae* of 420 BC refers to foreign and local silver coins alike.<sup>102</sup> In a number of documents we also find ἀργύριον (ἐπίσημον) ἡμεδαπόν.<sup>103</sup>

With the exception of Aeginetan and Corinthian staters in the list of expenses of 404/3 BC, as well as darics in documents from Eleusis, and the electrum coinages, all other foreign coins occur in the list of the *tamiai* of All the Other Gods of 429/8 BC.<sup>104</sup> This document listed coins that belonged to the Other Gods and were moved to the Acropolis for security reasons. These coins were in fact offerings in the various sanctuaries of Attica. In documents from Eleusis are mentioned coins, mainly darics, that were also offered as dedications.<sup>105</sup> All other documents record objects and coins of the Hecatompedon, Athena Polias and Victory and others.<sup>106</sup> Thus, the mention of foreign coins in these documents can be explained in relation to the function of the documents. These very rare cases of ἀργύριον ξενικόν together with the special mention of ἀργύριον ἡμεδαπόν reveal that all the other amounts were calculated in Athenian owls.<sup>107</sup> One recalls the 3,000 talents νομίσματος ἡμεδαποῦ

99. For Cyzicene staters, *hektai* and *chryson*, see IG I<sup>3</sup> III p. 1036 s.v. Κυζικηνός. For staters and *hektai* of Lampsacus, see IG I<sup>3</sup> III p. 1036 s.v. Λαμψακηνός. For electrum coins of Phocaea (*chryson*, staters, *hektai* and *argyrion*), see IG I<sup>3</sup> 342, ll. 9, 10, 19 (405/4 BC); 380, l. 34 (404/3 BC); 383, l. 19 (429/8 BC); [386, l. 50] (408/7 BC); [387, l. 57] (407/6 BC); 388, l. 7 (420-405 BC); 389, l. 8 (408/7 BC).

100. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, ll. 384-387 (429/8 BC); 384, ll. 1-2 (ca. 450 BC); 386, ll. 55-56 (408/7 BC); 387, ll. 63-65 (408/7 BC); 388, l. 13 (420-405 BC); 389, l. 14 (408/7 BC); 409, l. 22 (420-405 BC).

101. IG I<sup>3</sup> 384, l. 1 (450 BC).

102. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383, l. 384 (429/8 BC); 385, l. 5 (420 BC).

103. IG I<sup>3</sup> [372, l. 2] (413/2 BC); 376, ll. [32], 38, [41], 52, 67, 82 (409/8 BC); 378, l. 22 (406/5 BC); 383, l. 237 (429/8 BC).

104. IG I<sup>3</sup> 383.

105. IG I<sup>3</sup> 384-389.

106. Hecatompedon: IG I<sup>3</sup> 342 and 372; Athena Polias and Nike: IG I<sup>3</sup> 367-380; various: IG I<sup>3</sup> 409; statue of Athens: IG I<sup>3</sup> 458.

107. In epigraphic documents and literary sources, a city's own currency is noted in a generic way while the issuing authority is used when this is required for specific

of the decree of Callias from 434/3 (?) BC.<sup>108</sup> As was usual in the Greek world, in Athens the city's coinage had legal tender within its territory, and all transactions had to be done with owls. Thus, all money from the tribute that was delivered to Athens in the theatre of Dionysus during the Great Dionysia was calculated in Attic currency or converted into Athenian coinage. We can now turn to the decree.

### The Decree

Since the first and the last clauses of the decree are very fragmentary, we will start with the second clause.

(2) The second clause instructs the *Hellannotamiai* to record the names –most probably<sup>109</sup> of the cities; if they do not do so, they will be prosecuted; there is mention of the court (*heliaia*) of the *thesmothetai* and most probably a penalty for each one of them.<sup>110</sup>

(3) The third clause applies to officials in the cities, that is, Athenian officials in the allied cities of Athens, citizens and foreigners, and threatens harsh penalties for failure to carry out the terms of the decree: loss of rights ([ἄτ]μ[ος ἔστω]) and confiscation of property ([χρή]ματα).<sup>111</sup>

(4) The next clause provides that if there are no Athenian magistrates in the cities, the local magistrates shall act. These are also threatened with heavy

---

reasons, as in Thuc. 1.27.1, where Corinthian drachms are mentioned. Cf. Psoma 2009; 2012; 2019, 131–135, for the Corinthian drachms.

108. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 52, A l. 4. For the decrees of Callias, see Rhodes 1987, 164; Meiggs, Lewis 1988, 154–161 no. 58; Cawkwell 1997, 107–110; Will 2003, 234; Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 250–257 no 144. See also De Sainte Croix 1972, 74; Hornblower 1991, 87; Lazenby 2004, 23 *contra* Fornara 1971, 28–30.

109. Cf. Lewis 1987, 55: “(...) write up names of cities”. K. Hallof in his translation (<http://pom.bbaw.de/ig/digitale-edition/inschrift/IG%20I%C2%B3%201453>) proposes that the missing term is *argyrokopeion*, unlike Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 331, who refrain from speculation: “(...) of any of the cities”.

110. For the *heliaia* and the *thesmothetai*, see Bartzoka 2018, 34. See also Maltese 2021, 7–13.

111. For *atimia*, see Joyce 2018; Youni 2018. For Athenian officials in the allied cities, see also the decree of Cleinias (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 34, ll. 6–7 [448/7 or 425/4 BC]) and *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 122, ll. 5–6 (413–405 BC). Cf. Meiggs 1972, 167 and 172.

penalties if they do not carry out the terms of the decree. We know now from the new Aphytis fragment that they were also threatened with *atimia*.<sup>112</sup>

(5) The fifth surviving clause is very fragmentary and includes the expression “no less than a half”, a reference to a number of drachms per mina, a reference to exchange (of one currency for another) and a reference to guilt.<sup>113</sup> This clause is key for the interpretation of the decree. It mentions the mint for silver coins ([ἐν δὲ τῷ] ἀργυροκοπίῳ), a rate based on drachms and minas, and a verb meaning “to convert” ([κατ]αλλάττεν vel ἀλλάττεν) followed by the phrase “or be liable” (ἢ ἐνόχο[υς εἶναι]), which must indicate a penalty for not carrying out the provision.<sup>114</sup> There is also mention of the cities (αἱ πόλεις) and the first letters of the verb πράττω (πράττ[ουσαι]). One of the meanings of this verb is to “exact payment from one”.<sup>115</sup> In two passages of Thucydides this verb is associated with the payment of tribute.<sup>116</sup>

(6) The next clause contains the verb “to hand over” followed by a reference to the special fund of Athena and Hephaestus.<sup>117</sup> In the same clause there is mention of ἀργύριον that is left over ([δὲ δὲ ἂν περιγ]ίγνηται), and the generals (τοῖς στρατ[ηγοῖς]). What follows is the standard formula for an entrenchment clause, which appears to have been followed by a legal procedure for those who violate the clause.<sup>118</sup> This clause concerns the money that is left over and is mentioned in the previous phrase.

(7) The seventh clause contains instructions to elect heralds and send them to the four districts of the Athenian Empire. This has a parallel in the decree of

112. SEG 51, 55, ll. 8-9.

113. For this clause, see also Figueira 1998, 359-361; Bubelis 2019, 47 n. 23.

114. For the process of καταλλάττεν, see the speculations of Cataudella 1986, 112-118.

115. See LSJ s.v. πράσσω VI.

116. Thuc. 8.5.5 (summer 413 BC): ὑπὸ βασιλέως γὰρ νεωστὶ ἐτύγχανε (sc. ὁ Τις-σαφέρνης) πεπραγμένος τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς φόρους, οὓς δι’ Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων οὐ δυνάμενος πράσσεσθαι ἐπωφείλησεν; 8.37.2 (winter 412/11 BC): ὁπόση χώρα καὶ πόλεις βασιλέως εἰσὶ Δαρείου ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦσαν ἢ τῶν προγόνων, (...), μηδὲ φόρους πράσσεσθαι ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τούτων μήτε Λακεδαιμονίους μήτε τοὺς ξυμμάχους τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων (treaty of Miletus). See also n. 115, and Hdt. 3.58.

117. For this fund, see Faraguna 2006, 154-156.

118. For entrenchment clauses, see Lewis 1974; Harris 2006, 23-25.

Cleinias.<sup>119</sup> There appears to be a penalty at the end of the clause for generals, who do not send heralds. This clause might also provide us with a *terminus post quem* for the decree, because it mentions the four districts of the Empire. Evidence from the Athenian tribute lists shows that it was only after 438 BC that the Empire was divided into four districts.<sup>120</sup>

(8) The next clause contains a publication formula instructing officials in the cities to inscribe the text on a stone stele and place it in the agora of each city, while the *epistatai* should place the stele in front of the mint for silver coinage.

(9) The ninth clause contains an instruction to each herald.

(10) The tenth clause is also central to the interpretation of the measure but breaks off at a crucial point. The decree orders the secretary of the Council to add a phrase to the oath of the Council, which begins as follows: “if anyone mints silver coinage in the cities and does not use Athenian *nomismata*” (I am leaving this term intentionally untranslated) “and measures and weights (...)”. This takes one of the standard forms of an Athenian law, with a substantive provision in the *protasis*, followed by a legal procedure in the *apodosis*.<sup>121</sup> On the other hand, this is an oath, which should contain in the *apodosis* a verb in the future tense in the first person singular as in other oaths preserved in public documents on stone. The best example is the agreement with the city of Chalcis (IG I<sup>3</sup> 40), probably dated to the 440s BC, which contains a series of promises all expressed in verbs in the first person singular and in the future indicative. Another example is IG II<sup>2</sup> 111, ll. 57-69 from Keos.

The two last surviving clauses are known only from the copy of “Smyrna”, which mentions a previous decree that Clearchus proposed.<sup>122</sup> On the basis of the second Aphytis fragment, which ends with the *protasis* of clause ten (10)

119. IG I<sup>3</sup> 34 (426/5 BC?), ll. 22-28: Ἀθηναίος δὲ ἡελομέ|νος ἄνδρας τέττ|αρας ἀποπέ-  
μπε|ν ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀντ|ιγραφσομέ|νος τ[ὸ]ν φόρον τὸν ἀποδοθέντα κα|ὶ ἀπα|τέσσοντας  
τὸν μὲ [ἀποδοθέντα παρὰ τὸν ἑλλιποσ]δὸν, τ[ὸ] μὲν δύο πλε|ν ἐπ[ὶ] τὰς ἐπὶ Νέσον καὶ ἐπ’  
Ἰονίας ἐπ[ὶ] τ[ρι]έρους ταχε|ίας, [τὸ δὲ δύο ἐπὶ τὰς ἐφ’ Ἑλλεσπόντο κα|]ὶ ἐπὶ Θράικες.

120. For discussion, see Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 253-255 with n. 65.

121. For Athenian laws in the 5th cent. BC, see Harris 2013, 138-140.

122. Cf. Habicht in Whitehead 1997, 173 n. 42; Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 250-251, 261, 263-264.

and a *vacat*, what followed in the copy of “Smyrna” was considered as a rider of the first one.<sup>123</sup>

(11) The eleventh clause mentions foreign coins (ξενικὸν ἀργύριον), the city and the silver mint (τὸ ἀργυροκόπιον).

(12) The last clause concerns the *epistatai*, their duty to publish lists of something in front of the mint (ἔμπροσθεν τῷ ἀργυροκοπίῳ) for anyone who wishes to look at them, as well as the total amount of foreign silver, not counting something that is missing.<sup>124</sup>

As we saw above, ever since Wilamowitz, scholars –with few exceptions– have generally interpreted this decree as containing a ban on the minting of silver coins by the allies of Athens.<sup>125</sup> There are several objections to this view. We have already seen hoard evidence as well as evidence from mints. Some more objections are the following:

(i) There is no example in the ancient Greek world of one state forbidding another state to mint coins. By contrast, there is evidence (the law of Nicophon and the *isopoliteia* decrees of Smyrna) about cities allowing the circulation of other currencies in the territories under their jurisdiction.<sup>126</sup> This was also

---

123. See discussion in Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 250-251, 261, 263-264. According to Hatzopoulos, Matthaiou suggests a second decree and Papazarkadas a rider. For Hatzopoulos (2013-2014, 261), “Papazarkadas suggests that the letter *tau* in line 15 of the Siphnos fragment may represent the first letter of the same rider, and admits that in that case it would be the absence of the rider in the Aphytis version that would pose a problem. As a possible solution to the crux he suggests that it may have been inscribed on a different stele”. Cf. the rider of the decree for Brea (IG I<sup>3</sup> 46), which is written on face B of the stone. The hypothesis of a rider was first formulated by Habicht in Whitehead 1997, 173 n. 42. Cf. Maltese 2021, 13-15.

124. For other examples of the expression σκοπεῖν τῷ βουλομένοι of this clause, see Mattingly 1999, 120-122 and Hedrick 2000.

125. See recently Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, with previous bibliography.

126. For the law of Nicophon (SEG 26, 72), see Stroud 1974b. For this interpretation, see Stroud 1974b; J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1976, 190; *BE* 1977, 146; *BE* 1980, 195; Kroll 1976, 329-341; Giovannini 1978, 39; Engelmann 1985, 170-173; Dreher 1995, 91-106, 247; Kosmetatou 2001, 34-35; Engen 2005, 374; Psoma 2011b; Pébarthe 2012; Rutishauser

the case with federal states.<sup>127</sup> As we all know, Philip II did not close the mints of Greek cities,<sup>128</sup> while even the most powerful Hellenistic monarchs never stopped a Greek *polis* from minting coins.<sup>129</sup>

(ii) The preserved fragments of the decree do not explicitly mention a ban on minting coins. Scholars have restored a penalty clause in the missing *apodosis* of clause ten (10) but there are several reasons to reject this kind of a restoration. If this were the main clause of a law, this would be a plausible supplement, but the clause comes from an oath contained in a law. Furthermore, the Council did not have the power to inflict any punishment beyond a fine of 500 drachms and could not put anyone to death without a trial.<sup>130</sup> In the procedure of *eisangelia* to the Council, the Council only made a preliminary vote about whether to have the case go to court.<sup>131</sup> In the decree of Cleinias, which laid down strict regulations for the collection of tribute from the allies and their bringing a cow and panoply to the Panathenaea, the procedure for dealing

---

2012, 167-168. This has been challenged by those who regarded it as impossible that any Greek *polis* would mandate the acceptance of imitations: Buttrey 1979, 39-40 and 1981; cf. Giovannini 1975, 191-195; Bogaert 1976, 23-25 no 21 and 1976, 20-24; Cataudella 1986, 132-135; cf. Shipton 1997, 408-409; Matthaïou 2017. They were followed by scholars who assumed that an *agio* or discount had to be paid for these Athenian imitations (Mørkholm 1982, 290-296; Le Rider 1989, 160 and 2001, 263-266; Martin 1991, 43; Nicolet-Pierre 2003, 151-152). However, the law does not mention such an *agio*. Some think that “the wording of the law was not decisive on this point” (Ober 2009, 7), and that the acceptance and monetary values of imitations were matters for negotiation between the buyer and the seller (Ober 2008, 226-230). This negotiation is not at all mentioned in the law. For the decrees of Smyrna (*OGIS* 229; *I. Magnesia Sipylon* 1; *I. Smyrna* 573), l. 55: δεχέσθωσαν δὲ καὶ ἐμ Μαγνησίαι τὸ νόμισμα τὸ τῆς πόλεως [ἔνν]ομον. For the status of Magnesia near Sipylon during this period, see Cohen 1995, 216-217. Cf. Psoma forthcoming a.

127. For federal states, see Psoma, Tsangari 2003.

128. For Philip II, see Martin 1985.

129. For the Hellenistic monarchs, see Meadows 2001, 62-63. For Antiochus IV, see *ibid.*, 61-62.

130. Rhodes 1972, 179-207. See also [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 45; [Dem.] 47.43.

131. For *eisangelia*, see now Harris, Esu 2021.

with offenders reveals that the Council's power was certainly limited.<sup>132</sup> The phrasing from the oath in the so-called law of Demophantos in Andocides' *On the Mysteries* 1.97, that was recently proposed to be restored in clause number eleven (11),<sup>133</sup> must also be rejected, because this document is a forgery, as it has been recently shown.<sup>134</sup> This rules out the supplement dealing with putting someone to death. Thus, all previous restorations –including the death penalty– need to be rejected as well. Finally, in other oaths sworn by the Council and Athenian officials, one never finds any mention of punishment. We will come back to this clause later.

(iii) If the clause to be added to the oath of the Council did contain a ban on allied coinage, the wording of the *protasis* makes no sense: the clause reads “If someone strikes silver coin (coinage) in the cities and does not use the *nomismata* and weights and measures of the Athenians”. If this were a ban expressed in the normal way found in Athenian laws, it should be “if anyone mints silver coins, there is a penalty” or “there is a procedure to bring the person who violates the law to court”. Why the entire phrase about not using Athenian *nomismata*, weights and measures?

(iv) One might interpret this phrase to mean “if one mints silver coins and does not use Athenian silver coins”, that is, the clause not only bans minting coins but also requires the allies to use Athenian coins. But then what does

132. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 34*, ll. 31-41, esp. 37-39: [ἡ δ' ἄν] | καταγνῶι ἡ[ε] βολέ, μὲ τιμᾶν αὐτ]ῶι κυρία ἔστο [ἀλλ' ἐστ]|φερέτο ἐς τ[ὲν ἐλκιάαν εὐθύ]ς. For this decree and the Council's power, see Rhodes 1972, 189.

133. By A.P. Matthaiou in the 2004 Oxford Conference: see Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 242: “Matthaiou (...) invokes the Demophantos decree cited in And. 1.97 and proposes (*per litteras*) a restoration that would not exceed 23-24 letters, such as κ[τενῶ καὶ λόγῳι καὶ ἔργῳι]. The expression λόγῳι καὶ ἔργῳι occurs frequently in epigraphic documents but is never to be found with the verb κτείνω and only six times in a negative context: *IG II<sup>3</sup> 1*, 877 ll. 48-50, 283/2 BC: οὐδὲν ὑπεναντίον πράττω; *IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1*, 68 face A fr. 2, ll. 35-36, 302 BC: ἐναντίον τι πράττω; *BCH 115*, 1991, 172, ll. 5-6, Delphi, 3rd cent. BC: μήτε λόγῳι μήτε ἔργῳι κακόν; *IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 1*, ll. 8-9, Calydon, early 4th cent. BC: εἴτε χηρὶ εἴτε λόγῳι λέγων; *IG XII 5*, 109, ll. 19-20, Paros, after 411 BC: παραβαίνω; *IC III iii 5*, ll. 19-20, Hierapytna, 2nd cent. BC: κακοτεχνῶ.

134. Harris 2013/2014, 139-140.

one make of the phrase “weights and measures”? These two words can have a concrete meaning (scales and measuring rods) or an abstract meaning (weight standards and length standards) like pounds, feet and inches or centimeters and kilograms. The concrete meaning is absurd –would the Athenians require the allies to use scales and measuring rods manufactured in Athens? But if these words are to be construed in the abstract sense, then νομίμασι must also be construed in the abstract sense and mean “coinage standard” and not coinage.<sup>135</sup> We will return to this point.

(v) Clause eight (8) calls for copies of the decree to be placed in the agora, and the *epistatai* are to place it in front of the mint for silver coinage. The number of copies of the decree from different cities of the Athenian League corroborates this clause as far as the copies to be placed in the agora are concerned. We are not told explicitly by the decree if the mint at Athens is meant, if the mints in the cities are meant, or if both are meant at this clause. If the mints in the cities are meant and the decree bans the minting of silver coinage by the allies, all such mints would be closed. There would be no point in putting a decree in front of a deserted site. If the mint of Athens is meant, this was for specific reasons that we might guess with the help of clauses (5), (6), (11) and (12).

(vi) In the so-called second Athenian coinage decree, the fragmentary *IG I<sup>3</sup> 90*, which was of significant size, Laureion is mentioned (l. 11), as well as the ἐπιστάται (ll. 13-14), the verb καταλλάττειν (l. 14),<sup>136</sup> the same coin *vel* coinage (τοῖ αὐτοῖ νομίσμ[ατι]: ll. 15-16),<sup>137</sup> another coinage (ἄλλο βόλονται νόμισ[μα]: ll. 16-17), the Council ([ἡ βολ]έ: l. 17), and also expressions such as καὶ ἐὰν τις ἄλλος (l. 17), [ἡ]όπος ἄγ γίγνεται (l. 18), ἀπὸ τῶν τραπ[εζῶν?] (l. 19), [κε]ραμεῖα

135. Schönhammer 1993. Cf. Bonnín 2019, 141.

136. For this verb, also in the Athenian Standards' Decree, in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 90* and in the fragment from the Italian excavation of the wall of the stoas of Eumenes (*SEG* 52, 43 and 59, 56), see Papazarkadas 2009, 72. It occurs also in the law of Epicrates (ll. 10-11). For this law (*Agora I* 7495), see Richardson 2021 (ed. pr.), with Harris 2022.

137. For the term *nomisma*, see Faraguna 2003, 112-113. According to Faraguna, this was an Athenian 5th-cent. BC novelty. The term occurs also in the ASD as well as in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 52* and 383.

(l. 21)<sup>138</sup> and ἄρ[χοντες] (l. 20).<sup>139</sup> It also mentions χρυσίον, pointing indiscriminately to gold and electrum, i.e. darics and electrum coins minted by Cyzicus, Lampsacus, Mytilene and Phocaea.<sup>140</sup> There is a provision about exchange (καταλλάττειν), as well as what those who changed their coins received: the same coinage or another coinage (ἄλλο νόμισμα). It is plausible that with this fragmentary decree, the city of Athens introduced legislation concerning the exchange of χρυσίον (darics and Cyzicene staters).<sup>141</sup> If the standards decree bans the use of other coinages to the allies and dates before IG I<sup>3</sup> 90, why then the decree from 416 BC includes provisions related to other coins or coinages, and conversion of coinage?<sup>142</sup>

Despite the main uncertainties about the decree, one thing is fairly certain: clause five (5) refers to a process of conversion and mentions an amount expressed in drachms per mina. The fragmentary decree IG I<sup>3</sup> 90, that we mentioned above, also links the Council with the conversion of coinage. A link with the payment of tribute is also suggested by the mention of the *Hellannotamiai*

---

138. First epigraphic attestation: Faraguna 2008, 51 n. 71. This is a point in common with the law of Nicophon on silver coinage, which dates from 375/4 BC (SEG 26, 72). For this law, see also *supra* n. 126. Banking tables refer to coin-exchange by private individuals, and κεραμεῖα either to clay storage containers or to pottery workshops. For the first meaning, see Grace 1946, 31 n. 4; Mattingly 1970, 142 and 1987, 71. For the second, see Aeschin. 3. 119: καὶ κεραμεῖα ἐνφοκοδομημένα καὶ αὖλια. Cf. Hsch. s.v.: ἔνθα τὰ ὀστράκινα σκεύη πιπράσκειται.

139. For this decree, see *Agora* XVI 17 with pl. 3; Cataudella 1986; Faraguna 2006, 153 and 2008, 51 n. 71; Figueira 1998, 424-430; Meritt 1945, 119-122; Mattingly 1963, 267; 1968, 470-471; 1970, 142; 1977; 1987, 70-71; Papazarkadas 2009, 72 (simple mention); Rhodes 1972, 259; Stroud 1974a, 283-290; Woodhead 1974, 384-385.

140. Cf. Psoma 2020a.

141. Blamire 2001, 113.

142. For the date, see Tracy 2016, 124: the letter cutter worked between 423/2 and 394/3 BC (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1386). For a connection with the ASD, see Cataudella 1986; Mattingly 1977. *Contra* Figueira 1998, 424-430. This decree, along with the ASD and the mid-4th cent. BC law of Epicrates, testifies to the complete control of mining operation by the Council, the Assembly and magistrates and also the supervision by the city of the minting of owls: Faraguna 2006, 159-160.

in clause two (2) of the ASD. We know that these officials were responsible for collecting the tribute and making reports to the Council.<sup>143</sup> A relationship with minting coinage can be observed in the mention of the fund of Athena and Hephaestus in IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453C from Aphytis.<sup>144</sup> This fund is also mentioned in the law on silver coinage of 354/3 BC.<sup>145</sup> It was a significant fund and there is evidence for its links with Laureion.<sup>146</sup> This fund was supposed to receive silver / money that was left over (περιγίγνηται) after the conversion of foreign currency into Attic currency mentioned in the previous clause and the payment of the *agio*. This conversion procedure brought profit to the city of Athens and this profit entered the fund of Athena and Hephaestus. According to the entrenchment clause that followed, this money was not supposed to be borrowed or serve any other purpose.

We will now turn to oaths. Oaths by Athenian officials in matters regarding the allies give the allies guarantees and do not threaten them with penalties. They also place restrictions on the actions of Athenian officials. Penalties for allied citizens are placed in the main clauses of laws, not in oaths. The decree of Cleinias presents a good example.<sup>147</sup>

“If any Athenian or ally does wrong concerning the tribute  
which the cities must write on a tablet for those bringing it and

---

143. For the *hellenotamiai*, see Meiggs 1972, 234-238.

144. For this new fragment, see Hatzopoulos 2000-2003 (SEG 51, 55) and 2013-2014 (SEG 64, 53).

145. For this new law (the law of Epicrates), see *supra* nn. 136 and 142. For the fund of Athena and Hephaistos, see following note.

146. Faraguna (2006, 154-156) showed that this was a special fund and not a mine, also mentioned in IG I<sup>3</sup> 82, ll. 15-16 (τὸ *ἡε[φ]αί[σ]το καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίας*). He also showed that it can be identified with the Ἡφαιστικόν of IG I<sup>3</sup> 444, ll. 249-250: [*παρὰ ταμιδὸν ἡεφαιστικῷ ἀπὸ Λαυρείου*]; 445, ll. 294: [*παρὰ ταμιδὸν ἡεφαιστικῷ ἀπὸ Λαυρείου*]; 464, ll. 103-104: [*παρὰ ταμιδὸν ἡεφαιστικῷ ἀπὸ Λαυρείου*]; 465, ll. 126-127: [*παρὰ ταμιδὸν ἡεφαιστικῷ ἀπὸ Λ[αυ]ρείου*]. For IG I<sup>3</sup> 82, see also Makris 2014 (SEG 64, 38). For the fund of Athena and Hephaestus in IG I<sup>3</sup> 82, ll. 15-16, see Makris 2014, 190-191; Malouchou 2024 (Makris and Malouchou ignore Faraguna 2006, 154-156). For this fund, see also Maltese 2021, 8-9; Harris 2022, 69-71.

147. IG I<sup>3</sup> 34, ll. 31-43.

send to Athens, against him it shall be permitted to whoever wishes of the Athenians and the allies to write an accusation to the *prytaneis*; the *prytaneis* shall introduce it into the Council within three or five days from when the accusation is made, or they shall be penalized by ten thousand drachms each.<sup>148</sup> When a man is condemned by the Council (---) have [not] final power over him but shall bring out to the people about him; if he is judged to be in the wrong, the *prytaneis* shall institute a debate to judge what he should suffer in his person or pay.”<sup>149</sup>

Like the oath of the Council and the judges in the decree regulating relations with Chalcis, the oath in this decree should provide an assurance.<sup>150</sup>

“I shall not expel Chalcidians from Chalcis, nor shall I uproot their city; I shall deprive no individual of civic rights nor punish any with exile nor take any prisoner, nor execute any, nor confiscate the money of anyone not condemned in court without the authority of the Athenian people.”<sup>151</sup>

There is also similar evidence from other oaths of Athenian magistrates during the fifth and the fourth century BC.<sup>152</sup> From the fifth century we have the treaty between Athens and the cities of the Bottiaeans, dated to 422 BC.<sup>153</sup> This is also an oath of the Council and the generals. From the fourth century we have the treaty of alliance with Chalcis, which guarantees Chalcis freedom, autonomy, no payment of tribute, and no presence of an Athenian garrison or magistrate.<sup>154</sup> This dates from 378/7 BC. From 375/4 (or 372/1) BC dates the

148. For this penalty, see Beretta Liverani 2013.

149. Trans. Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 325 no. 154.

150. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 40*, ll. 4-10.

151. Trans. Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 171-172 no. 131. For this decree, see Mattingly 2014.

152. See also the treaty between Athens and Leontinoi in 433 BC: *IG I<sup>3</sup> 54*, ll. 21-32.

153. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 76*, ll. 12-16: [ἀμυνῶ τοῖς] Βοττιαίοις τοῖς | χσυντιθεμέ[νοις] [τὲν χσυμα-  
χίαν, κ]αὶ τὲν χ[σ]υμμαχία]ν πιστὸς καὶ ἀδόλος φυλάχσο Βοττιαίους προϋθυμόμε[ν]ος  
κατὰ τὰ χ[σ]υ]νκε[ί]μενα καὶ οὐ μνε]σικακέσο τῶ[ν παρ]οιχομένον ἔ[ν]εκα.

154. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 44*, ll. 21-27: ἔχ[εν τὴ]ν ἑαυτῶν Χαλκιδέ[ας ἐλ]ευθέρ[ος] ὄντα[ς καὶ] αὐτο-  
νόμος καὶ αὐ[. . . . .] μῆτε φρορὰν ὑποδεχομένος [παρ’] Ἀθηναίων μ]ῆτε φόρον

treaty with Corcyra,<sup>155</sup> and from 363/2 BC the treaty with the cities of Keos (IG II<sup>2</sup> 111, ll. 58-66). In their oath, the Athenian generals were committed in the following way:

“I shall not harbor grudges for what is past against any of the Ceans, nor shall I kill or make an exile any of the Ceans who abide by the oaths and this agreement, but I shall bring them into the alliance like the other allies. But if anyone commits an act of revolution in Ceos contrary to the oaths and the agreement, I shall not allow him by any craft or contrivance as far as possible. If any one does not wish to live in Ceos, I shall allow him to live wherever he wishes in the allied cities and enjoy his own property.”<sup>156</sup>

In the treaty with Aleuas of Larissa and the Thessalians (IG II<sup>2</sup> 116, ll. 16-20) of 361 BC, the generals and the Council swear:

“I shall go in support with all my strength as far as possible if anyone goes against the *koinon* of the Thessalians for war, or overthrows the *archon* whom the Thessalians have appointed, or sets up a tyrant in Thessaly.”<sup>157</sup>

What could this assurance be in our decree? That if anyone in the allied cities mints silver coins and does not use Athenian coinage standards, weight-standards and measurement-standards, I (i.e. the member of the Council) will convert it and will not exact a conversion fee of more than a certain

---

φέροντας μήτε [ἄρχ]οντα παραδ]εχομένος παρὰ τὰ δόγματ[α τῶν συμμάχων ἐὰν δὲ] τις ἴ[η] ἐ[πὶ] πολέμῳ [ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν - -]. For this document, see Psoma 2021.

155. IG II<sup>2</sup> 97, ll. 16-26: βοηθήσω Κορκυραίων τῶι δήμῳ παντὶ σθένει κατὰ τὸ δυνά-  
τόν, ἐάν τις ἴη ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἢ κατὰ γῆν ἢ κατὰ θάλατταν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν Κορκυραίων  
καθ' [ὅ]τι ἂν ἐπαγγέλ[ω]σι Κορκυραῖοι, καὶ περὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης πράξω καθότι ἂν  
τῶι πληθὲι τῶν συμμάχων δοκῇ, καὶ τᾶλλα ποιήσω κατὰ [τ]ὰ | [δ]όγματα τῶν συμμά-  
χων. ἀληθῆ ταῦτα νῆ τὸ[ν] Δία καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὴν Δήμητρα· [ε]ὐο[ρ]κόντι μέμ-  
μοι εἴη πολ[λ]ὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ, εἰ δὲ | μή τάναντία. For a later date, see Rhodes, Osborne  
2003, 112-113; Matthaiou 2010-2013, 26-27. Cf. Psoma 2022a, 225-230.

156. Trans. Rhodes, Osborne 2003, 196-201 no. 39.

157. Trans. Rhodes, Osborne 2003, 220-223 no. 44.

percentage (clause five [5]), i.e. I will convert it at the established rate.<sup>158</sup> In other words, the decree does not forbid the allied cities to continue to mint silver coinage, but insists that if the cities do not mint on the Athenian standard, they will pay only the conversion fee for any tribute paid in coinage minted on a non-Athenian standard. Such an interpretation is corroborated by the last phrase of the previous crucial clause ten (10) including the oath, as well as the last clause of the fragment from “Smyrna”. In this clause we have mentions of the foreign currency, the mint at Athens, a stele in front of the mint, the *epistatai* and a total sum not counting something that is missing. The sum not to count was most probably the money resulting from the conversion that found its way to the fund of Athena and Hephaestus. The tribute paid in foreign currency (ξενικὸν ἀργύριον) could be melted down and used to strike Athenian owls. This restoration best fits the context and, moreover, does not clash with the numismatic evidence. It is also consistent with further legislation about coinage in other Greek *poleis* during other periods of Greek history.

To understand the decree and to arrive at a better reconstruction of the key clause in the Oath of the Council, one must consider the financial needs of the Athenian Empire. Ever since the foundation of the alliance in 478 BC, the Athenians collected tribute from dozens of allies who paid with coins and

158. The last line (l. 15) of the Siphnos’ fragment (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453e: μέτροι[ς - - -ca. 14- - -] τ[- - -]) could be restored in the following way: μέτροι[ς κατὰ τὸν λόγον κα]τ[αλλάχσο αὐτό *vel* τὸτο] with precisely 14 missing letters before T. In the Smyrna fragment (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453g) we have: ll. 8-10: νομίσμα[σιν καὶ μ]έτροις καὶ στάθμοις, [- - - ca.21- - - κατὰ] | [τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος εἶπεν· - - -ca.19- - -]. This could be: νομίσμα[σιν καὶ μ]έτροις καὶ στάθμοις, [κατὰ τὸν λόγον καταλλάχσο κατὰ] | [τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος εἶπεν· - - -ca.19- - -] with 22 letters or [κατὰ λόγον αὐτό *vel* τὸτο καταλλάχσο] etc. with 23 letters. The *textus compositus* of IG is the following: [- - -ca. 14- - -]τ[- - -ca. 6- - - κατὰ τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος] etc. This could be: [κατὰ τὸν λόγον κα]τ[αλλάχσο κατὰ τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος] with 14 and 7 letters or [κατὰ λόγον αὐτό *vel* τὸτο κα]τ[αλλάχσο κατὰ τὸ πρότε]ρον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος], this time with 15 and 7 letters. Cf. Hatzopoulos 2013-2014, 260 on Stroud 2006, 20-26 (SEG 56, 77): “For some major discrepancies, such as the different endings of the Aphytis and the “Smyrna” versions, he (*scil.* Stroud) envisages the possibility of local adaptations of the original enactment due to local reactions, and also the eventuality of different decrees voted at different dates”.

maybe also with precious objects.<sup>159</sup> It has been recently proposed to link a number of coinages issued by tribes from the area between the Strymon and the Nestos Rivers to the tribute paid to the Delian League.<sup>160</sup> An idea of what the Athenian War Fund included can be offered by the Decadrachm hoard (CH VIII 48), which was buried ca. 465 BC. The Athenians also needed to make payments to their own officials and to those rowing in the fleet, who came from many different cities.<sup>161</sup> The Athenians could not collect tribute or make payments in dozens of different denominations. Such a situation would have made keeping accounts virtually impossible. Apollodorus explicitly states how complicated and difficult it was to keep records of the money he exchanged and spent: “I was ready to reckon it up item by item, while I had by me as witnesses to the expenditures the sailors and the marines and the rowers, in order that, if he disputed anything, I might refute him at once. Everything had been recorded so accurately by me, that I had written down not only the disbursements themselves, but also the objects for which the money had been spent, the nature of the service rendered, what the price was, in the coinage of what country the payment was made, and what the loss in exchange was, in order that I might be able to give convincing proof to my successor, if he thought any false entries were being made against him”.<sup>162</sup> The Athenians needed to make payments in coins minted on one standard and for these they used mainly the Attic drachm. This was the reason the Athenian drachm was the coin that Peloponnesian crews wanted to be paid in during the last decade of the war.<sup>163</sup> But to make payments in coins minted on one standard, they needed to collect tribute in coins minted on one standard or converted to one standard. As we have seen, in almost all Athenian financial documents from

---

159. The precious objects were suggested to me as an alternative by Stelios Damigos.

160. Wartenberg 2015, 360-361.

161. See the calculations by Flament 2011, 47-50.

162. Trans. by A. T. Murray of [Dem.] 50.30: λογίσασθαι δ' ἤθελον αὐτῷ καθ' ἕκαστον, ἕως μοι μάρτυρες παρήσαν τῶν ἀνηλωμένων οἱ τε ναῦται καὶ οἱ ἐπιβάται καὶ ἡ ὑπηρεσία, ἵν' εἴ τι ἀντιλέγοι εὐθὺς ἐξελέγχοιμι. Οὕτω γάρ μοι ἀκριβῶς ἐγγράπτο, ὥστ' οὐ μόνον αὐτά μοι τἀναλώματα ἐγγράπτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅποι ἀνηλώθη καὶ ὅ τι ποιοούντων, καὶ ἡ τιμὴ τίς ἦν καὶ νόμισμα ποδαπόν, καὶ ὁπόσου ἡ καταλλαγὴ ἦν τῷ ἀργυρίῳ, ἵν' εἴη ἀκριβῶς ἐξελέγξαι με τῷ διαδόχῳ, εἴ τι ἡγοίτο ψεῦδος αὐτῷ λογίζεσθαι.

163. See *supra* n. 33.

450s onwards, all figures are given without mention of issuing authorities.<sup>164</sup> The use of the Attic weight standard facilitated the task of collecting tribute and whatever else the allies needed to pay.

During later periods, silver coinages that were issued to serve military needs of allies were struck on the same standard: the ΣΥΝ coinage of the early fourth century BC (Persian or Chian standard), the *symmachikon* coinages of the late fourth century BC (Persian weight) and of the late third / second century BC (reduced Aeginetan standard), as well as the alexanders during the Hellenistic period (Attic standard).<sup>165</sup> A passage in Cassius Dio, a fictional speech allegedly held by Maecenas,<sup>166</sup> “... asserts the need for a single system of standardized measures and coinages around the Empire”.<sup>167</sup> The need the Romans felt in the late first century BC was also felt by the Athenians when

---

164. Unlike in the Spartan War Fund, in the Athenian financial documents all amounts are calculated in Athenian denominations, with few exceptions. For the Spartan War Fund (IG V 1), see Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 294-301 no. 151, with previous bibliography. For the date of the document, see Piérart 1995, 235-282. The document which included Cyzicene staters is IG I<sup>3</sup> 259 postscript 6-13. This is the first Athenian tribute list with a postscript that divided Athens' sixtieth into silver and Cyzicene staters “though the total tribute paid in Cyzicenes cannot have been even as much as 10 per cent of the whole”: Lewis 1987, 62 [= 2008, 129].

165. For the two coinages of the 4th century BC, see Psoma 2019, 107-112 and Psoma 2022b. For the *symmachikon* coinage of the middle Hellenistic period, see Psoma 2019, 112-135. For the alexanders, see Kremydi, Marcellesi 2019; Picard 2019.

166. Dio Cass. 52.30.9: μήτε δὲ νομίσματα ἢ καὶ σταθμὰ ἢ μέτρα ἰδίᾳ τις αὐτῶν ἐχέτω, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἡμετέροις καὶ ἐκεῖνοι πάντες χρήσθωσαν. I owe this reference to Dr Lucia Carbone whom I wish to thank warmly.

167. Carbone 2014, 12: “Certainly the line of action proposed by Dio’s Maecenas was not followed in toto, but it is difficult not to interpret measures such as the Thessalian *diorthoma* as representing an increasing desire for equivalent weights and measures throughout the Empire”. Ibid., p. 29: “The disappearance of Asian autonomous silver issues after Augustus seems to show that the advice of Dio’s Maecenas had been followed after all but with the caveat that the Augustan Age represents only the terminal point of a four-step process, where the creation of the Asian province, and the Mithridatic and Civil Wars all represented important milestones in the involvement of Romans in the direct administration of the province, which increased over time but had been obvious from the beginning”. Cf. App. *Mith.* 186: (sc. ὁ Ζηνόβιος) αἰτιασάμενος τὸν σταθμὸν (...).

they had to arrange the financial matters of their Empire and for this what served most probably as a model was the Great King, who was asking his subjects to calculate the tribute on the Babylonian standard for silver and on the Euboean standard for gold.<sup>168</sup> For the function of its own Empire Athens needed a reference coinage and this was its own silver coinage. Athens could mint its owls with silver from Laureion, as well as with silver in which the tribute and other taxes from the allies was received. This abundance of Athenian owls of good silver is linked with the end of a number of coinages of the allies in the same way the very significant number of Alexanders put an end to a number of coinages during the early Hellenistic period.<sup>169</sup>

### Date and character of the decree<sup>170</sup>

There are two restrictions for the date of the decree, and both derive from the decree itself: (a) the reference to the four districts of the Athenian *arche*, and (b) the mention together with coinage of weights and measures.

(a) In the Aphytis fragment (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453C) the districts are four and their order is *Islands - Ionia - Hellespont - Thrace*.<sup>171</sup> The same number of districts –four– occurred also in the decree of Cleinias.<sup>172</sup> As we all know, five districts existed between 443/2 BC (IG I<sup>3</sup> 269) and 439/3 (IG I<sup>3</sup> 273), following the order *Ionia - Hellespont - Thrace - Caria - Islands*.<sup>173</sup> Between 438 BC (IG I<sup>3</sup> 274) and 432/1 (IG I<sup>3</sup> 280) there are four districts and the sequence is *Ionia - Islands - Hellespont - Thrace*. From 427 BC onwards the Actaeon cities, taken from Mytilene, are added and thus in IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 (425/4 BC) there are six heralds and the following order of districts: *Islands - Ionia - Hellespont - cities of Akte - Thrace - cities of the Black*

168. Hdt. 3.89. For this passage, see Kleber 2015. Cf. Tuplin 1987; Journatzi 2000, 245 n. 17 and 246-252.

169. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 71-72.

170. I do not believe that the dates at which different cities became members of the League, the most significant argument of Harold Mattingly (Mattingly 1993, 99-102), have to be taken into consideration in the discussion about the date of the decree. I believe that a new member of the empire was required on its accession to publish a copy of the preexisting decree(s). Cf. Lewis 1987, 56.

171. Cf. Cavaignac 1953, 2 with reference to Tod 1933 no. 67; Maltese 2021, 15-16.

172. See *supra* n. 119.

173. Five Athenians are mentioned in the decree of Cleonymus: IG I<sup>3</sup> 68, ll. 16-18: ἐ-  
πὶ δὲ τὰς ὀφ[ι] [ελόσας πέ]μπεν πέ[ντε ἄνδρας ἡίνα] ἐσπράχσον[ται τὸν φ]όρον.

Sea.<sup>174</sup> Of later date is IG I<sup>3</sup> 100 (410/409 BC) with the order: *Islands - Hellespont - Ionia - Thrace - Euxeinos*. If we combine this evidence –number of districts and their sequence– we have a date range between the 420s and 410/409 BC for the Athenian Standards Decree.

(b) The decree mentions weights and measures together with coinage. A full survey of epigraphic documents of legal character (laws and decrees) that regulate matters pertaining to coinage indicates that coinage is never grouped together with weights and measures.<sup>175</sup> Weights and measures (μέτρα καὶ σταθμά) are to be found in five epigraphic documents, four from Athens and one from Paros (the Parian Marble).<sup>176</sup> In all five documents coinage is not mentioned together with weights and measures, while the literary texts that

---

174. Islands: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 I, ll. [61]; Ionia: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 I, l. [110]; Hellespont: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 II, l. [174]; *Aktaii* cities: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 III, ll. 124; Thrace: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 III, l. [152]; cities in the Black Sea: IG I<sup>3</sup> 71 IV, l. 126. IG I<sup>3</sup> 77 of 422/1 BC is very fragmentary but the same sequence seems to have been adopted.

175. IC IV 162 (Syll.<sup>3</sup> 525, SGDI 5011), Gortyna, Crete, ca. 250 BC: introduction of a coinage, decisions about the metal, the weight standard and the nominal value. IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>, 24 (Syll.<sup>3</sup> 218; IGDP no. 14 [Dubois], cf. BE 1997, no. 419 [Ph. Gauthier]; IK *Kalchedon* 16, Olbia, ca. 360 BC: protection of the city's own coinage and setting of exchange rates. IG XII 9, 1273/1274, Eretria, ca. 525–500 BC; SEG 26, 72, Athens, 375 BC, law of Nicophon, and I. Smyrna 573 II + II p. 376 (OGIS 229 II; I. Mag. Sipylos 1), decrees of *sympoliteia* between Smyrna and the settlements in Magnesia of the Sipylos, 242 BC: determining which coins issued by foreign states would be accepted as legal tender or not. IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 25+31, cf. SEG 32, 794; Müller 2010, 55, 341 n. 136, Olbia, 325 BC or first half of the 3rd cent. BC; ID 461A, Delos, ante 169 BC; *Achaie* III 2 (SGDI 1613; Syll.<sup>3</sup> 530), Dyme, first half of the 2nd cent. BC; I. Sestos 1 (OGIS 339), late 2nd cent. BC; I. Magnesia 164, early Imperial period: appointment of citizens responsible for minting coins. I. Sestos 1 (OGIS 339), late 2nd cent. BC: choice of coin types. P. Zenon 59021, Ptolemaic Kingdom, 258 BC: withdrawing coinage. Law of Epicrates, Athens, 353/2 BC and P. Zenon 59021, Ptolemaic Kingdom, 258 BC: conversion of local and foreign coins. IG XII 2, 1, Mytilene and Phocaea, post 427 BC and *Achaie* III 2 (SGDI 1613; Syll.<sup>3</sup> 530), Dyme, first half of the 2nd cent. BC: protection of coinage against counterfeiters. See Psoma forthcoming a.

176. Athens: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1013, 2nd cent. BC (I. Eleusis 237) with Doyen 2016; Doyen 2017, 195–197; Rizzi 2017; SEG 24, 157 and 222/1 BC; SEG 26, 121 (= IG II<sup>2</sup> 1035), 10/9–3/2 BC; Agora XVI 322, 60/73–120 AD; Paros (*Marmor Parium*): IG XII 5, 444 (= SEG 39, 862).

group the three together date after the ASD.<sup>177</sup> This indicates that the case of the Athenian Standards Decree is unique, has no parallels, and cannot be compared with other regulations pertaining to coinage and its uses. The addition of weights and measures to a decree about coinage and payment of tribute can only be explained if we take into account what these weights and measures served for: to calculate the weights and measures of various commodities. The need to make these calculations of commodities can only be explained with the famous *eikoste* in mind, about which we learn from Thucydides, who describes the situation at Athens after the Spartan invasion in 413 BC and the establishment of the newly built fort at Decelea (7.28; cf. Diod. Sic. 13.9.2).

Besides, the transport of provisions from Euboea, which had before been carried on so much more quickly over land by Decelea from Oropus, was now affected at great cost by sea round Sunium; everything the city required had to be imported from abroad, and instead of a city it became a fortress. (2) Summer and winter the Athenians were worn out by having to keep guard on the fortifications, during the day by turns, by night all together, the cavalry excepted, at the different military posts or upon the wall. (3) But what most oppressed them was that they had two wars at once, and had thus reached a pitch of frenzy which no one would have believed possible if he had heard of it before it had come to pass. ... (4). These causes, the great losses from Decelea, and the other heavy charges that fell upon them, produced their financial embarrassment; and it was at this time that they imposed upon their subjects, instead of the tribute, the tax of a twentieth upon all imports and exports by sea, which they thought would bring them in more money; their expenditure being now not the same as at first, but having grown with the war while their revenues decayed (trans. R. Crawley).

---

177. With the exception of a passage of Hecataeus on laws of the Egyptians (!): Hec. *FGrHist* 1 F 25 (*apud* Diod. Sic. 1.78.3). Other texts: Pl. *Laws* 746e; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 10.1 (Solon); Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 115 (*apud* Strab. 8.3.33; Pheidon of Argos); Plb. 2.37.10 (the Achaean League in the Hellenistic period); Dio 52.30.9; Fl. Philostratus, *Heroicus* 708 Olearius (Palamedes); Alcidas fr. 16.22 (Palamedes) Radermacher.

The “other heavy charges that fell upon them” were the money the Athenians were spending for the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 6.31.5): three hundred talents in summer 414 BC (Thuc. 6.94.4; Diod. Sic. 13.6.6 and 7.4), and either one hundred and twenty (Thuc. 7.16.2) or one hundred and forty (Diod. Sic. 13.8.7) in the following winter 414/3 BC.<sup>178</sup> It was because of all the problems described by Thucydides that the Athenians decided to replace tribute with the *eikoste*, a payment of a 5% tax on trade, in all cities of the Alliance and Athens (autumn 413 BC). Athens needed money for these two wars and the introduction of the *eikoste* belongs to this historical context. With the introduction of this tax “upon all imports and exports by sea”, all commodities should be calculated in a uniform way, and the tax should be paid in a common currency. This currency was Attic silver, while the Attic weights and measures would serve to calculate commodities imported and exported.<sup>179</sup> Attic currency could serve the collection of both the tribute and the new tax, but the mention of weights and measures in the decree and the need to use these can only be explained in relation with the *eikoste*. One recalls that all other decrees about the collection of tribute, i.e. the decrees of Cleonymus, Cleinias and Thoudippos do not mention weights and measures.<sup>180</sup> Although we know nothing about the details and the mechanisms of tax collection by the Athenians, the decree provides useful information about how the Athenians informed their allies. As with the collection of tribute, the *Hellenotamiai* were once more involved (clause 2). There is a mention of officials of the League, Athenians or foreigners (clause 3), as well as local officials (clause 4), heralds (clause 7), instructions to each herald (clause 9), as well as instructions by the League or city officials and the *epistatai* for the publication of the decree in the cities of the Empire and Athens (clause 8).

It is time now to turn to the so-called allusion to the decree in Aristophanes’ *Birds* presented in the Dionysia of 414 BC, i.e. in the month of Elaphebolion,

---

178. Because of all this money from Athens, Nicias was stressing that the Athenians were in a better shape than the Syracusans in summer 413 BC (Thuc. 7.48.5) and was later this summer “ready to agree with them on behalf of the Athenians to repay whatever money the Syracusans had spent upon the war if they would let his army go; and offered until the money was paid to give Athenians as hostages, one for every talent” (Thuc. 7.83.3).

179. Kallet, Kroll 2020, 104-122, esp. 119-121.

180. *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 68, 34 and 71.

March-April 414 BC.<sup>181</sup> The latest commentators and translators of the play did not accept the emendation of Bergk and preferred to keep ψηφίσμασι.<sup>182</sup> We need to follow them and deny any allusion to the decree for a number of reasons. First, all manuscripts have ψηφίσμασι and not νομίσμασι.<sup>183</sup> Second, the ancient scholia explain the term ψηφίσμασι (as laws) and not νομίσμασι (as coins or coinage).<sup>184</sup> This means that ψηφίσμασι was in the text in antiquity and there is no place for νομίσμασι. This goes together with our third argument: the decree seller is selling to the city of *Birds* a law code, which the decree seller calls new laws, and we know that laws were introduced in the form of ψηφίσματα during the fifth century BC. We can thus follow the latest commentators and translators of the play and conclude that there is no need at all to “correct” the text of Aristophanes and to detect an allusion to *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453*. With this in mind, we can propose a date for the decree introducing regulations for the payment of the *eikoste* almost simultaneously with the introduction of the *eikoste* in late summer / early autumn of 413 BC.<sup>185</sup>

181. For an introduction of the decree shortly before the presentation of the play, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 111–112. For the play at the *Dionysia*, see Henderson 2000, 2. Cf. Maltese 2021, 17–18.

182. See *supra* n. 5. Cf. Sommerstein 1987, 269 *ad v.* 1041 (decrees): “Bergk altered *psephismasi* ‘decree’ to *nomismasi* ‘coins’, but the decree-seller may have deliberately ‘adjusted’ the text of the decree in order to make his ‘customers’ believe that it is compulsory for them to purchase his wares”; Dunbar 1995, 571: “Since ψηφίσμασι makes a surprising third item after μέτροισι καὶ σταθμοῖσι and the terms of the Coinage decree (1040–2n.) are clearly in mind, Bergk’s note ‘expectaveras νομίσμασι’ (*praefatio* to text) was seen by many as confirmed later by the Coinage Decree, and adopted as an emendation by Blaydes. But applying prosaic logic removes Ar.’s joke; when the audience is expecting to hear νομίσμασι, the Decree-seller slips in ψηφίσμασι instead, thus representing his decrees as imposed on the new city by the sovereign Athenian Assembly no less than his weights and measures”.

183. van Leeuwen 1902, 162 *app. crit. ad* 1042: ψηφίσμασι Bergk] νομίσμασι codd. See Dunbar 1995, 101 *app. crit. ad* 1041: ψηφίσμασι] νομίσμασι Blaydes.

184. *Ad* 1041: ἀντὶ τοῦ νόμοις. This occurs in the Codex Venetus CCCCLXXIV (symbol V) of the 11th century. Dindorf 1838, 235; Dübner 1877, 234; White 1914, 197; Forster 1991, 161 For the manuscripts, see White 1914, lxxxvi–ciii.

185. It is very plausible that a decree of earlier date than the Standards Decree, this time a Coinage Decree, regulated matters of payment and collection of tribute

What the Standards decree requires was the use of Attic weights and measures for commodities and for the payment of the tax either in Attic coins and coins minted on the Attic standard or in coins converted to the Attic standard. Its aim was to facilitate the payments made by the allies to the Athenian treasury.<sup>186</sup> As we have seen, this took place during a period when the Athenians needed money to continue the war against Sparta, which was now supported by the Great King. With this decree the Athenians hoped to collect payments more quickly from the allies. Yet the whole undertaking appears to have been very difficult and complicated even though the details remain unknown to us. It is likely that the *eikoste* was quickly repealed and that the decree was rescinded after a series of Athenian victories at the naval battles of Cynossema (Thuc. 8.104.5-106.4), and Abydos in 411 BC (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.5) and Cyzicus in 410 BC (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.16-18). By 408 BC Alcibiades was putting pressure on Chalcedon to pay the arrears of the tribute from the preceding years (Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.2-9).

It is in this way that I propose to explain the decree and see it as a purely technical financial measure.<sup>187</sup> Athenian imperialism and lack of respect for

---

and included clauses similar to those of the Standards Decree. This decree was contemporary or probably earlier than those introduced by Cleinias (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 34 with Osborne, Rhodes 2017, 325 no. 154) and Cleonymus (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 68, ll. 16-18, with Osborne-Rhodes 2017, 300-307 no. 152). For a second decree see also Stroud 2006, 26; Figueira 2006. This Coinage Decree is most probably the decree of Clearchus mentioned in the 'Smyrna' copy. The reason that there is no place for 'the previous decree of Clearchus' in the new Aphytis fragment, which offers the very end of the Standards Decree, might be that Aphytis put on the stone exactly what was sent by Athens, i.e. the Standards Decree, and there was already a copy of the previous decree of Clearchus, i.e. the Coinage Decree, in all cities of the *arche*. Absent from the Aphytis' fragment are also the two last clauses of the decree from the 'Smyrna' copy, that both refer to Athenian affairs and concern duties of Athenian officials (*epistatai*). The problem is why these appear in the copy seen at Smyrna as well as the origin of this copy, but this is another problem. Cf. Maltese 2021, 13-15.

186. It recalls, in a way, the well-known decree of Olbia imposing the city's silver and bronze coinage in all transactions taking place within the frontiers of Olbia. For the decree of Olbia, see *I. dial. Olbia Pont* 14 and the comments of P. Gauthier in *BE* 1997, 420.

187. Schönhammer 1993; cf. Figueira 1998, *passim* and 422; Picard 1999; Samons 2000, 330-332.

the autonomy of the Greek city states who were members of the Alliance certainly cannot be denied in general, but the Standards decree has nothing to do with either of these.<sup>188</sup> More than a sign of despotism the decree is a victim of anachronistic assumptions based on nineteenth-century historical circumstances, i.e. the monetary unification of the German Reich in 1871 under Prussian guidance.

Selene E. Psoma  
University of Athens  
spsoma@arch.uoa.gr

---

188. See Psoma 2024.

## Appendix

### List of hoards with Attic coins buried in the territories of the *arche* before 400 BC<sup>189</sup>

#### **Attica**

IGCH 12, Acropolis, 479-478 BC. For later dates, see Tselekas 2020.

IGCH 14, Sounion, 480-470 BC.

IGCH 16, Attica, before 465 BC.

CH V 14, Piraeus, late 5th cent. BC.

CH X 15, Ano Voula, late 5th cent. BC.

IGCH 46, Eleusis, 406-394 BC. For dates between 406 and 404 BC, see Kroll 1996.

#### **Euboea**

CH II 20, Eretria 1973, 5th cent. BC.

CH VIII 69, IX 17, Eretria 1981, 411 BC. For a date ca. 446 BC, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 153.<sup>190</sup>

CH IX 11, Eretria 1976, 411 BC. For the date, see Kallet, Kroll 2020, 48-49, 70, 153.

IGCH 39, Euboea, late 5th cent. BC.

CH X 7, Eretria, 5th cent. BC.

#### **Thrace**

CH VIII 63, Scione, ca. 425 BC; cf. CH X 4 (the presence of Athenian coins is denied). For the burial date, see Kagan 2014: ca. 423 BC.

IGCH 359, Olynthos, 420s BC: one Athenian drachm.<sup>191</sup>

#### **Black Sea**

CH I 15, ca. 425 BC: Athens, "Sinope", sigloi and others: 16 / 108.

#### **Asia Minor**

Unp. hoard from South Caria, 470 BC: 2 / 152.

---

189. See also Appendix of all hoards buried within the territories of the Athenian *arche* in Kallet, Kroll 2020, 152-157.

190. Full publication by Kroll forthcoming.

191. CH I 18 is not a hoard. IGCH 362 (cf. CH VIII 34), Athos, 5th cent. BC with Attic tetradrachms and darics is not a hoard: Nicolet-Pierre 1992.

*IGCH* 1182, 460 BC, Asia Minor, western, many Athenian tetradrachms / many silver coins.

*IGCH* 1189, 450 BC Asia Minor, western, Athens, 1 / 11.<sup>192</sup>

*IGCH* 1251, Lycia, area of Antiphellus, 440-430 BC: Athens, 3 / 96+.

*IGCH* 1252, Southern Asia Minor, 450-430 BC, Athens, 2 / 32+.

*CH* VIII 73, Asia Minor, 400 BC: Athens, many sigloi and ingots.<sup>193</sup>

---

192. The first number refers to Attic silver coins and the second to the total number of coins present in the hoard.

193. For hoards with large numbers of Athenian tetradrachms of the 4th century BC, see Psoma 2015a.

### Summary

This article analyzes the clauses of the Athenian Standards Decree, which has long been interpreted as banning allied cities from minting their own coinage. It interprets the Standards Decree not as a sign of Athenian imperialism, as previously thought, but as a technical financial measure aimed at streamlining tax collection within the empire. It examines evidence from mints, hoards, and Athenian financial documents that cast doubt on this traditional interpretation. Following other scholars who have questioned the conventional view, the article introduces additional evidence to support an interpretation of the decree as a purely financial measure. Oaths in treaties between Athens and her allies are examined to show that all restorations of capital punishment in the missing part of the Bouleutic Oath are untenable because the Council did not have the power to impose punishments over 500 drachms. The article rejects previous attempts to see an allusion to the decree in a passage from Aristophanes' *Birds* (spring 414 BC) and to date it shortly before 414 BC, because of the manuscript tradition, ancient scholia, the passage's meaning, and the decree's purpose. Instead, the mention of four districts of the Athenian Empire and the inclusion of weights and measures alongside coinage point to a date in the autumn of 413 BC, coinciding with the introduction of the eikoste (a 5% tax). The article argues that through this decree, Athens attempted to increase revenue and to collect significant quantities of Attic currency. However, this measure did not last long; Athens reintroduced the tribute system most probably sometime after the decisive sea battle of Cyzicus.

### Abbreviations-Bibliography

- Alexander, J.A. 1953. "The Coinage of Potidaea", in G.E. Mylonas, D. Raymond (eds.), *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on His Seventieth Birthday*, vol. 2. Saint Louis, 201-217.
- Alfen, P.G. van 2012. "Xenophon *Poroi* 3.2 and Athenian 'Owls' in Aegean-Near Eastern Long-Distance Trade", in M. Asolati, G. Gorini (eds.), *I ritrovamenti monetali e i processi storico-economici nel mondo antico* (Numismatica Patavina 12). Padova, 11-32.
- Alfen, P.G. van 2016. "Aegean-Levantine Trade, 600-300 BCE: Commodities, Consumers, and the Problem of *Autarkeia*", in E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis, M. Woolmer (eds.), *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*. Cambridge, 277-298.
- ATL I-IV: Meritt, B.D., Wade-Gery, H.T., McGregor, M.F. *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. 4 vols. Princeton 1939-1953.
- Barron, J.P. 1966. *The Silver Coins of Samos*. London.
- Bartzoka, A. 2018. *Le tribunal de l'Héliée : Justice et politique dans l'Athènes du VI<sup>e</sup> au IV<sup>e</sup> siècles avant J.-C.* Brussels.
- Baumeister, A. 1855. "Monatsberichte no. 22", *Verhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 197.
- Beretta Liverani, M. 2013. "I decreto ateniese per i Faseliti (IG I<sup>3</sup> 10) e le multe di 10.000 dracme nel V sec.", *Historiká* 3, 131-158.
- Bergk, T. 1857. *Aristophanis Comoedias*, vol. 2. Leipzig.
- Blamire, A. 2001. "Athenian Finance, 454-404 B.C.", *Hesperia* 70, 99-126.
- Blaydes, F.H.M. 1882. *Aristophanis Comoediae*, vol. 4: *Aristophanis Aves*. Halle.
- Bodenstedt, F. 1981. *Die Elektronmünzen von Phokaia und Mytilene*. Tübingen.
- Bogaert, R. 1976. "L'essai de monnaies dans l'antiquité", *RBN* 122, 5-34.
- Bonnin, G. 2015. *De Naxos à Amorgos : l'impérialisme athénien vu des Cyclades à l'époque classique*. Bordeaux – Paris.
- Bonnin, G. 2019. "Phoroi, Syntaxeis and Loans from Delian Apollo: The Cyclades under Athenian Financial Imperialism", in T.J. Figueira, S.R. Jensen (eds.), *Hegemonic Finances: Funding Athenian Domination in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Centuries BC*. Swansea, 135-166.
- Braund, D. 2005. "Pericles, Cleon and the Pontus: The Black Sea in Athens c. 440-421", in D. Braund (ed.), *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (sixth century BC - first century AD)*. Exeter, 80-99.
- Bresson, A. 2009. "Electrum Coins, Currency Exchange and Transaction Costs in Archaic and Classical Greece", *RBN* 155, 71-80.

- Bubelis, W. 2019. "Imperial Numeracy? Athenian Calculation of Some Imperial Taxes", in T.J. Figueira, S.R. Jensen (eds.), *Hegemonic Finances: Funding Athenian Domination in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC*. Swansea, 25-53.
- Buttrey, T.V. 1979. "The Athenian Currency Law of 375/4 BC", in O. Mørkholm, N.M. Waggoner (eds.), *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thompson*. Wetteren, 33-45.
- Buttrey, T.V. 1981. "More on the Athenian Coinage Law of 375/4 BC", *NumAntCl* 10, 71-94.
- Carbone, L.F. 2014. "Money and Power: The Disappearance of Autonomous Silver Issues in the Roman Province of Asia", *Omni* 8, 10-34.
- Carradice, I. (ed.) 1987. *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford.
- Cataudella, M.R. 1986. "Aspetti e strumenti della politica monetaria ateniese fra V e IV secolo", *Sileno* 12, 111-135.
- Cavaignac, E.B. 1953. "Le décret dit de Klearkhos", *RN* 5.15, 1-7.
- Cawkwell, G.L. 1997. *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War*. London – New York.
- Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. 2007. *L'histoire monétaire d'Abdère en Thrace (VI<sup>e</sup> s. avant J.-C.-II<sup>e</sup> s. après J.-C.)* (Μελετήματα 51). Athens.
- Cohen, G.M. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 17). Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London.
- Del Corno, D., Zanetto, G. 1987. *Aristofane. Gli Uccelli*. Milano.
- Dindorf, W. 1838. *Aristophanis comediae*, vol. 4 part III : *Scholia graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata*. Oxford.
- Doyen, C. 2016. "Ex schedis Fourmonti. Le décret agoranomique athénien (CIG I 123 = IG II-III<sup>2</sup> 1013)", *Chiron* 46, 453-487.
- Doyen, C. 2017, "Réformes métrologiques à la fin du II<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.: pour une réévaluation de l'influence romaine", in C. Doyen (ed.), *Étalons monétaires et mesures pondérales entre la Grèce et l'Italie*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 187-206.
- Draganov, D., Paunov, E. 2017. "A Hoard of Apollonia Pontica Tetradrachms", *RBN* 163, 413-422.
- Dreher, M. 1995. *Hegemon und Symmachoi: Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Athenischen Seebund* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 46). Berlin.
- Dübner, F. 1877. *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*. Paris.
- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes' Birds, with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Eich, A. 2021. "Die Geo-Ökonomie des Ersten Attischen Seebundes: neuere Forschungen und Überlegungen", in W. Riess (ed.), *Colloquia Attica* 2.

- Neuere Forschungen zu Athen im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Hamburger Studien zu Gesellschaften und Kulturen der Vormoderne 12). Stuttgart, 51-77.
- Ellis-Evans, A. 2016. "Mytilene, Lampsakos, Chios and the Financing of the Spartan Fleet (406-404)", *NC* 176, 1-29 (with pl. 1).
- Ellis-Evans, A. 2019. *The Kingdom of Priam. Lesbos and the Troad between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Oxford.
- Ellis-Evans, A., Kagan, J.H. 2022. "Bimetallism, Coinage, and Empire in Persian Anatolia", *Phoenix* 76, 178-227.
- Engelmann, H. "Wege griechischer Geldpolitik", *ZPE* 60, 165-176.
- Engen, D.T. 2005. "Ancient Greenbacks, Athenian Owls, the Law of Nikophon and the Greek Economy", *Historia* 54, 359-381.
- Erxleben, E. 1969. "Das Münzgesetz des delisch-attischen Seebundes", *ArchPF* 19, 91-139.
- Erxleben, E. 1970. "Das Münzgesetz des delisch-attischen Seebundes", *ArchPF* 20, 66-132.
- Erxleben, E. 1971. "Das Münzgesetz des delisch-attischen Seebundes", *ArchPF* 21, 145-162.
- Fantasia, U. 2006. "Formione in Acarnania (Thuc. II 68,7-8) e le origini della guerra del Peloponneso", *Incidenza dell'Antico* 4, 59-98.
- Faraguna, M. 2003. "'Nomisma' e 'polis': Aspetti della riflessione greca antica sul ruolo della moneta nella società", in G. Urso (ed.), *Moneta mercanti banchieri: i precedenti greci e romani dell'euro*. Pisa, 109-135.
- Faraguna, M. 2006. "La città di Atene e l'amministrazione delle miniere del Laurion", in H.A. Rupprecht (ed.), *Symposion 2003. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Rauischholzhausen, 30. September - 3. Oktober 2003)*. Vienna, 141-160.
- Faraguna, M. 2008. "Calcolo economico, archivi finanziari e credito nel mondo greco tra VI e IV sec. a.C.", in K. Verboven, K. Vandorpe, V. Chankowski (eds.), *Pistoi dia tèn technèn: Bankers, Loans, and Archives in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert* (Studia Hellenistica 44). Leuven, 33-57.
- Figueira, T.J. 1998. *The Power of Money, Coinage and Politics in the Athenian Empire*. Philadelphia.
- Finley, M.I. 1985. *The Ancient Greek Economy*. 2nd. ed. London.
- Flament, C. 2011. "Faut-il suivre les chouettes ? : Réflexions sur la monnaie comme indicateur d'échanges à partir du cas athénien d'époque classique", in T. Faucher, M.-C. Marcellesi, O. Picard (eds.), *Nomisma: La circulation monétaire dans le monde antique* (BCH Suppl. 53). Athens, 39-51.
- Fornara, C.W. 1971. "Evidence for the Date of Herodotus' Publication", *JHS* 91, 25-34.

- Forster, E. 1991. *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanes Aves*, in D. Holwerda (ed.) *Scholia in Aristophanes*, vol. II 3, Groningen.
- Fried, S. 1987. "The Decadrachm Hoard: An Introduction", in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 1-10.
- Gatzolis, C., Psoma, S.E. "The Methone / Pieria 2006 Hoard", in S.E. Psoma, U. Wartenberg-Kagan (eds.), *Ἀργύριον Ἀττικόν. Ἰωάννη Ν. Σβορώνω μνήμης χάριν. New Hoard Evidence for the Chronology of 5<sup>th</sup> Century BC Athenian Coinage. Memorial of Ioannis N. Svoronos (1863-1922)*. forthcoming.
- Giovannini, A. 1975. "Athenian Currency in the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Century BC", *GRBS* 16, 191-195.
- Giovannini, A. 1978. *Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant Jésus-Christ*. Basel.
- Grace, V.R. 1946. "Early Thasian Stamped Amphoras", *AJA* 50, 31-38.
- Hardwick, N.M.M. 1993. "The Coinage of Chios from the V<sup>th</sup> to the IV<sup>th</sup> Century BC", in *Proceedings of the XI<sup>th</sup> International Numismatic Congress Organized for the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Société Royale de Numismatique de Belgique; Brussels, September 8<sup>th</sup> - 13<sup>th</sup> 1991*, vol. 1. Louvain-la-Neuve, 211-222.
- Hardwick, N.M.M. 1998. "The Coinage of Terone from the Fifth to the Fourth Centuries BC", in R. Ashton, S. Hurter (eds.), *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price*. London, 119-134.
- Harris, E.M. 2000. "The Authenticity of Andokides' *De Pace*: A Subversive Essay", in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Nielsen, L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis & Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History*. Copenhagen, 479-505.
- Harris, E.M. 2006. *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens. Essays on Law, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge.
- Harris, E.M. 2013. *The Rule of Law in Action in Democratic Athens*. Oxford.
- Harris, E.M. 2013-2014. "The Authenticity of the Document at Andocides *On the Mysteries* 96-98", *Τεκμήρια* 12, 121-153.
- Harris, E.M. 2016. "The Flawed Origins of Ancient Greek Democracy", in A. Havlicek, C. Horn, J. Jinek (eds.), *Nous, Polis, Nomos. Festschrift Francisco L. Lisi*. Sankt Augustin, 43-55.
- Harris, E.M. 2021. "Major Events in the Recent Past in Assembly Speeches and the Authenticity of [Andocides] *On the Peace*", *Τεκμήρια* 16, 19-68.
- Harris, E.M. 2022. "Notes on the New Law of Epicrates from the Athenian Agora", *ZPE* 222, 65-81.
- Harris, E.M., Esu, A. 2021. "Policising Major Crimes in Classical Athens: *Eisangelia* and Other Public Procedures", *Rivista di Diritto Ellenico* 11, 39-119.

- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 2000-2003. “Νέο απότμημα από την Ἀφύτι τοῦ ἀττικοῦ ψηφίσματος περὶ νομίσματος, σταθμῶν καὶ μέτρων”, *Horos* 14-16, 31-43.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 2007. “Nouveau fragment du décret attique sur les monnaies, les poids et les mesures en provenance d’Aphytis”, in *Acta XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae, Barcelona 3-8 Septembris 2002*, vol. II. Barcelona, 717-722.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 2013-2014. “The Athenian Standards Decree: The Aphytis Fragments”, *Τεκμήρια* 12, 235-269.
- HCT IV: Gomme, A.W., Andrewes, A., Dover, K.J., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. IV: Books V 25-VII. Oxford 1970.
- Hedrick, C.W. 2000. “For Anyone Who Wishes to See”, *AncW* 31, 127-135.
- Henderson, J. 2000. *Aristophanes III. Birds, Lysistrata, Women at the Thesmophoria* (Loeb Classical Library 179). Cambridge MA – London.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F.F. 1923. “Ἀττικὸς νομισματικὸς νόμος ἐκ Σύμης”, *AEph*, 116-117.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I: Books I-III. Oxford – New York.
- Houghtalin, L. 2015. “The Temple Deposit at Isthmia and the Dating of Archaic and Early Classical Greek Coins”, in E.R. Gebhard, T.E. Gregory (eds.), *Bridge of the untiring sea: The Corinthian Isthmus from Prehistory to Late Antiquity* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 48). Princeton, 97-108.
- Howgego, C.J. 1995. *Ancient History from Coins*. London – New York.
- Joyce, C. 2018. “Atimia and Outlawry in Archaic and Classical Greece”, *Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought* 35, 33-60.
- Kagan, J.H. 1987. “The Decadrachm Hoard, Chronology and Consequences”, in I. Carradice (ed.) *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 21-28.
- Kagan, J.H. 2014. “Notes on the Coinage of Mende”, *AJN* 26, 1-32, pls. 1-5.
- Kagan, J.H. 2022. “Stopping and Starting Coinage: Case Studies in the Cyclades and the Chalkidike during the Athenian Empire and Its Immediate Aftermath”, *RBN* 168, 1-13.
- Kallet, L. 2001. *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and Its Aftermath*. Berkeley.
- Kallet, L. 2013. “The Origins of the Athenian Economic Arche”, *JHS* 133, 43-60.
- Kallet, L., Kroll, J.H. 2020. *The Athenian Empire: Using Coins As Sources*. Cambridge – New York.
- Kleber, K. 2015. “Taxation in the Achaemenid Empire” in *Oxford Handbook Topics in Classical Studies* (<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.34>) (accessed 24/4/2024).

- Konuk, K. 2011. “Des chouettes en Asie Mineure : Quelques pistes de réflexion”, in T. Faucher, M.-C. Marcellesi, O. Picard (eds.), *Nomisma : La circulation monétaire dans le monde antique* (BCH Suppl. 53). Athens, 53-66.
- Konuk, K. 2012. “Asia Minor to the Ionian Revolt”, in W.E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*. Oxford, 43-60.
- Kosmetatou, E. 2001. “A Numismatic Commentary of the Inventory Lists of the Athenian Acropolis”, *RBN* 147, 11-37.
- Kremydi, S., Marcellesi, M.-C. 2019. “Introduction”, in S. Kremydi, M.-C. Marcellesi, (eds.) *Les Alexandres après Alexandre : Histoire d'une monnaie commune* (Μελετήματα 81). Athens, 17-24.
- Kroll, J.H. 1976. “Aristophanes’ πονηρὰ χαλκία: A Reply”, *GRBS* 17, 328-341.
- Kroll, J.H. 1993. *The Athenian Agora*, vol. XXVI: *The Greek Coins*. Princeton – New Jersey.
- Kroll, J.H. 1996. “The Piraeus 1902 Hoard of Plated Drachms and Tetradrachms (IGCH 46)”, in *Χαρακτήρ: αφιέρωμα στη Μάντω Οικονομίδου*, Athens, 139-146.
- Kroll, J.H. 2009. “What about Coinage?”, in J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas, R. Parker (eds.), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*. London, 195-209.
- Kroll, J.H. “An Eretrian hoard with Attic tetradrachms”, in S.E. Psoma, U. Wartenberg-Kagan (eds.), *Ἀργύριον Ἀττικόν. Ἰωάννη Ν. Σβορώνου μνήμης χάριν. New Hoard Evidence for the Chronology of 5<sup>th</sup> Century BC Athenian Coinage. Memorial of Ioannis N. Svoronos (1863-1922)*. forthcoming.
- Lazar, L. 2024. *Athenian power in the fifth century BC*. Oxford.
- Lazenby, J.F. 2004. *The Peloponnesian War: A Military Study*. London.
- Leeuwen, J. van 1902. *Aristophanis Aves cum prolegomenis et commentariis*. Leiden.
- Le Rider, G. 1989. “À propos d’un passage des Poroi de Xenophon : la question du change et les monnaies incuses d’Italie du Sud”, in G. Le Rider et al. (eds.), *Kraay – Mørkholm Essays. Numismatic Studies in Memory of C. M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm* (Numismatica Lovaniensia 10). Louvain-la-Neuve, 159-172.
- Le Rider, G. 2001. *La naissance de la monnaie : pratiques monétaires de l’Orient ancien*. Paris.
- Lewis, D.M. 1974. “Entrenchment-clauses in Attic Decrees”, in D.W. Bradeen, M.F. McGregor (eds.), *Φόρος. Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*. New York, 81-89 [also in P.J. Rhodes (ed.), *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*. Cambridge, 136-149].
- Lewis, D.M. 1987. “The Athenian Coinage Decree”, in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford*

- Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 116-130.
- Liampi, K. 2005. *Argilos: A Historical and Numismatic Study* (Kerma 1). Athens.
- Makris, A. 2014. "IG I<sup>3</sup> 82 Revisited", in A.P. Matthaiou, R. Pitt (eds.), *Ἀθηναίων ἐπίσκοπος. Studies in Honour of Harold B. Mattingly*. Athens, 185-202.
- Malouchou, G.E. 2024. "Hephaistos and Athena Hephaistia. A note", in A.P. Matthaiou (ed.), *The Athenian Law of Epicrates, 354/3 B.C.: Four Studies*. Athens, 33-38.
- Maltese, S. 2021, "Il decreto ateniese sulle misure, i pesi e le monete. Un testo di politica finanziaria", *Aevum* 95.1, 3-37.
- Marathaki, I. 2014. *Η νομισματοκοπία της Σκιώνης* (diss., Univ. of Athens).
- Martin, T.R. 1985. *Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece*. Princeton – New Jersey.
- Martin, T.R. 1991. "Silver Coins and Public Slavs in the Athenian Law of 375/4 B.C.", in W.E. Metcalf (ed.), *Mnemata. Papers in Memory of Nancy M. Waggoner*. New York, 21-48.
- Matthaiou, A.P. "The Athenian Standards Decree: The Cos Fragment", Unpublished communication to the international symposium *The Athenian Standards Decree. New Text, New Contexts* (Oxford, 16-18 April 2004).
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2009. *Studies in Attic Inscriptions and the History of the Fifth Century B.C.* (diss., La Trobe Univ.).
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2010. *The Athenian Empire on stone revisited*. Athens.
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2010-2013. "Δύο Ἀττικά ψηφίσματα", *Horos* 22-25, 17-42.
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2017. "Παρατηρήσεις εἰς ἐκδεδομένα Ἀττικά ψηφίσματα", *ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΟΝ* 6, 43-54.
- Matthaiou, A.P. 2022. "Ὀλίγα προκαταρκτικά σχόλια ἐπὶ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ Ἐπικράτους", *ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΟΝ* 11, 57-66.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1957. "The Date of the Athenian Coinage Decree", *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 54, 31-32.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1961. "The Athenian Coinage Decree", *ZPE* 10.2 148-188.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1963. "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism", *Historia* 12, 257-273.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1968. "Athenian Finance in the Peloponnesian War", *BCH* 92, 450-485.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1970. "Epigraphically the Twenties Are Too Late...", *BSA* 65, 129-149.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1977. "The second Athenian coinage decree", *Klio* 59, 83-100.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1979, "Periclean Imperialism", in G. Wirth (ed.), *Perikles und seine Zeit*, Darmstadt, 312-349.

- Mattingly, H. B. 1987. "The Athenian Coinage Decree and the Assertion of the Empire", in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History, April 1986* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 65-71.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1993. "New Light on the Athenian Standards Decree (ATL II, D 14)", *Klio* 75, 99-102.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1996. *The Athenian Empire Restored: Epigraphic and Historical Studies*. Ann Arbor.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1999. "What Are the Right Dating Criteria for Fifth-century Attic Texts?", *ZPE* 126, 117-122.
- Mattingly, H.B. 2000. "The Fifth-century Tetradrachm Coinage of Maroneia", *NC* 160, 261-263.
- Mattingly, H.B. 2014. "Athenian Imperialism and the Chalkis Decree", in A.P. Matthaiou, R. Pitt (eds.), *Ἀθηναίων ἐπίσκοπος. Studies in Honour of Harold B. Mattingly*. Athens, 11-18.
- May, J.M.F. 1950. *Ainos: Its History and Coinage, 474-341 BC*. London.
- Meadows, A. 2001. "Money, Freedom, and Empire in the Hellenistic World", in A. Meadows, K. Shipton (eds.), *Money and Its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford, 53-63.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Meiggs, R., Lewis, D.M. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
- Meritt, B.D. 1945. "Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century", *Hesperia* 14, 61-133.
- Mørkholm, O. 1982. "Some Reflections on the Use of Coinage in Ancient Greece", *Historia* 31, 290-305.
- Müller, C. 2010. *D'Olbia à Tanais : Territoires et réseaux d'échanges dans la mer Noire septentrionale aux époques classique et hellénistique*, Paris.
- Nicolet-Pierre, H. 1992. "Xerxès et le trésor de l'Athos (IGCH 362)", *RN* 6.34, 7-22.
- Nicolet-Pierre, H. 2003. "Les imitations égyptiennes des tétradrachmes athéniens d'époque classique", *AE* 142, 139-154.
- Ober, J. 2008. *Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*. Princeton.
- Ober, J. 2009. *Access, Fairness and Transaction Costs: Nikophon's Law on Silver Coinage (Athens, 375/4 BC)*. (work in progress, Stanford Univ.).
- Osborne, R., Rhodes, P.J. 2017. *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 478-404 BC*. Oxford.
- Papazarkadas, N. "The Athenian Standards Decree: The Smyrna Fragment", Unpublished communication to the international symposium *The Athenian Standards Decree: New Text, New Contexts* (Oxford, 16-18 April 2004).

- Papazarkadas, N. 2009. "Epigraphy and the Athenian Empire: Reshuffling the Chronological Cards", in J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas, R. Parker (eds.), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*. London, 67-88.
- Papazarkadas, N., Santini, F. 2023. "In Search of the Smyrna Fragment of the Athenian Standards Decree (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453G)", *ZPE* 226, 82-86.
- Pébarthe, C. 2012. "Droit et marché en Grèce ancienne : De la monnaie athénienne comme loi", in B. Legras, G. Thür (eds.), *Symposion. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Paris, 7.-10. September 2011). Vienna, 237-260.
- Picard, O. 1982. "Monnayage thasien au V<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C.", *CRAI*, 412-424.
- Picard, O. 1986. "Monnaie et gravure monétaire à Thasos à la fin du V<sup>e</sup> siècle", in Φίλια Ἐπη εἰς Γεώργιον Ἐ. Μυλωνᾶν, διὰ τὰ ἐξήντα ἔτη τοῦ ἀνασκαφικοῦ τοῦ ἔργου, (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας 103), vol. II. Athens, 149-162, pls. 40-41.
- Picard, O. 1999. "Monnaie et guerre en Grèce classique", *Pallas* 51, 205-221.
- Picard, O. 2000. "Monnaies", in Y. Grandjean, F. Salviat (eds.), *Guide de Thasos*. 2nd. ed. Athens, 303-314.
- Picard, O. 2019. "Conclusions", in S. Kremydi, M.-C. Marcellesi (eds.), *Les Alexandres après Alexandre : Histoire d'une monnaie commune* (Μελετήματα 81). Athens, 385-389.
- Piérart, M. 1988. "IG I<sup>3</sup> 281-282 et le *phoros* de Thrace", in D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*. Geneva, 309-321.
- Piérart, M. 1995. "Chios entre Athènes et Sparte : La contribution des exilés de Chios à l'effort de guerre lacédémonien pendant la Guerre du Péloponnèse, IG V 1, 1 + (SEG XXXIX 370)", *BCH* 119.1, 235-282.
- Price, M.J. 1987. "The Coinages of the Northern Aegean", in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 43-47, pls. VIII-IX.
- Price, M.J., Waggoner, N. 1975. *Archaic Greek Coinage: The Asyut Hoard*. London.
- Psôma, S. 1997. "Notes sur le début du monnayage fédéral des Chalcidiens de Thrace", *RN* 152, 423-28.
- Psoma, S. 2000. "Σταθμητικοί κανόνες στη Χαλκιδική κατά τον 5<sup>ο</sup> και 4<sup>ο</sup> αι. π.Χ.", *Οβολός* 4, 25-36.
- Psôma, S. 2001. *Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace : Études de Numismatique et d'Histoire*. Stuttgart.
- Psoma, S. 2006. "The 'Lete' Coinage Reconsidered", in P. van Alfen (ed.), *Agoronomia. Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll*. New York, 85-98.

- Psoma, S. 2008. "The Silver Coinage of Maroneia Reconsidered", in S. Psoma, C. Karadima, D. Terzopoulou, *The Coins from Maroneia and the Classical City at Molyvoti: A Contribution to the History of Aegean Thrace* (Μελετήματα 62). Athens, 157-182.
- Psoma, S. 2009. "Monetary Terminology in Pre-roman Asia Minor: Cistophori in Latin Authors and Greek Inscriptions and the Date of the Introduction of Cistophoric Coinage", *EA* 42, 170-180.
- Psoma, S. 2011a. "The Kingdom of Macedonia and the Chalcidic League", in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Ancient Macedon, 650 B.C. - 300 A.D.*, Leiden, 113-35.
- Psoma, S. 2011b. "The Law of Nikophon (SEG 26.72) and Athenian Imitations", *RBN* 157, 27-36.
- Psoma, S. 2012. "Obols, Drachms, and Staters of Bronze during the Hellenistic Period", *AJN* 2.24, 11-19.
- Psoma, S.E. 2015a. "Athenian Owls and the Royal Macedonian Monopoly of Timber", *MHR* 30.1, 1-18.
- Psoma, S.E. 2015b. "Did the So-called Thraco-Macedonian Standard Exist?", in U. Wartenberg, M. Amandry (eds.), *ΚΑΙΡΟΣ. Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Basil Demetriadi*. New York, 167-190.
- Psoma, S.E. 2016a. "Choosing and Changing Monetary Standards in the Greek World during the Archaic and the Classical Periods", in E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis, M. Woolmar (eds.), *The Ancient Greek Economy, Markets, Households and City-States*. New York, 90-115.
- Psoma, S.E. 2016b. "Réflexions sur la localisation de la pérée thasienne et sur la fondation de Philippes", in J. Fournier (ed.), *Philippes, de la Préhistoire à Byzance : Etudes d'archéologie et d'histoire* (BCH Suppl. 55). Athens, 79-95.
- Psoma, S.E. 2019. "À propos des *drachmai argyriou symmachikou*", *Τεκμήρια* 14, 107-148.
- Psoma, S. 2020a. "White Gold and Electrum in Literary Sources and Inscriptions", in P. van Alfen (ed.), *White Gold. Papers from a Conference at the Israel Museum, 25-28 June 2011*. New York, 65-82.
- Psoma, S. 2020b. "'Ἡδε Κύζικος πλέα στατήρων: How to Explain the Electrum Coinage of Kyzikos", in P. van Alfen (ed.), *White Gold. Papers from a Conference at the Israel Museum, 25-28 June 2011*. New York, 689-701.
- Psoma, S.E. 2021. "IG II<sup>2</sup> 44, ll. 22-23, Αὐ[τοπολίτα]ς vel αὐ[τοδίκος]ς", *ZPE* 217, 131-134.
- Psoma, S.E. 2022a. *Corcyra: A City at the Edge of Two Greek Worlds* (Μελετήματα 83). Athens.
- Psoma, S.E. 2022b. "The ΣΥΝ Coinage of the Classical Period: Agesilaus versus Lysander", *Phoenix* 76, 146-177.

- Psoma, S. E. 2024. "A casus belli: the Megarian Decree", *REG* 136, 2023.2, 271-299.
- Psoma, S.E. forthcoming a. "Nomos and *nomisma*", in M. Canavaro, E.M. Harris (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*.
- Psoma, S.E. forthcoming b. "Back to the 5<sup>th</sup> Century BC Silver Coinage in the Name of All the Arcadians and Some Thoughts on the Coinages of Elis, Aegina and Phocis", in S. Damigos et al. (eds.), *Memory and Impression: Walking through Loci and Images of the Peloponnese. Proceedings of an International Colloquium Organised at Tegea (December 12-13, 2019)*
- Psoma, S., Tsangari, D. 2003. "Monnaie commune et États fédéraux : La circulation des monnayages frappés par les États fédéraux du monde grec", in E. Chrysos et al. (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings*, vol. II: *Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Greek Antiquity*. Athens, 111-141.
- Radermacher, L. (ed.) 1951. *Artium scriptores* (ÖAW, Philosoph.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte 227, Abh. 3). Vienna
- Rhodes, P.J. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1987. "Thucydides on the Causes of the Peloponnesian War", *Hermes* 115.2, 154-165.
- Rhodes, P.J., Osborne, R. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*. Oxford.
- Richardson, M. 2021. "The Law of Epicrates of 354/3 BC", *Hesperia* 90, 685-746.
- Rizzi, M. 2017. *Marktbezogene Gesetzgebung im späthellenistischen Athen: Der Volksbeschluss über Maße und Gewichte. Eine epigraphische und rechtshistorische Untersuchung* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, Heft 113). München.
- Robinson, D.M. 1935. "A New Fragment of the Athenian Decree on Coinage", *AJPh* 56, 149-154.
- Robinson, E.S.G. 1949. "The Athenian Coinage Decree and the Coinages of the Allies", in *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 8). Baltimore, 324-340.
- Rutishauser, B. 2012. *Athens and the Cyclades: Economic Strategies 540-314 BC*. Oxford.
- Samons, L.J. II. 2000. *Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finance* (Historia Einzelschriften 142). Stuttgart.
- Schönert-Geiss, E. 1987. *Griechisches Münzwerk: Die Münzprägung von Maroneia* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike 26). Berlin.
- Schönhammer, M. "Some Thoughts on the Athenian Coinage Decree", in *Proceedings of the XI<sup>th</sup> International Numismatic Congress Organized for the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Société Royale de Numismatique de Belgique; Brussels, September 8<sup>th</sup> - 13<sup>th</sup> 1991*, vol. 1. Louvain-la-Neuve, 187-191.

- Segre, M. 1938. "La legge ateniese sull'unificazione della moneta", *Clara Rhodos* 9, 153-165.
- Sheedy, K.A. 2006. *The Archaic and Early Classical Coinages of the Cyclades*. London.
- Sheedy, K.A. 2012. "Aegina, the Cyclades, and Crete", in W.E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*. Oxford, 105-127.
- Shipton, K.M.W. 1997. "The Private Banks in Fourth-century BC Athens: A Re-appraisal", *CQ* 47, 396-422.
- Syll.<sup>3</sup>. Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. 4 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig 1915-1924.
- Sommerstein, A.H. 1987. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 6: *Birds*. Wiltshire.
- Stroud, R.S. 1974a. "Three Attic Decrees", *CSCA* 7, 279-298.
- Stroud, R.S. 1974b. "An Athenian Law on Silver Coinage", *Hesperia* 43, 157-188, pls. 25-27.
- Stroud, R.S. 2006. *The Athenian Empire on Stone. David M. Lewis Memorial Lecture*, Oxford 2006. Athens.
- Thür, G., Faraguna, M. 2018. "Silver from Laureion: Mining, Smelting, and Minting", in B. Woytek (ed.), *Infrastructure and Distribution in Ancient Economies. Proceedings of a Conference Held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, 28-31 October 2014*. Vienna, 45-57.
- Tod, M.N. 1933. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Oxford.
- Tracy, S.V. 2016. *Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century B.C.: The Rise of the Professional Letter Cutter*. Berlin.
- Tselekas, P. 2009. "On the 'Skione 1990/1' Hoard (*CH* VIII [1994], 63; *CH* IX [2002], 4)", in *Κερμάτια φιλίας. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον Ιωάννη Τουράτσογλου*, vol. 1. Athens, 321-329.
- Tselekas, P. 2020. "The Acropolis, 1886 hoard (*IGCH* 12) revisited", in K.A. Sheedy, G. Davis (eds.), *Metallurgy in Numismatics, volume 6: Mines, Metals and Money in Attica and the Ancient World* (Royal Numismatic Society Special Publications 58). London, 257-268.
- Tuplin, C. 1987. "The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire", in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History* (BAR-IS 343). Oxford, 109-166.
- Youni, M.S. 2018. "Outlawry in Classical Athens: Nothing to Do with *atimia*", in G. Thür, U. Yiftach, R. Zelnick-Abramovitz (eds.), *Symposium 2017. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Tel Aviv, 20.-23. August 2017). Vienna, 137-161.
- Wartenberg, U. 1992. Review of C.C. Lorber, *Amphipolis: The Civic Coinage in Silver and Gold*, *NC* 152, 193-195.

- Wartenberg, U. 2015. "Thraco-Macedonian Bullion Coinage in the Fifth Century B.C.: The Case of Ichnai", in U. Wartenberg, M. Amandry (eds.), *ΚΑΙΠΟΣ. Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Basil Demetriadi*. New York, 347-364, pls. 1-4.
- White, J.W. 1914. *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes: with an Introduction on the Origin, Development, Transmission, and Extant Sources of the Old Greek Commentary on his Comedies*. Boston.
- Whitehead, D. 1997. "The Athenian Standards Decree (IG I<sup>3</sup> 1453): 'The (?) Preceding Decree Which Klearchos Proposed'", *ZPE* 118, 169-173.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1877. "Von des attischen Reiches Herrlichkeit" (lecture given at Greifswald).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1880. *Philologische Untersuchungen I: Aus Kydathen*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1913. *Reden und Vorträge*. Berlin.
- Wilhelm, A. 1897. "Epigraphischer Bericht aus Griechenland", *Anzeiger der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Classe* 34, no. xxvi-xxvii, 178-188 [= 1898. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* Beiblatt, 41-50].
- Will, É. 1988. Review of T.R. Martin, *Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece*, in *Échos du Monde Classique / Classical Views* 30, 419-420 [= 1998. *Historica graeco-hellenistica. Choix d'écrits 1953-1993*. Paris].
- Will, W. 2003. *Thukydides und Perikles: Der Historiker und sein Held*. Bonn.
- Woodhaed, A.G. 1974. "Before the Storm", in *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux*. Paris, 375-388.
- Woodhaed, A.G. 1997. *The Athenian Agora*, vol. XVI: *Inscriptions: The Decrees*. Princeton – New Jersey.
- Zournatzi, A. 2000. "The Processing of Gold and Silver Tax in the Achaemenid Empire: Herodotus 3.96.2 and the Archaeological Realities", *Studia Iranica* 29, 241-271.