

NOTES ON TRIBUTE-QUOTA-LISTS 5, 6, AND 7 OF THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE

R. SEALEY

I. THE MONUMENT

THE SECOND ASSESSMENT-PERIOD discernible in the Athenian tribute-quota-lists comprises the four years 450/49–447/6 inclusively. Until 1934 it was believed that the four quota-lists of these years could all be found on the *lapis primus*; it was supposed that List 5 (450/49) and List 6 (449/8) were the two Lists at the bottom of the obverse of the stele and that List 7 (448/7) and List 8 (447/6) were both inscribed on the right lateral face.

In 1934 H. T. Wade-Gery showed that the writing in the upper part of the right face did not constitute a List but merely provided appendices to Lists 1 and 2.¹ Thus apart from those appendices only one List stood on the right face. It followed that for the four years of period II only three Lists were extant; and from this it was a likely, though not quite a necessary, inference that no tribute was collected in one of the four years.

The serial number “fifth” is extant in the heading of the last List but one on the obverse, so there is no doubt about its date. Because of Wade-Gery’s discovery of 1934 problems arose about the other two extant Lists of period II. In this paper the name “List *x*” will sometimes be used for the List at the bottom of the obverse and the name “List *y*” will sometimes be used for the List on the right face. Comparison of these two Lists revealed a significant fact about their relation. List *y* may be divided into two parts; the first, or “primary part,” was the regular List for year *y*, and this was followed by an “appendix,” which recorded “arrears” for year *x*, “complements” for year *y* and other irregular entries. Comparison of the two Lists showed that the entries in List *x* and those in the “primary part” of List *y* were the same names in the same order.² It followed that List *x* and List *y* belonged to successive years; that is, if there was a year in which no tribute was collected, that year did not fall between List *x* and List *y* but was either 449/8 or 447/6.

Before 1964 two epigraphic considerations were available towards discovering which year saw no tribute. First, the prescript of List *x*

¹*BSA* 33 (1932/33, published in 1935) 104–106 and 112.

²For analysis of List *y* see B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 3 (Princeton 1950) 39–52. I shall refer to this work as *ATL*. The fundamental study of the identity of order between Lists *x* and *y* is B. D. Meritt and A. B. West, *AJA* 32 (1928) 281–297. The term “primary part” is mine.

differs from those of other quota-lists in that it had no serial number. This could be held to indicate that an irregularity preceded List α , its secretary being uncertain how to number the List next after a List of two years before; thus the year without tribute would be 449/8. Secondly, List 9 began about ten lines below the top of the reverse; the space above it was unexplained until 1964 and this could be taken to indicate an irregularity preceding List 9, that is, the year without tribute would be 447/6.³ Epigraphic considerations being thus inconclusive, appeal was made to historical arguments; some, accepting the alleged peace of Kallias, thought that one of its consequences was a failure to collect tribute in 449/8; others cited the crisis in Athenian affairs after the battle of Koroneia as the reason why tribute was not recorded for 447/6.

The problem took on an entirely new aspect in 1964, when W. K. Pritchett published the results of examining the top surface of the stele, as extant in fragments 1, 3, and 4. At the edge of the top surface he found a smoothly dressed band of stone, about 0.032 m. wide and highly polished. Within this band the stone curves to form a ridge, which is about 0.03 m high where best preserved.⁴ The band and the ridge were not meant to be seen and they demand an explanation. The only explanation hitherto offered is that the band and the ridge served to make the join with a finial stone, designed to rest on top of the *lapis primus*. Perhaps some better explanation may eventually be found, but at present the suggestion of a finial is the proper conclusion to draw from the observations published about the stone.

³Part of the serial number "ninth" has sometimes been read in the highest letters preserved on the reverse; this reading has been defended by M. F. McGregor, *Phoenix* 16 (1962) 267-275. But it is doubtful whether one can insist on this reading; see D. M. Lewis, *BSA* 49 (1955) 25-29; cf. W. K. Pritchett, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 127. That the List preserved on the reverse above List 10 is indeed List 9 (not List 8) can be shown by comparing it with List 10; several places pay the same amount in this List and in List 10, after paying a different amount in Lists α and γ (see, for example, the entries for Galepsioi, Dikaia *para* Abdera, Mylases, Chalkeiatai).

⁴Pritchett first published his findings in *Historia* 13 (1964) 129-134. In August 1965 the top fragments were taken out of plaster; hence Pritchett was able to confirm his measurements in *GRBS* 7 (1966) 123-129; see also *ibid.* 8 (1967) 113-119. These findings have been doubted by B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 35 (1966) 134-140; cf. *GRBS* 8 (1967) 126, note 30. Even though the top surface is enigmatic, I do not find Meritt's arguments conclusive: (a) admittedly the smoothly dressed band should not be called "anathyrosis," but equally it is not just a marginal drafting; (b) the curving ridge is visible in Pritchett's photographs (*GRBS* 7); (c) Meritt writes (*Hesperia* 35.138): "There are no fragments from the top of the reverse, which the editors of *A.T.L.* have shown not to have been inscribed. Had part of any list been inscribed there, some small fragment at least would undoubtedly now be known²⁰, and the same can be said of the reverse of the alleged 'finial', if it had existed, and if it had been inscribed." His footnote 20 refers to *CP* 38 (1943) 238, where he remarks that fragments have been identified as belonging to the stele because they were inscribed. Between the observation of *CP* 38 and the inference of *Hesperia* 35 I think I detect an undistributed middle.

If there was a finial, its obverse may have been purely decorative, bearing a sculptured panel. The reverse of the finial was available for inscribing a quota-list, which may have continued on to the upper part of the reverse of the *lapis primus*. Thus if there was a finial, there is no compelling reason to suppose that in one year no tribute was collected; and it should be emphasized that the burden of proof rests with those who say that there was a failure to collect tribute in one year. Accordingly it should be supposed that List x is List 6 of 449/8, List y is List 7 of 448/7, and List 8 of 447/6 stood on the reverse of the finial and the uppermost part of the *lapis primus*.

Lists 5, 6, and 7 provide valuable indications concerning disaffection in the Athenian Empire, and the purpose of this paper is to present some observations on this theme. When a monument is reconstructed from numerous fragments and there are considerable gaps between them, any historical conclusions drawn from the reconstruction must be provisional; perhaps the time has come for further study of the fragments in the light of modern geological techniques. But the resemblance in order of entries between Lists 6 and 7 makes reconstruction of these two Lists relatively secure.

II. MILETOS AND ERYTHRAI IN 446

Once List y is identified as List 7 of 448/7 instead of as List 8, the behaviour of Miletos and Erythrai becomes a little easier to understand.⁵ Miletos was in revolt by the spring of 453 but was recovered in time to pay tribute in 452/1. In assessment-period II it is recorded among the "south-eastern group"; that is, it is one of about eleven cities which appear among "complements" in the last column of List 5; they are not recorded in List x , but their payments for year y appear in the "appendix" of List y and their payments for year x can be restored in the same "appendix". Recalcitrance has been suggested as the explanation for the record of the "south-eastern group."⁶ Miletos does not appear in the Lists of period III (446/5–444/3); its next recorded payment is for

⁵For the affairs of Miletos see J. C. Barron, *JHS* 82 (1962) 1–6; cf. A. J. Earp, *Phoenix* 8 (1954) 142–147.

⁶The "south-eastern group" was first recognized in *ATL* 3, 35–36; the authors attributed the peculiar record to the distance of the cities from Athens. R. Meiggs (*HSCP* 67 [1963] 16) has objected that Phaselis and the cities of Rhodes were still more distant but are recorded in the body of the Lists. For two reasons he suggests recalcitrance as the explanation of the record for the "south-eastern group." First, he believes that the last nine entries of List x appeared under the rubric "After the Dionysia," and so the "south-eastern group" had still not paid for year x when the hellenotamiai closed their books appreciably later; this view will be criticized in section III. His second reason is the behaviour of Miletos in periods I and III. Recalcitrance may be the correct explanation for the record of the "south-eastern group" in period II, although it is a little surprising that recalcitrance, followed presumably by Athenian pressure to pay, brought about the same result in three successive years without provoking a crisis.

443/2. Furthermore Miletos suffered a constitutional change some time after 450/49 but while the city was still under Athenian influence.

From these indications it has been inferred that Miletos rebelled a second time at some stage later than year y and was recovered before the spring of 443/2. Those who identified year y as 447/6 had to suppose that Miletos paid tribute in that year, when Athens was embarrassed by revolts in Boiotia, Euboia, and Megara and by a Peloponnesian invasion; they supposed that Miletos began her second revolt either in the year when the Thirty Years' Peace freed Athens of these embarrassments or even later. That is possible; human affairs are wayward. But if List y should be identified as List 7, there is no List extant for year 8 (447/6); that is, it is not known whether Miletos paid in that year. Then if the record of the "south-eastern group" indicates recalcitrance, one may guess that Miletos, after paying under pressure in years 5, 6 and 7, took advantage of the Athenian embarrassments of 447/6 to rebel in that year. This remains a guess, but there is no obstacle to it.

The evidence on Erythrai is less extensive than that on Miletos. The Lists for period I show that Erythrai was in revolt at the time of Lists 1 and 2. Possibly it was recovered in 452 by the same expedition as recovered Miletos. The name of the archon of 453/2 can be restored in the main Athenian decree concerning Erythrai (*IG* 1².10; cf. *ATL* 2 D 10), although as only one letter and part of another are extant from the archon's name, one cannot insist on this restoration or, consequently, on 452 as the date of recovery.

The record for Erythrai in period II may indicate further trouble. In that period Erythrai and its small dependencies still pay as a syntely; the phrase used to state this in Lists x and y differs from that used in List 5, and that may reflect a change of organization. In List 5 the syntely makes a "partial payment," which is not preserved, and Erythrai adds a large "complement" whose quota is given in the last column. In List x the syntely pays a sum which is not preserved; in *ATL* 2 the quota has been restored to imply a regular payment of 9 talents, but that is not necessary. In List y the syntely makes an irregular payment and in the "appendix" Erythrai adds a "complement"; each figure is preserved only in part and, while they can be restored to imply a total of 9 talents as in *ATL* 2, that is not necessary. Thus it is possible that in each of the three years the payments amounted to 9 talents, but it is also possible that they did not. In any case in each of two of the years two payments were recorded, and this suggests some degree of recalcitrance, though not open revolt.

Neither Erythrai nor its dependencies occur in the extant fragments of Lists 9 and 10; their next appearance is in List 11 (444/3), when the syntely has been broken up and its members pay separately. The

hypothesis that in the forties Erythrai rebelled a second time is strengthened by study of the fragments of a second Athenian decree concerning Erythrai (*IG* 1².11 and 12/13a). At least the view can be defended that these fragments do not belong to the main Athenian decree concerning Erythrai (*IG* 1².10) but to another.⁷

Thus the possibility deserves to be considered that Erythrai haggled over tribute or otherwise showed recalcitrance in years 5, 6, and 7, and rebelled soon afterwards. As List 8 is not preserved, there is no impediment to the view that Erythrai rebelled in 447/6, taking advantage of the revolts in Boiotia, Euboia and Megara. Its fortunes would thus be parallel to those of Miletos.

III. THE RUBRIC IN LIST 6, COLUMN IV

The last ten lines of the fourth and last column of List 6 can be read from two fragments (72 and 76) which make a secure join. The first of these ten lines bore a rubric beginning with *mu*. It was followed by nine names with their quotas. The first two of the nine names are not preserved but have been restored as [Lepsimandoi] and [Kasolabes]; the quota for [Lepsimandoi] is lost, but a large part of that for [Kasolabes] is preserved. The third of the names can be restored as [Ph]egetio[i]; a large part of its quota is preserved.⁸ The remaining six names with their quotas are preserved in full. Enough of fragment 76 is preserved to show that the nine names were followed by a blank space.

The entries in these ten lines were inscribed in a hand differing from that of the rest of the List.⁹ The rubric has been restored as M[εῖα τὰ Διονύσια] or M[εῖα Διονύσια]. Payments made after the Dionysia would be made after they were due.¹⁰ The hypothesis leading to this restoration

⁷On Erythrai see R. Meiggs, *JHS* 63 (1943) 24–25; *HSCP* 67 (1963) 5. The view that *IG* 1².11 and 12/13a belong to a decree other than *IG* 1².10 was taken by Meiggs in 1943; in *JHS* 86 (1966) 93 he promises a further defence of it.

⁸B. D. Meritt and A. B. West, *AJA* 32 (1928) 290 offered [Pasandes] and [Lepsimandoi] as the first two entries. In *SEG* 5 (1931) 6 they altered these restorations to [Lepsimandoi] and [Kasolabes] and gave reasons; these restorations have been kept in *ATL*. The positive suggestion about the rubric to be offered below will not depend on the restorations. The restoration [Ph]egetio[i] seems secure, but the photograph in *ATL* 1, page 38 shows that some of the letters ought to be dotted.

⁹This was first noticed by B. D. Meritt and A. B. West, *AJA* 32 (1928) 291. It can be verified from the photographs in *ATL* 1. 30–38.

¹⁰The restoration was first suggested “purely by way of example” by Meritt and West, *AJA* 32.291. The entry in *ATL* 1 was M[εῖα τὰ Διονύσια?]. In *ATL* 2.13 (cf. 82) the article and the question-mark were omitted and the reader was told that the change would be justified in volume 3; I have not been able to find the justification. That tribute was due at the Dionysia appears from Aristoph. *Ach.* 502–506 with schol. citing Eupolis fr. 240 (Kock); but one can neither affirm nor deny that this terminus was already recognized as early as 449/8.

appears to be that most of List 6 was inscribed about the time of the Dionysia but nine states paid later in the year and so their names were added later. This is not wholly satisfactory as an explanation of the change of hand. For the four columns of List 6 have almost the same length; the first three columns each have thirty-seven inscribed lines and column iv has thirty-eight. But for the rubric column iv would have exactly the same length as the other columns. Thus, if the rubric shows that some cities paid late and were inscribed late, one must suppose that the first mason, who inscribed the bulk of the List and planned the disposition of the names among the columns, knew in advance precisely how many cities would pay late. Moreover not only did he know that nine cities would pay after the Dionysia but before the end of the year; he also knew that the cities of the "south-eastern group" would not pay in time to be included in this List at all. This hypothesis is possible, but it makes the first mason into a remarkably successful prophet.

F. A. Lepper, studying the quota-lists from a different point of view, has found that a rubric indicating payment after the Dionysia would be a little strange. He claims that the other rubrics served to explain peculiarities of payment to the logistai, when they checked the quota-list against the tribute-list and above all against the current assessment. "Only M[ερὰ Διονύσια] in List 7 seems an absolutely unnecessary Rubric from an auditor's point of view . . ., but even it (assuming the restoration to be correct, which seems far from certain) is concerned with a peculiarity of payment, not of assessment, and that is surely what one would expect Rubrics to be about in this context" (*JHS* 82 [1962] 32).

The real test of the restoration M[ερὰ Διονύσια] must be made by asking whether the cities recorded under this rubric are likely to have paid late in the year. Lateness of payment might be due to distance or to recalcitrance. But distance is excluded as an explanation, when three of the late payers are Kythnos, Karystos, and Keos. The possibility of recalcitrance deserves examination.

For three of the nine entries the record in other years allows, but does not compel, a hypothesis of recalcitrance in 449/8. Those three are Sermylia, [Lepsimandoi], and [Kasolabes]. Sermylia pays a quota of 300 drachmas, indicating a tribute of 3 talents. It makes the same payment in List 7, whereas in periods iii and iv its tribute is 5 talents. In period i its record is odd: it pays large and irregular amounts in Lists 1 and 4 and it is recorded twice in List 2. Possibly these oddities indicate a recalcitrance which continued from period i into period ii; yet quotas of 300 drachmas in Lists 6 and 7 do not look irregular.

Lepsimandoi (Lepsimaniōi) make two payments in List 2. They pay 1500 drachmas in year 4 and probably the same in year 3. The figure of their quota is not preserved in List 6 or in List 7. In periods iii and iv

their tribute is 1000 drachmas. Possibly in period II they were reluctant to pay the 1500 drachmas of period I and the Athenians eventually agreed to a decrease in period III. Thus recalcitrance is possible in period II, though nothing compels this.

The case for recalcitrance in Kasolabes is different but scarcely stronger. Their payment in List 6 can be restored to imply a tribute of 2500 drachmas, and they have the same figure repeatedly in periods I and II. Kasolabes does not occur in the extant fragments of the Lists for periods III and IV, and in three years of period IV they are absent from a full panel. Evidently there was very real recalcitrance in period IV and possibly it began as early as year 6, though there is no need to suppose this.

These suggestions of recalcitrance among the last nine payers of List 6 amount to very little. The records for the others among the nine states suggest regularity. Three of them have a round figure in List 6 and the same in adjacent years; they are Keos (paying 4 talents in periods II, III, and IV) Kythnos (paying 3 talents in periods II, III, and IV) and Karystos (paying 5 talents in periods II and IV). The other three payers, Skabla, Phegetioi and Mende, have more varied records but nothing to suggest recalcitrance in the forties. Skabla is recorded with the quota 3000 drachmas in all three extant Lists of period II; it pays 2000 drachmas in periods III and IV. Phegetioi pay 1600 drachmas in period II but 1000 drachmas in periods III and IV. The record for Mende varies a good deal; its quotas imply tributes of 8 talents in Lists 3 and 4, 15 talents in Lists 6 and 7, an unknown amount in List 9, 5 talents in List 11, 9 talents in List 12, unknown amounts in Lists 13 and 14, and 5 talents in List 15; in periods V and VI its tribute is 8 talents. Probably some of the variations reflect relations between Mende and Skione, a topic which will require attention below; at least the record for years 6 and 7 does not suggest recalcitrance in Mende.

Thus the record in adjacent years for the nine entries at the end of List 6 does not suggest recalcitrance in that year but rather tells against that hypothesis. Accordingly, since neither distance nor recalcitrance is available to explain why those nine cities might pay after the Dionysia, their rubric should not be restored as *M[ετὰ Διονύσια]*. Some other theory must be found about the content of the rubric. This theory ought also to explain why the last ten lines were inscribed in a hand differing from the rest of the List.

At this point it is well to call to mind the other peculiarities of List 6. Its heading lacks a serial number; its entries are in the same order as those in the "primary part" of List 7; and it lacks entries for the "south-eastern group," though their record for year 6 may be presumed to have stood in the "appendix" of List 7. Ideally one would like to find a single

theory to account both for these peculiarities and for the rubric and change of hand in column iv of List 6. Yet such a theory may not be possible. The common order of entries in List 6 and the "primary part" of List 7 suggests that there was some special relation between the boards of hellenotamiai of years 6 and 7. In *Historia* 3 (1955) 326-327 a suggestion was offered about the nature of that special relation: it was suggested that the hellenotamiai of year 6 were dismissed and prosecuted before their term of office was complete (Antiphon 5.69-71 mentions an occasion when the hellenotamiai were prosecuted and condemned to death); accordingly the hellenotamiai of year 7 took office rather before the normal time. Those rejecting this suggestion (for example, A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* 14 [1957] page 5) have not explained the similarity of order between List 6 and the "primary part" of List 7.

Yet a hypothesis of a special relation between the two boards does not explain the peculiarities of List 6, column iv. The second hand in that column is not the hand of List 7; the form of the sigma is different. It will not help to suppose that the rubric in column iv gave the name of a new secretary, beginning with *mu*; for the name of the secretary of List 7 began with Diod- - -. Indeed a hypothesis of special relation between the two boards can account for the peculiarities of column iv only if it is assumed that those peculiarities reflect somehow lateness of payment; but that assumption is unlikely in view of the argument developed above from the equal lengths of the four columns of List 6.

Conjectures about the rubric in List 6, column iv, must be based on the records for the nine states which appear under that rubric. A clue is provided by the behaviour of Skabla. In List 1 Skabla was one of three cities paying jointly as a syntely, the other two being Assera and Olynthos; their joint payment, extant only in part, was more than 1 talent and may have been more than 3 talents.¹¹ Thereafter the three cities pay separately. The behaviour of Assera is regular in period II; it occurs in each of the three extant Lists with the quota on 2400 drachmas, and it has the same sum in Lists 4 and 9. The behaviour of Skabla in period II is likewise regular; it is recorded with the quota on 3000 drachmas in each of the three extant Lists. Olynthos was the largest of the three cities; it pays 2 talents in List 5 and its figure, where preserved, is the same in periods IV and V. But Olynthos does not occur in the extant or the restored parts of Lists 6 and 7. Since List 6 and the "primary part" of List 7 follow the same order, List 6 can be restored extensively with some confidence. The absence of Olynthos from the extant and restored parts of List 6 suggests, though it does not prove, that Olynthos failed to pay tribute in 449/8.

¹¹A higher quota was restored in *ATL* 1 and a rather lower one in *ATL* 2; the discussion of the point in *ATL* 3.6 does not claim to be conclusive.

Apart from Skabla, the fortunes of another city among the nine last entries in List 6 provide a similar clue; that city is Mende. Skione and Mende were near to one another; when Skione joined Brasidas in 423, Mende followed it promptly, and the Athenians sent a joint expedition against both (Thuc. 4.120–123, 129–131). In period I Skione and Therambos (or Thrambaioi) paid jointly; their entry for a tribute of 6 talents is extant in Lists 2 and 4 and restored in Lists 1 and 3. They do not occur in the extant fragments for period II. In and after period III Mende, Skione, and Therambos are recorded separately. In periods III and IV the tribute of Therambos is 1000 drachmas, whereas that of Skione is 6 talents; evidently Therambos was a small dependency of Skione. Thus Skione and Therambos suffered *apotaxis* not later than the assessment of 446; this may mark punishment for disaffection.

The case is strengthened by considering the curiously high entries for Mende in period II. In Lists 6 and 7 it is extant with the quota on 15 talents. Yet in Lists 3 and 4 it paid only 8 talents and in the next List where its figure is preserved, namely List 11, its tribute is only 5 talents. The explanation hitherto current for the high figure of Mende in period II is the hypothesis that in that period it paid on behalf of Skione and Therambos as well as for itself.¹² That explanation may be modified in view of the parallel relationship between Skabla and Olynthos in List 6; in other words, the hypothesis should be that in 449/8 Mende, like Skabla, was loyal, but Skione, like Olynthos, failed to pay tribute.

The suggestion here offered to account for the rubric in List 6, column IV is that the nine cities appearing under the rubric were loyal to Athens while their neighbours refused to pay tribute. This suggestion has been based on the records for Skabla and Mende; it can be defended for two more of the nine cities, Keos and Karystos, although their records are less helpful.

Keos is recorded as paying the quota on 4 talents in each of the three extant Lists of period II and thereafter it makes regular payments. The island consisted of four cities, which collaborated for some purposes. Only one of the four, Koresos, is recorded with a separate payment of quota and that only once, namely in List 4, when its quota implies a tribute of 2 talents 1500 drachmas. In List 4 there is also an entry for Keos; the figure is not preserved in full but it was not large,¹³ and the payments made by Keos and Koresos together in year 4 amounted to

¹²B. D. Meritt and A. B. West, *AJA* 32 (1928) 294; followed in *ATL* 1.284, 340, 410, and 3.64.

¹³Note, however, that association of the figure with the name Keioi depends on the physical relation of fragment 39 to fragment 25; from the photographs in *ATL* 1.21 and 25 it is not clear how precisely that relation can be determined, though there may be a join.

rather less than the 4 talents paid by Keos in periods II, III, and IV. Probably the entries for Keos and Koresos in List 4 reflect the disaffection widespread among the islands in period I and Athenian measures to suppress that disaffection (see R. Meiggs, *HSCP* 67 [1963] 6–8). That is, in 451/0 and perhaps in previous years loyalists held Koresos but there was recalcitrance in some other parts of the island. A somewhat similar situation may be supposed to have recurred in 449/8, if the rubric in List 6, column IV has to do with payments by loyalists when their neighbours were disaffected.

Karystos is recorded in each of the extant Lists of period II as paying the quota on 5 talents. In List 4 its tribute had been 7 talents 3000 drachmas. The decrease may reflect the foundation of a cleruchy in Euboia by Tolmides.¹⁴ Among the other chief cities of Euboia, the first extant records for Chalkis and Eretria are in List 6; the first extant records for Styra and Hestiaia are in List 5. In List 6 the figures for Chalkis, Eretria, Styra, and Hestiaia are imperfectly preserved; they may not have been regular. Likewise in List 7 the figures for Chalkis, Eretria, and Styra are imperfectly preserved and may not have been regular; the figure for Hestiaia in List 7 gives a tribute of 1000 drachmas (by a small correction), but one cannot tell whether that is regular, as no figure for Hestiaia is preserved in any other List. Euboia rebelled in 447/6 and among the punitive measures taken shortly afterwards by the Athenians Thucydides (1.114.3) thought fit to record the despatch of a colony to Hestiaia; land, perhaps intended for cleruchs, was probably confiscated from Chalkis and Eretria at the same time.¹⁵ Perhaps the disaffection, which culminated in the revolt of 447/6, was already apparent in some milder form of recalcitrance in parts of Euboia as early as 449/8; it may have been linked to the mysterious Lakedaimonian expedition known to Thucydides (1.112.5) as “the so-called sacred war.” Karystos was at the opposite end of Euboia to Hestiaia and was within easy reach of the Athenian fleet. If there was recalcitrance in parts of Euboia as early as 449/8, Karystos would be a likely place for loyalists to gather.

The hypothesis offered here is that the rubric in List 6, column IV referred to a privilege granted as a reward for loyalty to cities whose neighbours were disaffected. In Chalkidike the loyalists were Mende, Skabla, Sermylia, and Phegetioi, whereas Olynthos and Skione were probably disaffected. Among islanders of the Western Aegean the privileged loyalists were Kythnos, Karystos, and Keos. Their recalcitrant neighbours are more difficult to recognize; they may have included places in Euboia and Keos, and it may be relevant that Aigina made an irregular

¹⁴This date for the cleruchy is defended by R. Meiggs, *HSCP* 67 (1963) 8–9.

¹⁵See now P. A. Brunt, *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg* (Oxford 1966) 87–89.

payment in List 5 and is not extant in List 6 or List 7. Of the nine names under the rubric in List 6, column iv there remain [Lepsimandoi] and [Kasolabes], but it is prudent to refrain from conjecturing their fortunes and those of their neighbors; among small places in the Karian District anything might happen.

What was the privilege mentioned in the rubric? Possibly the nine cities were allowed to pay quota alone without tribute. Two decades later this privilege was granted to Methone (*IG* 1².57 = *ATL* 2 D 3). On this hypothesis the rubric in List 6, column iv might begin with some part of *μόνος* or of *μνᾶ*, and the change of hand would be almost understandable: perhaps the hellenotamiai were at first uncertain whether to include in their List cities paying quota alone, and so they left a space for these entries but delayed inscribing them until they reached a decision. Yet on this view restoration of the rubric is not easy. In List 26 (429/8) Methone, Haison, and Dikaiopolis of the Eretrians are recorded as paying quota alone, but their rubric indicating this is quite different from anything that can be restored in List 6.

Perhaps it is better not to seek for a restoration of the rubric in List 6, column iv. The purpose of this section has been (i) to show that the restoration M[ετὰ Διονύσια] is open to several objections, and (ii) to urge that the nine cities under this rubric, whatever it said, may have been recorded thus because they were loyal to Athens when their neighbours were disaffected.

IV. THE ABSENTEES FROM LISTS 6 AND 7

As already observed in section I, the resemblance in order of entries between List 6 and the "primary part" of List 7 makes it possible to reconstruct these two documents extensively with some confidence. Accordingly in section III the absence of Olynthos and Skione from the reconstructed List 6 was used as an indication suggesting, though not conclusively, that these two cities failed to pay tribute in 449/8. The present section will try to follow up this indication more systematically.

The authors of *ATL* have estimated the total numbers of states for which quotas are recorded in the three extant Lists of period II (*ATL* 3.30–31, 37, 58). For List 5 they reach a total of about 163 tribute-paying states, after allowing for "second entries" in the last column. In List *x* they recognize only 150 states; but if the payments of the "south-eastern group" for year *x* were recorded in the "appendix" to List *y*, about 11 names should be added; thus quota of year *x* was recorded for about 161 states. In the "primary part" of List *y* the authors of *ATL* recognize 150 tribute-payers; from the "appendix" one may add the "south-eastern group" and tentatively payments for Berge and for four

places in the Chersonese (*ATL* 3.45–46); so the total of regular payers for year *y* is 161–166.

Thus the total number of states for which quotas are recorded in the three Lists is almost constant, but this constancy is deceptive. About 11 states were recorded in List 5 but not in Lists *x* or *y*. Correspondingly about 11 states recorded in Lists *x* and *y* must have been absent from List 5, but it is not possible to identify these, as rather less than two-thirds of List 5 is preserved. From the list in *ATL* 3.53–57 the following roster may be drawn up of names which occur in List 5 but not in Lists *x* or *y*:¹⁶

In Hellespontine District:

Alopekonnesos

Prokonnesos

Perinthos

Astakos

Daskyleion

Neandreia

In Thrace-ward District:

Olynthos

Akanthos

(Skione may be considered with these:

see section III)

In Karian District:

Erines

Pasanda

In Island District:

Aigina.

It will be convenient to consider these states in order of Districts and ask whether their record in adjacent years is compatible with a hypothesis of disaffection in years 6 and 7. Of the six states in the Hellespontine District three, namely Astakos, Daskyleion, and Neandreia are absent from full panels in some years of periods iv, v, and vi, but that does not necessarily throw any light on their behaviour in period ii. Indeed each of the three states pays its regular tribute in year 5 (Astakos pays 1000 drachmas, as in period iii; Daskyleion pays 500 drachmas, as in period i; Neandreia pays 2000 drachmas, as in periods i, iii, and iv). Likewise the record for Prokonnesos is not suggestive, as its figure in List 5 is not preserved. But for Perinthos and Alopekonnesos the record in List 5 indicates irregularity. In List 5 Perinthos makes a small “partial

¹⁶The authors of *ATL* (3.29) say that “some dozen” names occur in List 5 but not in Lists *x* and *y*. My count is based on *ATL* 3.53–57 and gives 11 cities; with these I associate Skione, which does not occur in the fragments of List 5.

payment" and adds a large "complement"; the figures total 10 talents; this was the tribute of Perinthos in later years, and the corresponding quota should probably be restored in List 3. Apparently in 450/49 Perinthos was at first reluctant to pay its full amount but added its "complement" under pressure. The record for Alopekonnesos in List 5 is more puzzling; its quota there implies a tribute of 3240 drachmas. Except for this, the earliest figures extant for Alopekonnesos belong to periods iv and v, when it pays sometimes 1000 drachmas and sometimes 2000 drachmas. Possibly its irregular figure for List 5 indicates that it had been assessed at a still higher figure in 450 and refused to pay in full; later it persuaded the Athenians to reduce its obligation.

To move to the Thrace-ward District: enough has been said in section III about Olynthos and Skione. For Akanthos the earliest recorded figures belong to period III; then, as later, the tribute was 3 talents. The only earlier entry for Akanthos is in List 5, where the quota is not preserved. It occupied only one letter-space, so it was not the quota on 3 talents; tributes of 5 talents and of 10 talents have been suggested;¹⁷ likewise a tribute of 1 talent cannot be excluded. Thus there is a possibility of irregularity at Akanthos, as well as at Olynthos and Skione, in period II.

In the Karian District Erines pays a tribute of 1000 drachmas in period III but is absent from a full panel in three years of period IV. Its earlier record indicates a tribute of 4130 drachmas in year 2 and a tribute of 3240 drachmas in year 5. These irregular figures may suggest that in periods I and II the Athenians demanded a larger sum than they eventually settled for in period III and Erines would meet only part of the larger Athenian demand. The record for Pasanda is rather more suggestive. At the time of List 4, as in period IV, its tribute is 3000 drachmas. But in List 5 Pasanda is recorded twice; each entry implies a tribute of 3000 drachmas and the later record occurs among the "second entries" of the last column. *Prima facie* this evidence shows that in period I the tribute of Pasanda was 3000 drachmas but at the assessment of 450 the Athenians increased their demand to 1 talent; in 450/49 Pasanda tried to limit its payment to 3000 drachmas and paid the remaining 3000 drachmas only under pressure.

Aigina has been noted in section III and its story is well known. The Athenians brought it into the Empire by a protracted siege early in the First Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 1.105.2-4, 108.4). In the quota-lists it often appears as paying the large tribute of 30 talents. In 432 it sent a surreptitious complaint to Sparta (Thuc. 1.67.2). At last in 431 the Athenians expelled the Aiginetans from the island (Thuc. 2.27).

¹⁷For a tribute of 5 talents see *ATL* 2.4. The formal possibility of 10 talents is noted by R. Meiggs and A. Andrewes in their revised edition of G. F. Hill, *Sources for Greek History* (Oxford 1951) page 415.

In List 5 the quota for [Aiginetai] implies a tribute of 26 talents 1200 drachmas, a figure which surely indicates irregularity.

To conclude this section, 11 states occur in List 5 but not in Lists 6 and 7. For five of these (Perinthos, Alopekonnos, Erines, Pasanda and Aigina) the record in List 5 indicates irregularity; disaffection in another city, Olynthos, as also in Skione which does not appear in List 5, was posited in section III to explain the records of their neighbours (Skabla and Mende). Thus the absence of the 11 states from Lists 6 and 7 probably indicates that they refused to pay. In other words, in 449/8 and 448/7 there was considerable disaffection among cities of the Hellespont and Propontis, in Chalkidike, and in Aigina, possibly also in parts of Euboia and Keos (see section III); and in some of the disaffected cities recalcitrance was already apparent in 450/49, although in that year it amounted mostly to mere haggling over tribute, not to an outright refusal to pay. As concerns Chalkidike it should be added that Poteidaia and Argilos do not occur in the three extant Lists of period II.

V. DISAFFECTION IN THE MID-FIFTH CENTURY

The observations above bear on the problem of disaffection in the Athenian Empire in the middle of the fifth century. Accordingly it may not be amiss to make a hasty survey of the problem as a whole, for a modified picture of Athenian policy is beginning to emerge from recent studies.

In 1950, when *ATL* 3 was published, the grand climactic year was 449. The authors recognized the occurrence of disaffection at earlier periods; they noted, for example, the revolts of Miletos and Erythrai in the fifties. But it is not unfair to say that the authors inclined to minimize disaffection in the late fifties; for example, the absence of a goodly number of island-cities from the quota-lists of period I was explained by the hypothesis that they still contributed ships. For the authors of *ATL* 3 the crisis of the Empire came with the peace of Kallias; tribute had been exacted for the war against the barbarian, and so the Athenian claim to tribute lapsed when peace was made. Accordingly a moratorium was declared on tribute for 449/8 and the Athenians sought authority to exact tribute afresh. There was reluctance among the allies, the Athenians took steps to improve the collection of tribute, and the effect can be seen in the exceptional length of List γ.¹⁸

Lately the picture has begun to change. It is no longer an appalling heresy to doubt the historicity of the peace of Kallias. The case for believing in a year's moratorium on tribute has been weakened. Above all,

¹⁸The reconstruction of the crisis of 449 had already been published by H. T. Wade-Gery, *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 212-229; see also *idem* *JHS* 52 (1932) 222-223 (reprinted in *Essays in Greek History* [Oxford 1958] 262-264).

further detailed study of the quota-lists, stimulated by *ATL* 3, has disclosed a good deal of intermittent disaffection in many parts of the Empire in periods I and II.¹⁹ In the new picture no single year has the outstanding importance attributed to 449 in *ATL* 3, but major changes can be recognized in 454 and in 447/6.

In 454 the Athenians made changes in their policy.²⁰ They stopped fighting on any appreciable scale against the Peloponnesians; at least Thucydides (1.112.1) found nothing worthy of record in the ensuing three years. Thus the Athenians were free to deal with recalcitrant allies, such as Miletos and Erythrai. Their measures included despatch of cleruchs to Andros, Naxos, and Euboia in 450. The growing security of Athenian control is reflected in an increase in the yearly number of cities paying tribute. In period I the normal number was about 140–145;²¹ in period II it was about 161–163.

In 451 the Athenians concluded the Five Years' Peace with Sparta; this took further the policy they had pursued since 454. But a good deal of disaffection is discernible in the Lists of period II. Different degrees of disaffection should probably be distinguished; a city might merely dispute the total amount of tribute due, or it might refuse to pay anything; perhaps a further distinction should be drawn between refusal to pay tribute and more overt acts of rebellion. In sections III and IV an attempt has been made to identify some states which refused to pay in 449/8 and 448/7; some "partial payments" were noticed in passing. One of the striking features of period II is the frequency of "partial payments."²²

¹⁹Disaffection in the period 454–446 has been treated by R. Meiggs, *HSCP* 67 (1963) 1–36. It will be obvious that I owe to this article a great deal (including the observation on Poteidaia and Argilos at the end of my section IV). Meiggs, however, accepts a peace of Kallias and a corresponding imperial crisis.

²⁰Cf. my *Essays in Greek Politics* (New York 1967) 78–79 = *PACA* 1 (1958) 63.

²¹The estimates in *ATL* 3.265 are: 140 payers in List 1, 162 payers in List 2, 145 payers in List 3, 157 payers in List 4. These figures differ little from those previously reached by A. W. Gomme (*Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 [Oxford 1945] 275). But 17 entries in List 2 and 12 entries in List 4 record small places in Karia which paid rarely and only under pressure; their occurrence in these two Lists probably reflects the presence of an Athenian fleet in Karian waters in 453/2 and 451/0 (*ATL* 3.7–9 and 211–212). So these entries must be subtracted from the two Lists in order to ascertain normal numbers of payers. A normal total of 140–145 payers in period I does not mean that a uniform body of 140–145 cities paid throughout the period; on the contrary, as is well known, the identity of the payers varied a good deal from year to year within period I. It must be admitted that these figures depend on the physical lengths of the first four quota-lists, that is, on the reconstruction of the monument from the fragments, and so they may need to be revised.

²²A hasty check on "partial payments" in the index of *ATL* 4 discovers references to period II and to the Decree of Kleonymos. This distribution is probably not accidental, although "partial payments" are often difficult to recognize and doubtless some have escaped notice.

The three extant Lists of period II indicate that there was plentiful discontent in some parts of the Empire, such as Aigina, parts of Chalkidike, and parts of the Hellespontine District. This gives perspective to the revolts of 447/6 in Boiotia, Megara, and Euboia. Thucydides reports these three revolts; they occurred in places which threatened Attica and they had a lasting effect on Athenian power. His silence does not exclude the possibility that elsewhere in the Empire the same year was marked by the outbreak of revolts which had no lasting result.

The remarkable feature of the revolts in Boiotia, Megara, and Euboia is their co-ordination; Athens was compelled to give way only because they occurred in close succession. Co-ordination implies a co-ordinator; one may suspect that the Lakedaimonians had opened relations with disaffected elements in Central Greece not long before, perhaps during "the so-called sacred war." Yet in the crisis of 447/6 the Athenians saved their maritime Empire by the policy of understanding with Sparta which they had pursued since 454. This time the Spartans were more demanding: the Athenians had to give up their claims to Megara and Boiotia and thus abandon their aspirations to land-empire in Central Greece. The Spartans abandoned Euboia.

The Thirty Years' Peace left the Athenians free to deal with their recalcitrant allies. In the next few years they subdued some who were in revolt: Erythrai paid tribute by the spring of 443 and Miletos by the spring of 442. By 442 the rule of Athens over her Empire must have appeared secure; it was perhaps to celebrate this that Perikles increased the splendour of the Panathenaic festival of that year (Plut. *Per.* 13.11). If so, his confidence was premature. Two years later Athenian support of Miletos provoked the Samian Revolt.

Thus the picture that emerges nowadays of the Athenian Empire in the fifties and forties is one of usually unco-ordinated but widespread and frequent disaffection. This in turn supports the view of those who think that Athenian rule was on the whole not popular.²³

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

²³D. W. Bradeen, *Historia* 9 (1960) 257-269; J. de Romilly, *BICS* 13 (1966) 1-12. They oppose the view of G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *Historia* 3 (1954) 1-41. See also H. W. Pleket, *Historia* 12 (1963) 70-77; T. J. Quinn, *Historia* 13 (1964) 257-266.