

Attic Building Accounts from *Euthynae* to *Stelae*¹

SHIMON EPSTEIN

In this paper, I intend to explore the relationship between the forms of Athenian building accounts as presented by relevant officials at their annual *euthynae*, as deposited in a state archive on perishable materials, and as carved on marble in public places. Various forms and probable purposes of inscribed building documents will be discussed, with particular attention given to the factors behind preserving or omitting the names of workers. I will mostly deal with three groups of building accounts: those of the Periclean building programme from the third quarter of the fifth century, of the Erechtheion (409-405 BCE), and the Eleusinian accounts of the Lykourgan epoch (333-328 BCE).

1 This paper owes much to the lecture of Prof. D. Schaps, which I heard at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in March 2007. I am grateful to him for showing me the yet unpublished text of a later version of his paper presented at the 13th International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy in Oxford, September 2007. It is also my pleasure to express my gratitude to Prof. M. Faraguna for inviting me to the conference on *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies* in Trieste, and for his valuable suggestions during and after the conference. Other participants' contributions and comments were very helpful, too. This paper was prepared during my Hans-Jensen-Minerva post-doctoral fellowship at Freiburg University. I would like to thank the Minerva Foundation for providing financial support, and Prof. Sitta von Reden, my host at Albert Ludwig University of Freiburg.

As is well known, the Periclean inscriptions (the statue of Athena Promachos – IG I³ 435, the Parthenon – I³ 436-51, the chryselephantine statue – I³ 453-60, the Propylaea – I³ 462-6, the golden Nikai from the Parthenon – I³ 467-71, and the two statues for the Hephaestion – I³ 472) mention no builders' names and very few construction details. In contrast, minute recording of what was done and by whom is, on the face of it, a salient feature of the accounts of the Erechtheion (IG I³ 475-9, mostly 475-6), whereas the Eleusinian documents (IG II/III² 1672 and 1673)² mention dozens of names, but selectively, as will be shown.

In this paper, I will try to establish the following arguments:

- a) While there may have been a particular reason for publishing each building account, there was a common purpose, too: the inscribed documents served as symbols and, to an extent, as a means of attaining transparency and accountability.
- b) While the form of each building inscription may have correlated with the purpose of its erection, it depended heavily on sources available. Due to the *euthynae*, financial accounts were always there, whilst no other relevant document may have existed.
- c) Accordingly, even if commemorating the builders' names may have been one of the reasons for engraving the accounts from the Erechtheion and Eleusis (as well as from Epidaurus and Delos), this aim has been only partially achieved, as I shall argue. I argue that the anonymous workmen at the Erechtheion and most of builders left unmentioned in the Eleusinian inscriptions were unnamed in the original documents, and perhaps this was true for earlier projects, too. The authorities did not go out of their way to find out information, absent from financial accounts, even where it could have been obtained relatively easily.

Finally, I will discuss broader implications of these conclusions as to the role of archives and documents in classical Athens.

It is difficult to imagine more different building documents than the Periclean inscriptions on the one hand and the accounts of the Erechtheion on the other. The former parade huge sums but remain obscure as to technical, organizational and even financial details. In the latter, the sums are modest but we can see what was built in which prytany, how much did it cost, who performed the work and how he was paid for it. Here for the first time we have building accounts ordered by prytanies, and within each prytany – and this makes the inscriptions of the Erechtheion unique – by architectural elements. In addition, for the first time individual builders are named and their statuses indicated. Eighty years later,

2 See now CLINTON 2005, nos. 159, 177.

some Eleusinian accounts are still ordered by prytanies, but others are not. Many workers and sellers are named in these accounts, but in spite of a clear tendency towards giving more information with the passage of time, the proportion of persons of undefined status is much higher in the Eleusinian inscriptions than in those of the Erechtheion. In what follows, I try to make sense of these differences and similarities. I do not pretend to know full answers: as we are all aware, Greek inscriptions are often haphazard in what they mention or omit. Not to mention the accidents of survival of various bits of information in various inscriptions. Still, I hope to have discerned a certain logic behind what is preserved and what is not in inscribed building accounts.

It seems a natural hypothesis that the differences between various groups of building accounts as we have them depend, to a significant extent, on why these documents were inscribed in the first place. At the same time, whatever the purpose of an inscription might have been, it could include only the available information, though not necessarily all such information, of course. As already said, here I presume that financial accounts prepared for the annual *euthynae* were the main and often the only source of the relevant information. We do not know many details about the process of the *euthynae*, but the officials in question – in our case, primarily *epistatai* and the *tamiai* of the temples built – surely had to submit the records reflecting their activity during their term in office. The form of these records might have been loosely defined, but there were common elements, probably indispensable: almost every Greek account we have contains the names of the magistrates and the year in which they served, generally identified by an eponymous magistrate; what they received from the previous officeholders; and what they passed on and to whom. These records (presumably on papyrus, but perhaps on wax-covered wooden tablets or on whitewashed boards where texts were written with charcoal) could be subsequently deposited in an archive, though I am not certain. According to *Ath. Pol.*, the tablets, indicating the payments due according to the various deadlines during the year, made by the *poletai*, were deposited with the council and then produced and wiped off when the payments were made.³ Similarly, the records of at least some officials' accounts could have been deleted after their examinations were finished,⁴ especially if the records were inscribed.⁵ Alternatively, these records might have been

3 Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 47.2-48. Cf. RHODES 2001, 34. The contracts themselves were perhaps kept for future reference, at least when they were important for maintaining evidence of ownership. See FARAGUNA 1997, 12-3, and now PAPAZARKADAS 2011, 51ff. Other examples of documents destroyed: COHEN 2006, 79; SICKINGER 1999, 68-70.

4 This is perhaps why the famous *ATL* lists the *aparchai* rather than the tributes themselves: the inscribing probably began only in 432/1 (*ATL* I vii), and if the *hellenotamiai*'s accounts for the previous years were not preserved, but the temple inventories, with their obvious religious meaning, were, the Athenians may have simply published these inventories.

5 This possibility must not be assumed automatically for all types of documents: SICKINGER 1999, 70 ff.

deposited in a reduced form. Once the examination passed, not all the information may have been deemed worthy of preservation: whereas the data proving the officials' integrity were perhaps no more relevant, the sums paid still were. Although, on the face of it, it would be easier simply to deposit in an archive the same table that was submitted for the audit, two considerations might have interfered: economy of space (we do not know how archives were organized) and perhaps more formal character of archives in comparison with the files presented for the *euthynae*. The *euthynae* were basically oral procedures, I believe, especially in the fifth century: the records prepared may have been rather loosely organized, because they were accompanied by oral explanations. We should expect more uniform requirements for the files deposited into archives.

I see three basic possible reasons for significant differences in form and content between various building inscriptions: 1) while some inscriptions were based on the records submitted for the *euthynae*, others took information from the reduced form of these records, deposited in an archive; 2) evolution of the format of the records presented for the *euthynae* and perhaps of those stored in archives; 3) having similar information for all building projects, the Athenians in each given case decided to inscribe various parts of this information, depending on what seemed relevant for their purposes. Of course, these three possible factors are not mutually exclusive.⁶ We will now consider the probability of each of these factors' influence for every one of the three main construction projects of Classical Athens.

PERICLEAN BUILDING DOCUMENTS

I doubt that anyone could have passed his audit with only the data preserved in the inscriptions of the Parthenon or of Athena Promachos. This is especially true with regard to those who paid to individual builders rather than to official bodies: since no name is mentioned, who could check that no obol of the huge sums involved ended up in the coffers of those who pretended to give the money away to masons and sculptors? Since we know that individual workmen were named in the accounts of the Erechtheion and Eleusis, it is, on the face of it, the most economic hypothesis that these data were available to the authors of the texts of the Periclean building inscriptions as well, but were omitted – most probably for the sake of economy, but also perhaps because too much information would obscure the main messages of the inscription, to which we shall soon return. In any case, it was a relatively early stage in the development of the epigraphic habit, when inscribing too detailed accounts was not something the Athenians got

⁶ The fact that building inscriptions are often reduced versions of original accounts may undermine Burford's theory of the evolution of the building contracts: KUZNETSOV 2000, 119-23, 127ff, 166-7 with EPSTEIN 2008, 110.

used to. But while this hypothesis – my number three – seems most economic, I would not altogether exclude two other possibilities. First, the Parthenon accounts seem not to have been inscribed until the project had been in full swing: the first five years are all inscribed in the same hand.⁷ Likewise, the accounts of the statue of Athena Promachos, which span the period of at least nine years, may have been published at a single time.⁸ If so, the records of the accounts for several years must have been kept in some archive, at least until they were inscribed,⁹ but they may have contained a reduced form of the records submitted for the audit – the form we read today. By the time contemporary accounts were published, the epigraphic routine had already been established. Regardless of the delay in publication, the reduced form may have been the only one preserved in an archive, at least at that time. Another possibility is that the written accounts of the Periclean time, already at the stage of *euthynae*, were much less detailed than we would expect. Some data may have been privately recorded and produced only when required, i. e. when objections were raised during one's audit. Thus, when the officials disbursed money to hundreds of workers witnesses presumably had to be present. To record the witnesses' names could have been even more important than to write down all the names of the recipients, as many of them, being foreigners, would leave Athens by the time of the *euthynae*.¹⁰ Here we deal with one of the most important differences between the roles of documents in ancient Greece and in modern times. In our accounts, every entry about expenses and even receipts has to be balanced by a corresponding signed document testifying to the reality of the transaction. However, in ancient Greece witnesses and (public) oaths played the role of our signature. Even in fourth-century Athens, written contracts properly sealed and deposited were invalid without eyewitnesses of the agreement.¹¹ This reminds us of destroying of documents concurrently with a party's compliance with the obligations imposed by written arrangements, mentioned above.¹² Accordingly, it would not be so surprising if the recipients of public money remained sometimes (or always) anonymous in the accounts of the Pentekontaetia. Surely, Pericles would not publicly point to Pleistoanax and Kleandridas in his famous audit in 446.¹³ As for the eyewitnesses of the transactions, if they were ever officially registered (I doubt), it would serve no purpose to preserve their names on stone after the *euthynae*.

7 SICKINGER 1999, 70.

8 *Ibid.*

9 SICKINGER 1999, 70-1.

10 See EPSTEIN 2010 for a probably high ratio of journeymen among the builders of Athenian temples and fortifications.

11 E.g. Dem. 34,35; cf. COHEN 2006, 79 with n. 40; FARAGUNA 2008.

12 See *supra*, n. 3.

13 Ar. Nub. 859 with schol.; Plut. Per. 23.1.

Another interesting problem is the organization of the accounts by prytanies (or absence of such organization). Some payments were made once in a prytany already in the middle of the fifth century (I³ 435.19, 26, 52, 77, 112), and, of course, the *epistatai* of Athena Promachos kept records of such payments before they submitted their accounts. However, other payments are made daily or as lump sums (*μισθοὶ ἀπόπαχς*, *ibid.*, see also 472.186), and monthly payments (but not payments per prytany) are mentioned in the accounts of the Parthenon and Propylaia (*καταμενίους*: I³ 436.29; 443.231; 446.339; 447.361; 449.403; 462.51). For this reason, I would not be surprised to find out that the files submitted to *logistai* (or whoever examined the officeholders after their terms in the fifth century) were not ordered by prytanies. This ignoring of prytanies seems even more probable for the documents preserved in archives.

After envisaging the possibility that the original documents from which the Parthenon inscriptions were drawn simply lacked many important data, we remain with the fact that some data were surely there and were omitted when the accounts were engraved. Thus, the names of the *epistatai*, recorded down to 438/7, are not given afterwards. As far as administration goes, it was not important: their secretary is named (strangely enough, his name is preserved even for the years when he was a *syngrammateus*, though the other *grammateus'* name is unknown), so the board may be easily identified, but this was so from the start.¹⁴ Whatever the reasons for dropping the names of the commissioners, commemorating these officials was hardly the purpose of inscribing the accounts. What was the purpose?

It was once believed that the administrative accounts were inscribed for public scrutiny.¹⁵ We are more skeptical today.¹⁶ The fuller version of the *epistatai's* accounts may have been exposed, on *συνίδες*, for scrutiny between their end of term and *euthynae*,¹⁷ but the Parthenon inscriptions as we have them are hardly a convenient tool for accountability. In particular, no worker could find himself in these documents and check whether all money allegedly paid to him had really reached his hands. And, of course, it would be pointless to check the rectitude of the officials who underwent their audits several years ago. Of course, the huge sums may have served as imperial propaganda,¹⁸ though one can wonder whether the buildings and statues themselves were not enough for this purpose. A partial answer is that the epigraphic propaganda could be launched before the constructions became impressive (but this does not seem to apply to the statue of Athena

14 Another example of haphazardness: the dating prescripts of the early years of the Parthenon accounts and of those of Propylaia omit archon's names.

15 See, for example, *ML*, 164.

16 See, e.g., HEDRICK 1994, whose case is perhaps overstated. See also HEDRICK 1999; RHODES 2001, 140-4 for a more balanced view.

17 On *συνίδες*, see WILHELM 1909, 239-49; FISHER 2003.

18 Cf. RHODES 2001, 140-1.

Promachos, as we have seen). There probably were other propagandistic points, besides the grandeur of the undertaking. One of them, I would suggest, is demonstrating that the sums, contributed by the *hellenotamiai*, are relatively modest. In the best preserved accounts for 434/3 (ML 59) the board is not mentioned at all, and in the Propylaia account of the same year (ML 60) it is only Athena's *aparche*, a mina in a talent. The treasures of Athena seem to be the main paymasters. It is probably not a coincidence that the publication of the Parthenon accounts began the next year after the ostracism of Pericles' main rival. The decision to commemorate the accounts on stone was probably taken in the year of Thoukydides' ostracism, when the opposition to the Periclean building program seems to be maximal. In view of the accusations that the Athenians exploited their allies by using their money, taken for military purposes, for adorning their own city (Plut. *Per.* 12.2), Pericles and his supporters tried to demonstrate that the construction was mostly financed from Athens' own resources. The *aparche* was presumably seen as legitimate. Which contention was closer to the truth is another matter.¹⁹ There may have been an administrative point, too. The year when the accounts of the Parthenon were first inscribed is the year when *syngrammateis* to the boards of the *epistatai* of the Parthenon and of the *hellenotamiai* are first securely attested.²⁰ Whatever the logic behind these reforms, it was perhaps deemed worthwhile to advertise the changes.²¹

Last but not least, there was democratic propaganda, too. Though not very suitable as a check on the authorities, the inscribed accounts probably served as a symbol of accountability and transparency. When an Athenian looked at the stele with the Parthenon accounts, he understood that the magistrates involved had undergone audits whereby every willing citizen had been allowed to be present and even to challenge any official. Therefore, the technical details are not that important now. What matters is that it is we, the Athenians, who build magnificent temples and manage impressive sums. Our officials submit us annual accounts and publicize them. Every citizen who wishes may learn which board contributed how much to which purpose. As stated above, some information that we consider as important and that we find in later building documents may have not been easily available to the authors of the Periclean building inscriptions.

19 See KALLET-MARX 1989 versus SAMONS 1993.

20 See ML, on p. 164.

21 Michele Faraguna reminds, in his response to this paper, that the sheer fact that there were both a *grammateus* and a *syngrammateus* implies that the paperwork to be dealt with was not negligible. One could suggest that the appointment of a permanent co-secretary of the Parthenon commissioners was needed because the decision to publish the records increased the amount of paperwork. This seems seducing as far as the Parthenon accounts are concerned. However, the appointment in the same year of a permanent *syngrammateus* to the *hellenotamiai*, whose accounts remained unpublished at this stage (and perhaps at all, as we have seen: above, n. 4) should give us a pause.

Even so, the Athenians could publish much more details, had they wished. What they included was probably deemed sufficient for the purposes suggested here.²²

THE ERECHTHEION

So much for the building accounts before the Peloponnesian war. As we have seen, the documents of the next construction complex attested, the Erechtheion, are mainly distinguished by three new features: they are ordered by prytanies; inside prytanies they are ordered by architectural elements; they contain detailed descriptions of how much was paid, to whom, for which tasks and by which method. Of these three features, the order by prytanies was already established by the time the construction of the Erechtheion was resumed (e.g. *ML* 77 and, more immediately relevant, *ML* 84 of 410/9; interestingly, an oligarchic decree known as *ML* 81 refers to months, not to prytanies). In contrast, the order by architectural elements is special for the Erechtheion. Besides the stringent financial and political situation, what was so special for this project is that the construction was interrupted (we do not know when, nor, for that matter, when it began). Schaps, in his yet unpublished essay referred to above, suggests that, when the project was renewed in 409/8, «nobody will have known exactly how much work remained to be done, and so nobody can have calculated precisely how much it should cost».²³ Hence the need to publish the survey of what was already done (I³ 474), «so that the information would remain publicly available during the work and money could not be claimed for work that in fact had been done by the earlier commissioners». The survey was organized, naturally enough, by architectural item. For a further check on the commissioners, the annual accounts recorded precisely which work was done, organized in the same way. The explanation seems tempting. I would add another peculiarity of

22 The response of M. Faraguna justly emphasises the religious dimension of publicising the building accounts. It is true that most Greek building inscriptions preserved reflect the construction of temples. Not all the temples, however. We still have to answer, why the building accounts of some temples (and some secular projects, like Conon's restoration of the Athenian Walls) were inscribed, whereas other public construction activity remained epigraphically unattested. To the secular projects named by Faraguna one might add the construction of the Pnyx (three times), of the Theater of Dionysus (twice, not to count local theaters), of the Tholos, of the Arsenal, and so on. However, we have no accounts for the first stage of the erection of the Erechtheion, either. One cannot assume, together with Humphreys 1985, that all these buildings were privately financed. In any case, there are no significant differences in this respect between the Lykourgan period and earlier decades, as we have seen. Of course, some building inscriptions may remain unknown to us, but this possibility does not save Humphrey's theory.

23 This is especially true if no accounts of the corresponding commissioners survived. Of course, such possibility should have been an excellent argument for preserving the accounts, but surely, the Athenians, like any other people, frequently learned from their own mistakes. On the other hand, some accounts may have not survived in the stormy events of 415-410.

the project in question, following, too, from the interruption of the works: the *epistatai* had to deal only with relatively advanced stages of the construction. Neither transportation nor works in quarries were needed. Certainly, the accounts of these activities would not be ordered by architectural elements.

The particular need to provide a check on embezzlement, due to the unique situation mentioned above, may have something to do with detailed indication of the workers, their tasks and their salaries. Together with order by prytanies and by architectural items, this feature surely made the accounts of the Erechtheion look more like accounts. And though we find most of these features in later accounts in Attica and elsewhere, only the Delian building documents can rival the inscriptions of the Erechtheion in their minute description of the tasks. It seems that the *epistatai* used for their accounts written specifications from which the builders read off (or heard) their instructions. The similarity between some lines of I³ 475 – 476 and the inscribed specifications of the ships' arsenal built by Philon (IG II² 1668.15ff), is striking. It is the most economic hypothesis that these specifications were included already in the records presented for the *euthynae*. Similar material seems to be available to the officials of Periclean Athens, too,²⁴ but they did not use it, at least for the inscribed accounts. As for the indication of the workmen's status, the accounts of the Erechtheion remain unsurpassed in Antiquity. Various explanations were offered for this first appearance of the individual in building accounts.²⁵ Political and financial situation, administrative reforms and gradual development of epigraphical habits were proposed as causes. In fact, as individuals are named in later accounts, we should beware of too circumstantial explanations. As for the stringent financial situation, surely no time was so prosperous that the Athenians were ready to tolerate embezzlement. Some general factors surely were at play here. Thus, designation of metics through demes where they were registered and of slaves through their owner's name in genitive is not attested before the end of the fifth century. As for the metics, Whitehead sees here a real reform of their status,²⁶ but a simple change of epigraphic practice seems at least no less plausible. And it looks like the only option for the change in designation of slaves. Similarly, as stated above, there is no telling when individual workmen make their appearance in the *euthynae* – the change may have been merely epigraphic. Even so, neither resident aliens nor slaves would be designated so precisely in any document before the end of the fifth century.

While this mentioning of every worker, including a slave, and meticulous indication of his status is a (perhaps the) prominent feature of the accounts of the

24 Cf. BURFORD 1963, 25.

25 They are summarized in FEYEL 2006, 16-7.

26 WHITEHEAD 1977, 152.

Erechtheion,²⁷ we will be surprised to understand that some workmen remain anonymous and probably even more are not even mentioned. The anonymous workers are the *σύνεργοι* of Raidios (I³ 475.57, at least two, only one working each given day²⁸) and of Phalakros Paianieus (475.41-2, one man). They may be slaves (cf. Xen. *Mem.* 2.3.3; we know that Phalacro had slaves, but they are named: IG I³ 476.81-3, 229-31, 313-4), or relatives,²⁹ or pupils. The unmentioned workmen are those who helped artisans employed on the basis of piece rate pay. The existence of such assistants is indicated by two facts. First, Raidios, already mentioned here, works with assistants when employed on daily basis, but alone when paid by piecework.³⁰ But he surely needs assistants when working with a two-hand saw, as he probably does. The difference between the employment methods is that it was pointless to mention assistants in the account when only the amount of work done was relevant (and the name of the recipient of the pay – Raidios in our case). In comparison, the number of workers was of course relevant for daily payment (but their names were not, since obviously the wage was taken directly by Raidios). Second, the possibility of artisans paid by piecework having unmentioned assistants (once more, probably slaves, but not necessarily) is sometimes implied by comparison of their earnings when working in a group (when every craftsman was recorded) and alone (cf., e. g., IG I³ 475.31-51 and 476.192-218, 223-48). We may find it strange, that some workers are left unmentioned whereas in other cases no one is forgotten, not even slaves. In fact, what is unusual is not that one's slaves or other assistants are ignored when the pay depends on the amount of work done, but that slaves are so often mentioned (and named) in these accounts. Let us see, then, when they are mentioned. This occurs in two cases: when slaves work separately of their masters, as slave carpenters do (IG I³ 475.66-9, 233-4, 254-6, 288-93; and perhaps 476.119-23), or when they channel columns in brigades, together with free masons. When slaves have independent tasks, their names are relevant either as their owners' title for the money earned, or as independent recipients of their wages. But why on earth should one mention slaves when they channel columns together with their masters (this is what most slaves attested at the Erechtheion do), while omitting them when they work, together with their masters, on stone blocks? The answer, I believe, lies within the collective character of the channeling. Channeling of each column was, in fact, a latent form of contract,³¹ but still without a formal contract and accordingly without a formal contractor. Formal contracts for large sums are

27 In one instance, too diligent indication of status creates obscurity: *Λυσίαι Ἰαλίππο Κεφισ* (475.110-3). See EPSTEIN 2010, n. 31.

28 See EPSTEIN 2010 with n. 4.

29 Cf. IG XI, 2, 161.71: *Νίκωνι καὶ τῶι υἱῶι ἐργασασμένοις ἐπὶ τοῦ κίονος ἡμέρας δύο μισθὸς δραχμαί...*

30 Cf. EPSTEIN 2009 with nn. 49-50.

31 CASKEY 1927, 411.

avoided at the Erechtheion, for reasons that should be discussed separately. Accordingly, there was no one man who could receive the wage earned by the entire brigade. In addition, the composition of these brigades was always heterogeneous: never only members of one family, never only a master and his slaves. Accordingly, it was important to precise the contribution of each worker – or of his master, if we speak of a slave. The slaves' names proved that their owner really brought such and such number of workers.³²

Now, if we believe, together with Burford and some other scholars, that the workers are named (mainly) for ideological purposes,³³ we should conclude that those unnamed did not work. However, we do have at least three unnamed *synergoi*. Moreover, the contractors' workers are never mentioned in our inscriptions, including those of Epidaurus, on which Burford's hypothesis is primarily based. Does it mean that commemorating the builders just was not the purpose of inscribing these accounts? Not necessarily. We must keep in mind the difference between the purpose of an account, and the purpose of its publication. The commissioners did not think of commemorating the workers when they prepared the file for their audit – they probably thought how to avoid severe punishment in case of accusation of abusing public trust. When they prepared the inscription, the names were not there. Of course, they could be restored, at least in some cases. Phalakros, for example, was an Athenian citizen; his assistant's name could not be a great secret. But, apparently, this was never done. I am not surprised.

If commemorating the names of those who contributed to the building of the temple had been the purpose of inscribing the accounts, why not simply publish a list of names, as, for example, in the casualty list of the Erechtheis tribe (IG I³ 1147), or the list of those who participated in a naval battle (I³ 1032 = II² 1951)? By inscribing the financial accounts, the Athenians achieved several aims: not only they commemorated the names, but the precise contribution of everyone involved. Beyond this, they provided an additional check on their officeholders. If the Periclean building inscriptions served as symbols of accountability and transparency, those of the epoch of Cleophon were a means of attaining these aims. I believe this step was taken, at least to an extent, consciously.

32 One Erechtheion account (IG I³ 475.272-85) lists numbers of anonymous workers, from 19 to 33, (with unnamed functions) in several prytanies, and the sums paid. The sum in drachmas equals the number of men in each of the prytanies. LOOMIS 1998, 105-6, sees here «laborers, who did...unspecified work». The anonymity of these workmen induces KUZNETSOV 2000, 52-3 to assume that they were slaves, public or private. I am not sure, and suggest that the sums registered are intended for the workers' nourishment: one or two obols a day, during three or six days for a worker. See EPSTEIN 2008a, nn. 2, 15. In this case, the anonymity was only natural.

33 See, e.g., GRAHAM 1998 108: «citizens, foreigners, metics and slaves are engaged in some common enterprise». Cf. BURFORD 1971, 75.

In Lykourgan Athens the records for the *euthynae* were doubtless ordered by prytanies, as are the accounts of 329/8 (II² 1672). However, the accounts of transportation of marble drums to Eleusis (II² 1673) ignore prytanies. This is surely a case when not all information available was deemed relevant, probably because the work was undertaken between July and September.³⁴ II² 1672 is much more similar to the accounts of the Erechtheion: the order by prytanies; sometimes by architectural details; many workers are named and their status indicated. Before I proceed to differences between these accounts, I will highlight the differences between the conditions in which the works on the two complexes were performed, as well as between the contexts in which the accounts were prepared. First, II² 1672 reflects the activity of two boards: not only the Eleusinian *epistatai*, but also of the Treasures of the two Goddesses. As these boards had different *euthynae*, the accounts we have had to be composed for the publication, which provided good opportunity for editing. Second, contractors were widely used; we shall see some consequences of this fact for the form and content of our accounts. Third, the activity reflected is not actually construction of a temple where none existed. Some elements were built; some parts were repaired. Building debris was removed. Transportation and quarrying were performed. Like in Delos, but not as in the Erechtheion neither the works themselves nor the accounts could be totally ordered by architectural items. The description of the work done is typically less detailed than in the accounts of the Erechtheion. One of the reasons, I suggest, is that instead of using the written specifications as a basis for the accounts, as at the Erechtheion, the Eleusinian accounts use the contracts. This is one result of contracting the work out: after all, one of the supposed advantages of such contracting is that now it is the contractors, rather than the officials, who should mostly deal with the specifications. Another, more obvious result of the wide use of contracts is that the contractors' workers – probably most builders involved – are totally unknown to us. I doubt that the authorities wanted to commemorate these workers, but had they wanted it would not have been easy – they surely did not know these workmen's names.

What is more enigmatic is the complete anonymity of daily wagers in the Eleusinian accounts. As the workers employed on a daily basis are named in the accounts of the Erechtheion (except when they are assistants), we may suggest that the names of such workers were recorded in Lykourgan Athens, too. My guess is that these names were omitted when the accounts were prepared for publication. Since all daily workers of the same skill level got the same salary, their names seem to be considered irrelevant. At the Erechtheion, such workers were fewer and, especially in the first documented year, they did not work

34 SALMON 2001, 200.

by more than three together. Afterwards the habit to mention the daily wagers was already established. In comparison, at Eleusis we often see groups of ten *mis-thotoi*, so that significant space could be saved by suppressing their names. One result is that we ignore the number of daily workers in the Eleusinian construction project. Accordingly, as only a name gives out its bearer's status in Athens, we cannot calculate the ratio of builders of various statuses on the Eleusinian building site.³⁵

CONCLUSION

The Greeks were unique in inscribing financial accounts. We have seen how interplay between the available information and the purposes of its publication might influence the form and content of a particular subset of these accounts – building accounts. Though fuller versions of building documents may have existed in archives on perishable materials, the inscribed version was somehow considered the official one, in contrast to our present conception of the document.³⁶ It is remarkable to what extent this official document could have been shaped by contingent circumstances.

35 For such calculations, see FEYEL 2006, 325.

36 RHODES 2001, 136.

- ATL
B. D. MERITT, H. T. WADE-GERY, M. F. MCGREGOR, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (American School of Classical Studies at Athens), I-IV, Princeton 1939-1953.
- BURFORD 1963
A. BURFORD, *The Builders of the Parthenon*, «G&R», Suppl. 10, 23-35.
- BURFORD 1971
A. BURFORD, *The Purpose of Inscribed Building Accounts*, in: *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy* (Cambridge 1967), Oxford, 71-6.
- CASKEY 1927
L. D. CASKEY, *The Erechtheum: measured, drawn and restored* by G. P. Stevens; text by L. D. CASKEY et al.; ed. by J. M. PATON, Cambridge (MA).
- CLINTON 2005
K. CLINTON, *Eleusis, the Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme, I*, Athens.
- COHEN 2006
E. E. COHEN, *Consensual Contracts at Athens*, in: H.-A. RUPPRECHT (ed.), *Symposion 2003: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 73-84.
- EPSTEIN 2008
S. EPSTEIN, Review Article: V. D. Kuznetsov, *Organization of Public Construction Works in Ancient Greece* (Moscow, 2000), «SCI» 27, 95-111.
- EPSTEIN 2008a
S. EPSTEIN, *Why Did Attic Building Projects Employ Free Laborers Rather than Slaves?*, «ZPE» 166, 108-12.
- EPSTEIN 2009
S. EPSTEIN, *Towards a Question of Slave Labor in the Athenian Public Construction Projects* (in Russian), «VDI» 4, 42-62.
- EPSTEIN 2010
S. EPSTEIN, *Attic Public Construction: Who Were the Builders?*, «Ancient Society» 40, 1-14.
- FARAGUNA 1997
M. FARAGUNA, *Registrazioni catastali nel mondo greco: il caso di Atene*, «Athenaeum» 85, 7-33.
- FARAGUNA 2008
M. FARAGUNA, *Oralità e scrittura nella prassi giudiziaria ateniese tra V e IV sec. a.C.*, in: E. HARRIS, G. THÜR (eds.), *Symposion 2007: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 63-82.
- FEYEL 2006
CHR. FEYEL, *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique à travers la documentation financière en Grèce*, Athènes.
- FISHER 2003
J. E. FISCHER, *Sanides and Sanidia*, in: G. W. BAKEWELL, J. P. SICKINGER (eds.), *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, Oxford, 237-50.
- GRAHAM 1998
A. J. GRAHAM, *Thucydides 7.13.2 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes: An Addendum*, «TAPhA» 128, 89-114.
- HEDRICK 1994
CH. W. HEDRICK, JR., *Writing, Reading, and Democracy*, in: R. OSBORNE, S. HORNBLLOWER, (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford, 156-74.
- HEDRICK 1999
CH. W. HEDRICK, *Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit*, «Hesperia» 68, 387-439.

- HUMPHREYS 1985
S. C. HUMPHREYS, *Lycurgus of Boutadae: An Athenian Aristocrat*, in: J. W. EADIE, J. OBER (eds.), *The Craft of the Athenian Historian. Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, Lanham-London, 199-252 (reprinted with an afterword in EAD., *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*, Oxford, 2004, 77-129).
- KALLET-MARX 1989
L. KALLET-MARX, *Did Tribute Fund the Parthenon?*, «CA» 8, 252-66.
- KUZNETSOV 2000
V. D. KUZNETSOV, *Organization of Public Construction Works in Ancient Greece* (in Russian), Moscow.
- LOOMIS 1998
W. T. LOOMIS, *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*, Ann Arbor.
- ML
R. MEIGGS, D. LEWIS 1988: *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- PAPAZARKADAS 2011
N. PAPAZARKADAS, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
- RHODES 2001
P. J. RHODES, *Public Documents in the Greek States: Archives and Inscriptions*, «G&R» 48, 33-44, 136-53.
- SALMON 2001
J. SALMON, *Temples the Measures of Men. Public Building in the Greek Economy*, in: D. J. MATTINGLY, J. SALMON (eds.), *Economies Beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*, London, 195-208.
- SAMONS 1993
L. J. SAMONS, *Athenian Finance and the Treasury of Athena*, «Historia» 42, 129-38.
- SICKINGER 1999
J. P. SICKINGER, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*, Chapel Hill and London.
- WHITEHEAD 1977
D. WHITEHEAD, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, Cambridge.
- WILHELM 1909
A. WILHELM, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien 7), Wien.