

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

(PLATE 12)

I. NEW EVIDENCE FOR THE ARCHON SOSTRATOS¹

DURING a study of inscriptions in the "disjointed style,"² the author has found that *I.G.*, II², 1709, *I.G.*, II², 2863, and Agora I 1126, published originally in *Hesperia*, XXXVI, 1967, p. 86, no. 17, are three contiguous fragments of the same inscription.³ The joining areas and the relative position of the fragments are most easily seen by referring to Plate 12 (*I.G.*, II², 2863 is at the top, Agora I 1126 in the middle, and *I.G.*, II², 1709 at the bottom).

I.G., II², 2863 + Agora I 1126 + *I.G.*, II², 1709

fin. saec. III a.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

- [^{ca. 7?} — o] ἰ ἐπὶ Σφ[— — — ἀρχοντος]
^{vv} ἀνέ[θηκαν]
 [^{ca. 6} —] Κυδαθηνα[ιεύς]
 [^{ca. 6} —] ατος ἐκ Κο[ίλης]
 5 [^{ca. 5} —] ωρος Λαμπτ[ρεύς]
 [^{ca. 9} —] Ἰωνίδ[ης]
 [^{ca. 8} — Ω] αθεν
 [^{ca. 7} —] ς Σουνιεύ[ς]
 [^{ca. 6} —] όρας Φλυεύ[ς]
 10 [⁴⁻⁵ —] ημος Χολαργ[εύς]
 [³⁻⁴ —] ωρος Περιθοί[δης]
 Σφ[τ]ήριχος Συπαλ[ήτιος]
 Δι[ονύς]ιος Ἐλευσ[ίνιος]
vacat
 15 Ἀγαθοκλ[ῆς — ^{demotic} —]

¹ E. Vanderpool and T. Drew-Bear kindly verified the joins between *I.G.*, II², 2863, Agora I 1126, and *I.G.*, II², 1709 for me in the museum in Athens. S. Dow put his squeeze collection at my disposal and read an early draft of this paper. B. D. Meritt made observations on specific points related to the archon list. The author is grateful to these scholars for their assistance and constant encouragement of his work on epigraphical hands.

² Identified by A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Auffuehrungen*, pp. 63-64 and named by S. Dow, *A.J.A.*, XL, 1936, pp. 58-60, this "style" appears, after considerable study, to be the work of one man.

³ A marginal notation by Dow in his *Corpus* next to II², 2863 reading "part of 21709" originally brought II², 2863 to my attention.

γραμματε[ύς ----]
 Μητρόδω[ρος - ^{demotic} -]
 ὑπογραμμ[ατεύς]
 Ἀντίγο[νος - ^{demotic} - -]
 20 γραμματ[εύς ---- -]
 Δημο[- - ^{demotic} - - -]
 ΕΣ [- - - - -]

Line 1. The order of the phylai dates the fragment positively in the years of the thirteen phylai, viz. 224-201 B.C. The eponymous archon in line 1, therefore, cannot be the archon Sonikos or the archon Sosigenes, as Kirchner suggested in his commentary on *I.G.*, II², 2863, for they held office respectively in 175/4 and 172/1. In all probability, the nomen Sostratos is to be restored. The archon Sostratos first became known in 1963 when B. D. Meritt published Agora I 6700 (*Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 34, line 93); a second Agora fragment, I 6982 (*Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 90-92, no. 3), comprising part of a roster of ephebes came to light in 1964 and revealed that Sostratos held office during the period of the thirteen phylai. Meritt set forth in *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 91-92 the prosopographical evidence which bears on the date of this archon and entered his name tentatively for the year 210/09.

In the period 224-201 B.C. there are, as the archon list is presently constituted, four years for which we do not know the name of the eponymous archon: 223/2, 210/09, 209/8, and 207/6.⁴ Let us review here briefly the present state of the evidence for the name of the archon in each of these years:

223/2. *I.G.*, II², 917, line 1 is the sole source of the evidence for the archon of this year. S. Dow, *Prytaneis*, *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, pp. 76-77, no. 30, has re-edited this text and estimated the length of the archon's name as *ca.* 9½ letters. The name Sostratos suits almost perfectly. If, however, Σώστρατος Νικοστράτου Χολα(ργεύς), who was an ephebe and, therefore, 18 years old at the time of Sostratos' archonship,⁵ was an ephebos in 223/2, he must have been 65 to 70 years of age when he was treasurer of the Boule between 176 and 169 B.C.⁶ This seems a rather advanced age and, therefore, makes 223/2 an unlikely, though not impossible, year for Sostratos' archonship.

210/09. There is no evidence for the archon of this year.

209/8. Our only evidence depends on the assignment of *Inscr. Magn.*, no. 37 to this year. Its date has usually been determined by the date (restored) of the celebration

⁴ E. Vanderpool, "Hoplōn, an Athenian Archon of the Third Century B.C.," *Hesperia*, XL, 1971, pp. 109-111, has convincingly assigned Hoplōn to the (previously vacant) year 217/6.

⁵ *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, p. 91, no. 3, line 20.

⁶ *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, p. 118, no. 24, line 13.

of the Leukophryena in *Inschr. Magn.*, no. 16, line 25.⁷ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, 1939, pp. 166-167, however, has shown that this restoration (which gave the universally accepted date 208/7 for the Leukophryena) is itself extremely improbable, if not untenable, in view of the spacing of the letters on the stone. The exact date of *Inschr. Magn.*, no. 37 must rest, therefore, on the secretary's demotic, Erchia (IV), preserved in line 2, combined with the historical circumstances of the Leukophryena and the embassies sent out by the Magnesians. The same ambassadors who visited Athens (*Inschr. Magn.*, no. 37, lines 11-12) also visited Chalkis (*ibid.*, no. 47, lines 11-12). At the time of their visit Chalkis was under the control of Philip; the embassy, therefore, took place before 199 B.C.⁸ The evidence is by no means conclusive; nevertheless, it seems probable that *Inschr. Magn.*, no. 37 belongs to the year 209/8.

The length of the archon's name was estimated by Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, 1931, p. 209, as *ca.* 11. An estimate of *ca.* 10 would be more accurate;⁹ the name Sostratos would suit the space quite well.

207/6. Line 84 of *I.G.*, II², 2323, in the text as reconstructed and re-edited by C. A. P. Ruck (*IG II² 2323, The List of the Victors in Comedies at the Dionysia*, Leiden, 1967), provides the only evidence for the archon of this year. His name was *ca.* 5½ letters long.¹⁰ Sostratos will not suit the requirements of space. In addition, Meritt has already shown on prosopographical grounds that Sostratos could not have been archon in this year.¹¹

To summarize, 207/6 was not, 223/2 is unlikely to have been the year of Sostratos; however, 210/09 and 209/8 appear, on the basis of present knowledge, equally possible and probable. The hand offers no help, for the dated work of this mason covers the period 229/8-206/5.

In estimating the letters lost in this line, the author assumes that line 1 began at the same left margin as the titles in lines 16, 18, and 20. This is an assumption of convenience; line 1 may well have begun several spaces further to the left.

Line 13. The restoration appears inevitable. What appears to be part of a round stroke along the break (on the basis of which Meritt printed dotted rho as the first preserved letter of this line in his text of the Agora fragment) must be part of the line of break and not a letter-stroke.

⁷ Cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 1932, p. 128; L. Robert, *Rev. Et. Anc.*, XXXVIII, 1936, pp. 13-14.

⁸ Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 36 note 8.

⁹ Dinsmoor observed in note 4 on page 209: "The earlier lines show a progressive increase from 43 letters (line 2), 44 (3), 46 (4), 47 (5 and 6)." He did not, however, take this into account in making his estimate. Line 1 was probably a letter shorter than line 2, hence my estimate of *ca.* 10.

¹⁰ Ruck, *IG II² 2323*, p. 30.

¹¹ *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, p. 91.

Line 14. This line was apparently left blank for the member of this board from Aiantis (XII).

Lines 16 and 20. The titles begin slightly less than two full letter-spaces to the left of the names. The two secretaries were probably differentiated in some way; see, e.g., *I.G.*, II², 1710, lines 6 and 8.

Line 21. M. Th. Mitsos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1951, p. 51, first made this reading.

Line 22. These letters are *ca.* 0.0045 m. high, i.e. half as tall or less than the letters above. They are probably part (the first letters?) of the artist's signature.¹² There is no artist attested in E. Loewy, *Inscripfen griechischer Bildhauer*, 1885 or in J. Marcadé, *Receuil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs*, I, 1953, II, 1957, whose name begins with the letters epsilon sigma.

The marble breaks off just below this line; it appears unlikely that any lines are lost.

To the fundamental set of questions concerning this text, which may be summarized as "Who are dedicating what to whom?" there seem to be no probable answers.

II. FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR THE ELECTION OF ATHENIAN GENERALS¹³

B. D. Meritt first published Agora I 2105 in *Hesperia*, XXXVII, 1968, pp. 272-273, no. 11. A study of the mason who inscribed it, during which the present writer brought together all of the fragments which could be assigned to him, has revealed that this fragment joins the top left side of *I.G.*, II², 954a. The join gives a more complete version of the opening lines of this rather unusual text. (The Agora fragment gives the first preserved letters in lines 1-5.)

Agora I 2105 + *I.G.*, II², 954a

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. *ca.* 38

[ἐπὶ - ⁴¹⁻⁵¹ - ἄρχο]ντος Μουνιχι[ῶνο]ς δευτέραι μετ' ἐ[ῖ]
 [κάδας· βουλή ἐμ] βουλευτηρίῳ[ι σύ]νκλητος στρατη
 [γῶν παραγγελιά]ντων κ[α]ὶ ἀπ[ὸ βουλ]ῆς ἐκκλησία ἀρ
 [χαιρεσῖαι κατὰ τ]ὴν μαντ[είαν τοῦ] θεοῦ· Τίμων Α[.]
 5 [- - - ^{ca. 15} - - - -] ΝΔ[-^{ca. 3} - εἶπεν·] ἐπειδὴ Πανσίμ[α]
 [χος πρότερόν τε διατρίβων παρὰ τῷ βασ]ιλεῖ Εὐμένε[ι]

See *I.G.*, II², 954, for the remainder of the text.

¹² For signatures on documents of a comparable nature, see *I.G.*, II², 2814 and 2825.

¹³ The title comes from a recent article by B. D. Meritt, "The Election of Athenian Generals," *Klio*, LII, 1970, pp. 277-282. In addition to Meritt who has corresponded with the author concerning the problems raised by the new join, the present writer is especially grateful to G. M. Quinn and S. Dow for helpful advice during the preparation of this paper.

Line 1. This text must fall during the reign of Eumenes II (197-160/59 B.C.). Careful attention to the relative positions of the first preserved letters and comparison with the restorations in lines 2, 3, and 4 reveal that the archon's name was at most $5\frac{1}{2}$ letter-spaces long and at least $4\frac{1}{2}$ (allowing a half-space for iota). Of the archons attested in this period only Ἰππίας (193/2)¹⁴ and Ἀχαιός (166/5) have names short enough to fit the available space.

It appears doubtful that this honorary decree can have been enacted as early as 193/2. King Eumenes visited Athens during his joint campaign with the Romans against Antiochos in the years 192 and 191 B.C.¹⁵ He did not however emerge as preeminent until 189, as a result of the settlement imposed by the Roman senate after the defeat of Antiochos at Magnesia in 190.¹⁶ The earliest Athenian decree honoring him (indirectly) is *I.G.*, II², 955, which has recently been assigned to 188/7.¹⁷ Other Athenian decrees which pay him honor are all somewhat later in date, belonging to 175/4 (II², 905), 168/7 (II², 945), 166/5 (II², 946), and 160/59 (II², 953). It appears unlikely, therefore, that the Athenians paid him honor, even indirectly, prior to 189 B.C. The available evidence, i.e. the spacing of the first line and the historical circumstances, combines to suggest rather strongly that *I.G.*, II², 954 belongs to the year of Achaïos (166/5).

There exists, however, an obstacle to this conclusion. B. D. Meritt, "The Election of Athenian Generals," *Klio*, LII, 1970, pp. 277-282, has found reason to date this text to the year of Symmachos (188/7) and to conclude that it, II², 892, and II², 955 were all passed at the same session. As a result of the join, we now observe that the name Symmachos (requiring 8 full letter-spaces) will not fit into the space available in line 1 of II², 954. If Meritt is correct in placing this text in the year of Symmachos, we must assume that the mason made a mistake in inscribing the archon's name, i.e. committed an haplography such as ΕΤΙΞΥΜΜΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΞ.¹⁸ Although such an assumption is possible, methodologically it should be a last resort and not a first one. Let us therefore examine the preserved evidence to see whether it is strong enough to require the assumption of an error by the mason.

Since *I.G.*, II², 955 gives almost no independent information and is restored extensively by Meritt from II², 892, we will not discuss it further here. The important point for the present discussion is the relationship between II², 954 and II², 892. To facilitate the discussion, there follow the first 8 lines of II², 892 as restored by Meritt:

¹⁴ For the date, B. D. Meritt, "Athenian Calendar Problems," *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 240.

¹⁵ Livy, XXXV, 39, 1-2.

¹⁶ E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon*, 1947, pp. 88-92.

¹⁷ B. D. Meritt, *Klio*, LII, 1970, pp. 277 ff.

¹⁸ Such an error in the first and, in some sense, the most important phrase of the decree is *per se* highly unlikely and, to the present writer's knowledge, unparalleled in any other Attic decree.

a. 188/7 a.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 29

[ἐ]πὶ Συμμάχου ἄρχον[τος ἐπὶ τῆς Λεωντί]
 dos ¹⁹ δεκάτης πρυτα[νείας ἥι Ἀρχικλῆς]
 Θεοδώρου Θεορίκιος ἐγρ[αμμάτευεν Μον]
 νιχιῶ[νο]ς δευτέραι μετ' [εἰκάδας, ἐνάτει]
 5 καὶ εἰ[κ]οστῇ τῆς πρυτανε[ίας· ἐκκλησία]
 ἀρχαιρεσίαι κατὰ τὴν μαντ[είαν τοῦ θεοῦ]
 τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν [— —^{ca.} 8 — — Ἡ]
 φαιστίωνος Ἐρχιεύς καὶ συ[μπρόεδροι]

Now that the join reveals that in the second line of *I.G.*, II², 954 the prytany date was not given, any case for dating II², 892 and II², 954 to the same day of the same year must rest on their common month date and the occurrence of the unusual phrase ἐκκλησία ἀρχαιρεσίαι κατὰ τὴν μαντείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.²⁰ In his article Meritt naturally assumed that this phrase was virtually unique and referred only to 187 B.C.²¹ If we assume instead, following the new evidence of II², 954, line 1, that the phrase is formulaic, perhaps one of several standard expressions in use to describe the conditions for the ἀρχαιρεσίαι (one would suspect that consultation of the Delphic oracle was one of the usual ways of securing sanction for the election), then the *only* evidence for supposing that II², 954 and II², 892 were passed at the same session is their common month day.

How compelling should the occurrence of the same month date on two different inscriptions for ἀρχαιρεσίαι be as evidence that they were passed in the same year? Not compelling at all. To suppose for a moment that decrees were passed entirely at random during the year, probability theory alone would tell us that the likelihood of finding two decrees of different years with the same month date is rather high.²² But decrees were not passed at random. There were only four meetings of the ekklesia in each prytany²³ and, although these meetings were not fixed, it seems clear from the surviving dates²⁴ that the last or next to the last day of each month was a regular meeting date. Thus, the coincidental occurrence of this particular month date

¹⁹ Restored from *I.G.*, II², 955.

²⁰ It occurs only in these two texts and has been restored in *I.G.*, II², 955.

²¹ Meritt, *Klio*, LII, 1970, p. 278 especially.

²² An analogue from probability is the classic "birthday problem." In this problem we are seeking the probability in a group of X number of people that two will have birthdays on the same day. The surprising answer is that it requires a group of only 23 for the probability to be 51% that two will have birthdays on the same day. If the group size is 50, the probability rises to 97%. See S. Goldberg, *Probability, An Introduction*, 1960, table 10 on p. 59. Similarly, in a group of 50 inscriptions chosen at random the probability would be rather high that two would have the same month date.

²³ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 43, 3.

²⁴ Cf. J. Kirchner, *I.G.*, II², *pars quarta*, index II, pp. 27-33.

(the next to the last day of Mounichion) is quite in the ordinary course of things and provides no evidence that these two decrees were passed in the same year.²⁵

We should also note the fact that a difference in wording occurs in these two preambles. *I.G.*, II², 954 presents a highly abbreviated preamble (the indication of the tribe and prytany, the secretary's name, the prytany date, and the name of the chairman who put the vote are all omitted); nevertheless, it includes the phrase *βουλή ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳ σύνκλητος στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία κτλ.* The conclusion seems nearly inescapable that this phrase had significance enough that it could not be omitted, even when other parts of the preamble could.²⁶ II², 892, although it has a full and complete preamble, does not include this phrase. This provides rather strong evidence against supposing that these two decrees were passed at the same session.²⁷

We conclude, therefore, that *I.G.*, II², 954 belongs to the year of Achaïos (166/5) and that we have evidence for two elections of generals, instead of for one as Meritt had supposed. This new evidence supports Meritt's main points concerning the election, namely that it did not have to occur in the seventh prytany and that the *εὐσημία*, the condition under which the election could be held, was a circumstance somewhat out of the ordinary.²⁸ Indeed, we now appear to have some ground for supposing that in the first half of the second century B.C. the election of generals customarily was held rather late in the year.

Line 4. The nomen Τιμῶνα[ξ] (Kirchner, followed by Meritt) is rare in Attic epigraphy. The reading Τιμων A[— — *ca.* 10 — —] suggested by Wilhelm²⁹ thus seems more probable.³⁰

Line 5. Eta seems equally possible for dotted nu; the dotted delta could well be alpha. The most probable restoration of the demotic appears to be [Κυδαθη]γα[ιεύς]. [Ἀμφιτρο]πα[ιεύς], [Ἰπποτο]μά[δης] are less likely, but at least possible. The patronymic was approximately 11 letters in length.

STEPHEN V. TRACY

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

²⁵ This interpretation is that of J. D. Mikalson whose aid in this difficult problem is herewith gratefully acknowledged.

²⁶ The exact phrase is fully preserved only once elsewhere, in *I.G.*, II², 897 (185/4), and a variant of it, *ἐκκλησία σύ[γκλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς στρατη]γῶν παραγγ[ειλάντων]*, occurs in II², 911 (169/8).

²⁷ Enough of the phrase is preserved in *I.G.*, II², 898 to render it probable that the whole phrase occurred. It and II², 897 were passed at the same session and both apparently included the phrase.

²⁸ Cf. Meritt, *Klio*, LII, 1970, pp. 277-278.

²⁹ *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXIX, 1914, p. 306.

³⁰ I am indebted to S. Dow for drawing my attention to this.



I.G., II², 2863 + Agora I 1126 + *I.G.*, II², 1709

STEVEN V. TRACY: EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES