

## A REVISION OF *HESPERIA*, XLIII, 1974,

### "A NEW EPHEBIC INSCRIPTION FROM THE ATHENIAN AGORA "

DURING the summer of 1975 I had the opportunity to study in the Stoa of Attalos the Agora inscription I 7181, which has recently been published in this Journal (Vol. 43, 1974, pp. 246-259) by O. W. Reinmuth.<sup>1</sup> A thorough examination of the actual stone and a detailed measuring of the letter spacing on a lined squeeze have brought about a new text in which I believe improvement in the readings and restorations, as well as in the overall dating, may be offered.

Several of the new readings call for special comment. In line 1 I read Αἰα[ντίδος], but the prytanizing phyle may alternately be read Ἀκα[μαντίδος] as in the *editio princeps*, since only the lower part of a vertical stroke is preserved in the second letter space of the tribal name. The position of this stroke, however, near the center of the letter space, the close spacing of the two alphas (they are more closely spaced, for example, than tau and sigma in the same line), and the economy necessary to accommodate both the formula at the end of line 1 and the short name of the secretary at the beginning of line 2, all favor Aiantis.

The revised text has been made to conform throughout to the principle of syllabic division. The *editio princeps* allowed eight exceptions to syllabic division, in lines 11, 12, 24, 36, and 38 (all with text preserved), and in lines 5, 6, and 10 (text restored). I have examined the stone repeatedly and find no evidence of chi at the end of line 11 (the reading is epsilon-iota-sigma in any case), of gamma at the end of line 12 (the stone is preserved and clearly *vacat*), of phi at the end of line 24 (much of the letter space is preserved and shows no evidence of inscribing), or of sigma-tau at the end of line 36 (there are some scratches on the stone but they do not belong to letters). There is room to restore iota at the edge of the stone in line 38 (cf. the even tighter spacing at the end of line 32 where iota also was squeezed in), and the spacing will allow proper syllabic division in the restored ends of lines 5, 6, and 10.

In addition, new restorations have been made at the beginning of lines 12, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 which better suit the spacing and/or sense. The name of the paidotribes in line 40 is probably to be restored as [Ἐρμούδωρον Ἑορτί]ον Ἀχαρν[έ]α.

<sup>1</sup> I have sought and received important help from B. D. Meritt, Merle K. Langdon, and Terry-Allen Traill. To them and to the Agora staff, who have provided every courtesy, I offer warmest thanks. The financial assistance of a Canada Council grant enabling me to spend the summer of 1975 in Greece is also gratefully acknowledged. The calendrical questions pertaining to this paper and the overall chronology of the period are treated more fully by B. D. Meritt, "Athenian Archons 347/6-48/7," *Historia*, in press.

Father and son alternated down through the years,<sup>2</sup> and it may be that in this instance the name of the father should be exchanged with that of the son, but the suggested restoration allots more nearly equal tenures in this office. In lines 93 and 94 the demotics have been entered from Reinmuth's commentary.

At least thirty letters in the *editio princeps* should be dotted, and another fifteen enclosed in square brackets (the final sigma of the demotic in line 70 was never inscribed and should appear in parentheses). A clear vertical stroke is preserved of the first extant letter in line 49 and the text must accordingly read [δοῦ]γαι, not [μερί]σαι. Punctuation has occasionally been altered and a number of misprints which marred the *editio princeps* corrected.

## THE TEXT

a. 204/3 a., archonship following Diodotos

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 49-61

- [ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ] τῆς Αἰᾶ[ντίδος τρίτης πρυτανείας]  
 [ἦι <sup>4-5</sup>— Θράσωνος Ὁγήθεν ἐγραμ]μάτευεν· Βοη[δρομῶνος —<sup>ca. 7-8</sup>—]  
 [—<sup>ca. 12-13</sup>— τῆς πρυτανεί]ας· βουλὴ ἐν τῷ Παν[αθηναϊκῷ στα <sup>v</sup>]  
 [δίωι τῶν προέδρων ἐπειρήφιξε]ν Νικόστρατος Μενεμάχου Ἀχα[ρ <sup>vv</sup>]  
 5 [νεὺς καὶ συμπρόεδροι· <sup>vv</sup> ἔδο]ξεν τεῖ βουλευί καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Σωσιγ[έ]  
 [νης —————<sup>19</sup>—]ς εἶπεν· <sup>v</sup> ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἔφηβοι οἱ ἐπὶ Διοδό [<sup>v</sup>]  
 [του ἄρχοντος τὰς θυσίας τὰ]ς καθηκούσας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας ἀρξάμενο[ι]  
 [ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ καὶ τὰς] ἐγγραφὰς ἐκεῖ συνετέλεσαν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ [<sup>v</sup>]  
 [δήμου προαίρεσιν· ἐπόμπενσ]αν δὲ καὶ τὰς πομπὰς τὴν τε τῶν Σεμνῶν Θ[ε]  
 10 [ῶν καὶ τοῦ Ἰάκχου ὡς μάλισ]τα τοῖς πατρίοις ἀκολούθως εὐτακτοῦντ[ες·]  
 [ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τεῖ θυσίαι τοῦ]ς βούς· ἀπεδήμησαν δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἑλευσίνα εἰς [<sup>v</sup>]  
 [τὸ ἱερὸν ὅπως ἂν εὐσεβῶς] ἔχει πάντα τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς· λελειτουρ <sup>v</sup>  
 [γῆκασιν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μυστ]ηρίοις καθάπερ ἡγγέλθη αὐτοῖς· διετέλεσαν  
 [δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν εἰς τὰ] γυμνάσια· ἔδραμον δὲ καὶ τὰς λαμπάδας <sup>v</sup>  
 15 [ἀπάσας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀγῶ]νας ἡγωνίσαντο καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως·  
 [τοῖς δὲ Ἐπιταφίοις ἐν τοῖς] ὅπλοις ἀπόδειξιν ἐποιήσαντο· ἐπεμελή [<sup>v</sup>]  
 [θησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν] πόλεων πειθόμενοι τοῖς στρατηγοῖς κα[ὶ <sup>v</sup>]  
 [τῷ κοσμητεῖ· ἐλειτούργησα]ν δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἡφαιστιείῳ· διετέλεσαν δὲ κα[ὶ <sup>v</sup>]  
 [τὴν ἄσκησιν εὐτάκτως ποιοῦν]τες μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων οὐθενὸς αὐτοῖς μεριζ[ο]  
 20 [μένον ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου· ἐποιήσα]ντο δὲ καὶ πρὸς τεῖ μελέτει τεῖ κατὰ τὸν πλο[ῦν]  
 [τὴν περὶ τῆς ἐφηβείας ἀπόδει]ξιν τεῖ βουλευί τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἀκολούθω[ς]  
 [τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τοῖς ψηφίσ]μασι τοῖς εἰς πολεμικὴν χρεῖαν καθήκουσιν· κα <sup>v</sup>  
 [θάπερ παρείχον αὐτοὺς ὑπ]ὲρ πατρίδος μέλλοντας ἀγαθοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς  
 [τοῖς διδασκάλοις πειθόμεν]οί τε καὶ ἐπιμελεῖς· ἀκολούθως δὲ ταῖς ἐγγρα <sup>v</sup>  
 25 [φαῖς ἐν ἀκροπόλει εὐδόξως τ]ὰ ἐξιτητήρια παρασκευάζονται ποιεῖν ἵνα

<sup>2</sup> See the table in *Hesperia* 11, 1942, p. 302.

- [τὰ ὄπλα αὐτῶν παρέχουσιν μετὰ] πάσης εὐκοσμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰς χλαμύδας <sup>υ</sup>  
 [καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐνδύματα αὐτῶ]ν· <sup>υ</sup> ὅπως ἂν οὖν αἰεὶ τοῖς ἐφηβέουσιν ἐφάμιλ  
 [λον ἦι εἰδόσιν τοὺς πειθαρ]χοῦντας τοῖς χειροτονουμένοις ἐπὶ τὴν εὐ  
 [ταξίαν τιμηθέντας, ἀγαθεὶ τύ]χει δεδόχθαι τεῖ βουλευὶ τοὺς λαχόντας <sup>υυ</sup>  
 30 [προέδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσα]ν ἐκκλησίαν χρηματίσαι περὶ τούτων· γνώμην <sup>υ</sup>  
 [δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλ]ῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι δοκεῖ τεῖ βουλευὶ ἐπαι <sup>υ</sup>  
 [νέσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ Διοδότου ἐφ]ηβέυσαντας καὶ στεφανῶσαι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι  
 [εὐταξίας ἔνεκα καὶ εὐσεβεί]ας καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἣν ἔχοντες διατετελέκα <sup>υ</sup>  
 [σιν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν κ]αὶ τὸ [ν] δῆμον καὶ ἀνειπεῖν τοὺς στεφάνους Διονυσίων  
 35 [τε τῶν ἐν ἄστει καὶ] Παναθηναίων καὶ Ἐλευσινίων τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν·  
 [τῆς δὲ ἀναγορεύσει]ς καὶ ποιήσεως τῶν στεφάνων ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς <sup>υυ</sup>  
 [στρατηγούς καὶ τὸ]ν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν· ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ [<sup>υ</sup>]  
 [προεδρίαν ἐμ πᾶ]σιν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν οἷς ἡ πόλις τίθησιν· δοῦναι δ' αὐτοῖς κα[ὶ]  
 [ἀνάθημα ἐν τόπωι ο]ὔτ' ἂν αὐτοῖς αἴρωνται· ἐπαινέ[σαι δὲ] καὶ τὸν παιδοτρί [<sup>υ</sup>]  
 40 [βην Ἑρμόδωρον Ἑορτί]ου Ἀχαρν[έ]α ὅτ[ι το]ῖς νό[μοις τοῦ δῆμου] καὶ τοῖς ψη [<sup>υ</sup>]  
 [φίσμασιν ----- ca. 39 -----] δὲ καὶ τὸν  
 [----- ca. 43 -----] ἀκον]τ[ι]στήν  
 [----- ca. 50 -----]να  
 [----- ca. 49 -----]ου  
 45 [-ca. 6- κα]ὶ τὸν γραμμ[ατέα ----- ca. 23 -----] στε]φα [<sup>υ</sup>]  
 [νῶσαι ἕκ]αστον αὐτῶν [θ]αλλο[ύ] στεφάνωι· ἀνα]γραψαι δὲ τό[δε τὸ] ψήφι  
 [σμα καὶ]τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρ[υ]τα[ν]είαν  
 [ἐν στήλ]ει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν τεῖ ἀγορᾷ· τὸ δὲ γεγόμενον ἀνάλω [<sup>υυ</sup>]  
 [μα δοῦ]ναι τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. *vacat*

*vacat* 0.027 m.*in tribus**linearibus circulis*

- 50 ἡ βουλή  
 ὁ δῆμος  
 [τ]ὸν κοσμη  
 [τ]ὴν Νικόβου  
 λον Ἐργοχά  
 55 ρου Ὁῆ  
 θεν

*vacat* 0.037 m.*in tribus**linearibus circulis*

- ἡ βουλή  
 ὁ δῆμος  
 τοὺς ἐφῆ  
 60 βους

*vacat* 0.027 m.*in tribus**linearibus circulis*

- οἱ ἔφῃ  
 βοὶ τὸν κο  
 σμητὴν Νι  
 κόβουλον Ἐρ  
 γοχάρου 65  
 Ὁῆθεν

[οἱ ἐφ]η βεεύσαντες ἐπὶ Διοδότου ἄρχοντος

[[Ἀντιγονίδος]]

Ἀκαμαντίδος

[---]ος Σωφίλου Ἀγρυλῆθεν

Οἰνείδος

70 [---]τος Φίλωνος Λαμπτρέυ(ς)

Εὐκριτος Εὐκρίτου Ἐπικηφίσιος

	[[Δημητριάδος]]	Ἐργοχάρης Νικοβούλου Οἰήθεν	85
	[----] Φιλωτάδου Φυλάσιος	Στησίλεως Νικοβούλου Οἰήθεν	
	[---Δη]μητρίου Ἀτηνεύς	Ἀνθεμίων Θεοφώντος Περιθοίδης	
	[----Δη]μητρίου Ἀτηνεύς	Οἰνόβιος Οἰνοβίου Ἐπικηφίσιος	
75	[-----] φίλου Μελιτεύς	Δημήτριος Μηνοφίλου Ἀχαρνεύ[ς]	
	[Ἐρεχθείδος]	Κεκροπίδος	90
	[-----]ου Κηφισιεύς	Λυσίνος Κηφισοφώντος Ἀθμ[ονεύς]	
	[-----] Κηφισιεύς	Ἰπποθωντίδος	
	[Αἰγείδος]	Κόνων Ξενοφάντο[υ Κειριάδης]	
80	[-----] Ἐρχιεύς	Ἄβας Κλεάνδρο[υ Ἀμαξαντεύς]	
	[-----] ἄτου Ἐρχιε(ύς)	Αἰαντ[ίδος]	95
	<i>lacuna</i>	<i>lacuna</i>	

Line 13, *lapis* ΚΑΘΑΠΑΡ, *pace* H. Wilkinson.

### THE DATE

Careful measurement of the spacing in lines 1 and 2 indicates that the archon's name (in the genitive) contained approximately 11 letters and the secretary's name, patronymic, and demotic a total of 17 to 18 letters. In the case of the latter the unusual shortness of the name and the approximate prosopographical date of the text (a subject on which I shall have more to say below) immediately invite comparison with [...<sup>ca. 10</sup>...] *vos* Ὀῆθεν (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 973),<sup>3</sup> secretary in the archonship of Apollodoros, i. e. during 204/3 B.C. Apollodoros nicely fits the spacing in line 1 of the ephebic text and both these inscriptions may provisionally be assigned to that year.

The Apollodoros who was archon in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 845 cannot be assigned to the same year as the Apollodoros above, if his secretary's name is correctly read in the *Corpus* text; [-]ερσ[.....]ρασ[----] is at least four letters too long for identification with the secretary from Oe. (The assignment of Ankylos to 197/6 by Meritt and Traill<sup>4</sup> leaves the year 208/7 free for just such an additional Apollodoros.) But is the reading of the secretary's name in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 845 secure? W. K. Pritchett thought not. He expressed his doubts as to the *Corpus* reading of epsilon-rho-sigma in *Hesperia* 16, 1947, p. 191, and he published a photograph (pl. XL) to substantiate his criticism. Having examined at length this photograph, I would concur with Pritchett's judgment that it does not justify the *Corpus* text in this line.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, I would assign *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 845 to the same year as *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 973 and

<sup>3</sup> Although the second and fourth (and probably also the sixth and seventh) lines of this nearly-stoichedon inscription each had 43 letters, the fifth line had 44 letters, and it follows that the third line may be restored with either 43 or 44 letters. Syllabic division apparently was the deciding criterion here.

<sup>4</sup> *The Athenian Agora*, XV, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton, 1974, p. 144, no. 165.

<sup>5</sup> Traces of eta reported by Pritchett (*loc. cit.*) are visible directly below the alpha in ἄρχωντος.

Agora I 7181 and render the following composite text of the secretary's name:  
 [-<sup>4-5</sup> - Θ]ράσ[ω]νος Ὁρήθεν.

The new ephebic inscription provides the welcome additional information that Diodotos (lines 6, 67) occupied the year immediately preceding Apollodoros, *viz.* 205/4 B.C. In *The Athenian Year* (Los Angeles, 1961, pp. 199 and 235) Meritt had assigned Diodotos (with a question mark) to the year 202/1. The dating of Diodotos' archonship in 205/4 immediately displaces Pantiades and Kallistratos; Meritt and I would now assign these archons to 206/5 and 207/6 respectively. The evidence for the dates of these two archons is derived from the combined witness of Diogenes Laertius and Philodemos. Diogenes Laertius (IV, 61) allows us to fix the date of Lakydes' succession as head of the Academy to the year 241/0, while Philodemos (*Acad. Ind.*) tells us that Lakydes continued as head of the Academy for eighteen years, extended his life just as many years longer, and died in the archonship of Kallistratos, or, according to others, in the archonship of Pantiades. Dinsmoor<sup>6</sup> adds  $18 + 18 = 36$  to arrive at a date for Kallistratos' archonship of either 206/5 (by inclusive reckoning) or 205/4 (by exclusive reckoning). But we may apply inclusive reckoning to *each* 18 year period, i. e.  $241/0 - 224/3 = 18$  years and  $224/3 - 207/6 = 18$  years, to justify the date of 207/6 for Kallistratos' archonship.

#### ARCHON LIST 210/9-201/0

The revised archon list for the period 210/9 to 201/0 may be drawn up as follows:<sup>7</sup>

Type	Year(B.C.)	Archon	Secretary	Phyle
O	210/09	Sostratos	<i>Hesperia</i> 32, 1963, p. 34 (no. 32, line 93); 34, 1965, pp. 90-92; 41, 1972, pp. 43-46	3
I*	209/8	[- <sup>ca. 11</sup> - -]	Ἀρχικλῆ[s X]αριδήμου Ἐρχιεύς Pritchett and Meritt, <i>Chronology</i> , p. xxv; <i>Inschriften von Magnesia</i> , pp. 27-28, no. 37	IV
O	208/7			5

From this eta to the rho of ρασ in the same photograph the *lacuna* measures seven letter spaces. Assuming that this eta belongs to the conjunction  $\eta\iota$ , the nomen of the secretary contained five letters. The inscription republished above, p. 297, line 2, indicates a name of between four and five letters, i. e. probably a name of five letters one of which was iota. Iota usually takes half a letter space elsewhere in the *Hesperia* ephebic text and often a full letter space in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 845.

<sup>6</sup> *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, pp. 48-49.

<sup>7</sup> This list has been excerpted from the full list from 347/6 to 48/7 B.C. by B. D. Meritt, *op. cit.*, note 1 above.

Type	Year(B.C.)	Archon	Secretary	Phyle
O	207/6	Kallistratos	Ἀγωνίδης Ἀπατου[ρί]ον [----] The archons Kallistratos and Pantiades are displaced upward by one year by the new assignment of Diodotos to 205/4, <i>q.v.</i> <i>I.G.</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 849 can be restored for an ordinary year. <i>Chronology</i> , p. xxv.	6
I	206/5	Pantiades	<i>Chronology</i> , p. xxv; see 207/6	7
O	205/4	Diodotos	Above, pp. 297-299, a republication of <i>Hesperia</i> 43, 1974, pp. 246-248; <i>T.A.P.A.</i> 95, 1964, p. 240. His existence here justifies the epithet of Diodotos in 192/1	8
O	204/3	Apollodoros	[-- <sup>4-5</sup> -- Θ]ράσ[ω]νος Ὁῆθεν <i>Hesperia</i> 5, 1936, p. 422 for the archon; <i>I.G.</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 845 and 973 for the archon <i>plus</i> secretary; for the secretary's name see <i>Hesperia</i> 16, 1947, p. 191; both archon and secretary are restored above, p. 299	IX
O*	203/2	Proxenides	Εὐβουλος Εὐβουλίδ[ο]ν Αἰξωνεύς <i>Chronology</i> , p. xxvi; <i>T.A.P.A.</i> 95, 1964, p. 240; <i>Agora</i> XV, pp. 132-134, no. 147	X
I	202/1	Dionysios	<i>I.G.</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 850, 2798. Dionysios here accounts for the epithet of Dionysios of 194/3	11
O	201/0	Isokrates	[----]οδήμον [Α]ἰγυλιεύς <i>Chronology</i> , p. xxvii; <i>T.A.P.A.</i> 95, 1964, p. 240; <i>I.G.</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 934/5	V

## THE PROSOPOGRAPHY

Let us examine the prosopography of the Agora ephebic list in the light of the revised date of 204/3 B.C.

(1) The father of an ephebe of the phyle Demetrias is recorded in line 72 as Φιλοτάδης (Φυλάσιος). He is otherwise known as polemarch in the archonship of Leochares (228/7) from the great archon list of the late 3rd century.<sup>8</sup> By reckoning down twenty years<sup>9</sup> from 228/7 the ephebate of his son is determined as approximately 208/7 B.C.

(2) The date of the ephebe Konon, son of Xenophantos, of the phyle Hippothontis (line 93) may be determined as approximately 205/4 by subtracting twenty years from the date of his father's appearance as archon basileus in 225/4.<sup>10</sup> The demotic Κειριάδης may, I think, be restored unquestionably in line 93 of the new inscription.

(3) The ephebe Ἀβας Κλεάνδρου[ν] was undoubtedly the brother of an ephebe of Hippothontis in the archonship of Menekrates (220/19).<sup>11</sup> Abas, to whom the demotic Ἀμαξαντεύς should be assigned, was therefore a younger brother of the ephebe of 220/19.

(4) The two sons of Demetrios of Atene (lines 73, 74) were doubtless related (father and uncle) to that Demetrios of Atene who was councillor in 173/2.<sup>12</sup> Counting back 33 years one finds that the ephebes of the new text must be dated approximately in 206/5.

(5) Anthemion of Perithoidai (line 87) must be identified with the priest of Attalos in a prytany inscription which Meritt and Traill would now date 193/2.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> I.G. II<sup>2</sup>, 1706, line 13; cf. S. Dow, *Hesperia* 2, 1933, pl. XIV.

<sup>9</sup> Following the practice employed by Kirchner in his *Prosopographia Attica* the editors of newly found inscriptions from the Athenian Agora have regularly counted the span of a generation as thirty-three years. For example, when the date of an inscription is known (e.g. 305/4) containing the name of a man and his father, the date assigned to the father will be 33 years earlier (e.g. 338/7): see *Agora* XV, p. 349. Since many inscriptions refer to ephebes, however, it has been customary to give the father a date only 20 years earlier: see *Hesperia*, *Index: Volumes I-X, Supplements I-VI*, p. iii. These practices are of course arbitrary, but they have been found satisfactory and the advantages of uniformity in relative dating are obvious. Any marked divergences from normal can always be noted in the prosopographical commentary.

<sup>10</sup> I.G. II<sup>2</sup>, 1706, line 42; cf. S. Dow, *Hesperia* 2, 1933, pl. XIV.

<sup>11</sup> *Hesperia* 15, 1946, p. 192, no. 37, line 26.

<sup>12</sup> *Agora* XV, p. 171, no. 206, line 117.

<sup>13</sup> See B. D. Meritt, *op. cit.*, note 1 above. H. B. Mattingly (*Historia* 20, 1971, pp. 26-28) argues for the year 181/0, following Meritt's *T.A.P.A.* (95, 1964, p. 239) date for the archonship of Phanarchides. A restudy of the archon list, however, has convinced Meritt and Traill that the correct dates for Phanarchides and Hippias were those given in *The Athenian Year* (pp. 195-200, 235-236), i.e. 193/2 and 181/0 respectively. As to the date of *Agora* XV, no. 259, 193/2 seems preferable to 181/0. The councillor Athenodoros of Konthyle was chairman of the proedroi in 196/5 (*Agora* XV, no. 166, lines 4-5) and it is better to have his two terms as councillor come in 196/5 and 193/2 than in 196/5 and 181/0. He was ephebe in 210/09 (*Hesperia* 34, 1965, p. 90,

The floruit of the father would thus be 33 years earlier, in 226/5, and the ephebate of Anthemion would be reckoned approximately 206/5 B.C. (twenty years later).

(6) Reinmuth plausibly suggests that the Sophilos who was father of the ephebe from Agryle (line 69) may be the same man who was councillor at some date between 210/9 and 201/0,<sup>14</sup> a very natural relationship in time considering the revised date of the ephebic inscription.

(7) Diodotos in 205/4 B.C. is thirteen years earlier than the Diodotos who was designated as *ὁ μετὰ Φαναρχίδην* to distinguish him from his homonymous predecessor. The date 230/29 assigned to the earlier Diodotos in the *editio princeps* leaves an interval of thirty-eight years between the two archons named Diodotos and it is difficult to believe that with so long an interval any distinguishing epithet for the second Diodotos would have been deemed necessary.

The prosopographical indications are unanimous in dating the new text in the last decade of the 3rd century and, further, offer strong confirmation for its assignment to the archonship of Apollodoros in 204/3.

JOHN S. TRAILL

VICTORIA COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

no. 3, line 14) and his age will have been 32 and 35 years in his two terms on the council. Similarly, Νικί[α]ς Πολυξέγονυ Πόριος was proposer and very probably councillor in 198/7 (*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 850, line 3) and again in Phanarchides' year.

<sup>14</sup> *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup>, 912, line 21 = *Agora* XV, p. 129, no. 138, line 60.