

THE EPONYMOUS ARCHONS OF ATHENS

FROM 159/8 TO 141/0 B.C.

ANY ATTEMPT TO RECONSTRUCT the list of the eponymous archons of Athens for the 2nd century B.C. faces exceptional difficulties for two periods:¹ the first years, down to 194/3,² and the years from 159/8 to 141/0, which are discussed here. While the names of all the archons seem to be known for these years, the corresponding secretary, together with the demotic indicating his tribe, is attested for only five of them. Thus the official order of the twelve tribes, in which the secretaries were accustomed to follow one another annually, is of no great help in reconstructing the sequence of the archons. Worse still, this order was violated: while it is virtually certain that the sequence of the secretary cycle was strictly observed from 200/199 to 160/59 and again from 140/39 down to the end of the century, scholars have long recognized that somewhere in the intervening period, there must have been a break. Dinsmoor thought that it occurred during, and was limited to, the years between 154 and 146, whereas Meritt recently proposed restricting the irregularity to the single year 146/5. His view was that in 146/5 there officiated not a secretary from tribe XII but a member of tribe VIII, who in turn was followed the year after (as would be expected, had there been no disturbance) by a *grammateus* from tribe I.³

The regularity in the sequence of secretaries clearly shows itself in the years preceding and following the problematic period:

164/3	Euergetes VI	140/39	Hagnotheos VI
163/2	Erastos VII	139/8	Diokles 7
162/1	Poseidonios 8	138/7	Timarchos 8
161/0	Aristolas IX	137/6	Herakleitos IX
160/59	Tychandros X	136/5	Timarchides 10

It is true that the secretaries for Diokles, Timarchos, and Timarchides in the 130's are not yet known, but the sequence of these five archons is nevertheless quite certain, as is the fact that Timarchides in 136/5 was followed by Dionysios with a secretary from tribe XI.

¹ I am grateful to S. V. Tracy for letting me see his then unpublished paper on the archon Achaïos (see footnote 56 below) and for encouragement and criticism.

Works frequently cited are abbreviated as follows:

Agora XV = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora*, XV, *Inscriptions. The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton 1974
 Bruneau, = P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris 1970
I. Délos = *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1926–
 Meritt, 1977 = B. D. Meritt, "Athenian Archons 347/6–48/7 B.C.," *Historia* 26, 1977, pp. 161–191
 Roussel, *DCA* = P. Roussel, *Délos, Colonie Athénienne*, Paris 1916

² Discussed most recently by C. Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1982, pp. 159–177. Since then, *Hesperia* 53, 1984, p. 370, no. 3 has confirmed that Hippias (181/0) was, in fact, the immediate successor of Timesianax (182/1).

³ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, New York 1939, p. 177. Meritt (1977, pp. 165–166), however, also entertains another possibility: "There may have been a complete cycle of secretaries in allotted order from 157/6 down to and including 146/5."

Such regularity is not surprising in a time, following the Third Macedonian War, relatively free of political unrest. This very stability suggests that any irregularities in the secretary cycle between 159/8 and 141/0 would have been of short duration. To be sure, there is nothing to indicate that the secretaries of a full twelve-year cycle did not follow each other according to the rule, but instead in a sequence determined by lot.⁴

I

For the nineteen years from 159/8 to 141/0 nineteen names of archons⁵ are available.⁶ They are, in alphabetical order, Andreas, Anthesterios, Archon, Aristaichmos, Aristophantos, Aristophon, Dionysios, Epainetos, Epikrates, Kallistratos, Lysiades, Metrophanes, Mikion, Mnesitheos, Phaidrias, Pyrrhos, Speusippos, Theaitetos, and Zaleukos. A list of Athenian gymnasiarchs at Delos after the island reverted to Athens provides the first clues for their respective dates. This list was drawn up by the thirteenth holder of the office, Phokion from Melite. He listed the names of his twelve predecessors and his own; the list was later continued.⁷ The orthodox view is that it began in 167/6, as Roussel argued, followed by Kirchner and Kolbe. In contrast, Plassart argued for 166/5 as its first year, followed in this by Dinsmoor.⁸ In the following discussion, Roussel's chronology is assumed to be the correct one. If this is so, then Phokion was gymnasiarch in 155/4. Seven years later, in 148/7, the gymnasiarch was Gorgias from Ionidai; four years later, 144/3, Leonides from Melite. It is also known that Gorgias held office during the year of the eponymous Athenian archon Archon,⁹ Leonides in that of Theaitetos.¹⁰ Archon, therefore, was the eponym of Athens in 148/7, Theaitetos in 144/3.

Archon, in turn, was succeeded by Epikrates, whose year therefore was 147/6.¹¹ Theaitetos, on the other hand, directly preceded Aristophon, so that Aristophon has to go to 143/2.¹² S. V. Tracy kindly reminds me that the inscription published as *Agora XV*, no. 261 and dated to 95/4 B.C. was inscribed by the cutter of I 6006,¹³ who was active between 169 and 134 B.C. The archon's name is not preserved, but Παριανεύς is, as the demotic of the secretary, who therefore was from Pandionis III. Other secretaries from this tribe within the

⁴ See Meritt's alternative assumption cited in the previous note.

⁵ The name of Dionysios (p. 243 below) is here included.

⁶ The supposed archon E— has been excluded in view of the comments of W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt (*The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge, Mass. 1940, p. 130). The reading E— in *I. Délos*, no. 1507, line 37 which seemed to establish him as the immediate successor of Metrophanes had already been questioned by A. Plassart (*BCH* 36, 1912, p. 406, note 2). After repeated study of the stone, it has also been questioned by P. Roussel and M. Launey (*I. Délos*, ad no. 1507, line 37).

⁷ *I. Délos*, no. 2589.

⁸ See the comments on *I. Délos*, no. 2589.

⁹ *I. Délos*, no. 1952.

¹⁰ *I. Délos*, no. 2593.

¹¹ *I. Délos*, no. 1505, lines 41 ff.

¹² Apollodoros, *FGrHist*, no. 244, F 47. T. Dorandi, "Testimonianze sugli arconti nei papiri Ercolanensi," *Cron. Ercol.* 10, 1980 (pp. 153–174), p. 164, T 52.

¹³ S. V. Tracy, "Five Letter-cutters of Hellenistic Athens (230–130 B.C.)," *Hesperia* 47, 1978 (pp. 244–268), p. 263.

critical span of time are attested for the archons Nikosthenes (167/6), Mnesitheos (155/4; see below) and Epikles (131/0), so that *Agora* XV, no. 261 will have to go to 143/2. The name of the archon consequently ought to be Aristophon. The resulting picture is as follows: preceding Archon, Lysiades;¹⁴ 148/7 Archon; 147/6 Epikrates VIII; 146/5 [name]; 145/4 [name]; 144/3 Theaitetos; 143/2 Aristophon III. These dates are incompatible with a regular sequence of the secretary cycle in the years following 160/59, since in that case the year 150/49 and not 147/6 would have been the year of a secretary from tribe VIII.

Another closely connected group of four archons is formed by the epigraphical record of the Dionysia. They indicate that soon after 161/0, the year of the archon Aristolas, three archons succeeded one another in the following order: Anthesterios–Kallistratos–Mnesitheos III.¹⁵ Furthermore, a still unpublished inscription from Delos contains the information that Pyrrhos was the immediate predecessor of Anthesterios.¹⁶ Mnesitheos, as *Agora* XV, no. 225 (lines 42–43) reveals, had a secretary from tribe III, Philiskos from Paiania.¹⁷ Provided that at that time the secretary cycle was still following the rules, this group of four can then be connected with the archons of the 160's in the following way: 160/59 Tychandros X; 159/8 N. 11; 158/7 Pyrrhos 12; 157/6 Anthesterios 1; 156/5 Kallistratos 2; 155/4 Mnesitheos III. The gap which still exists in 159/8 can be filled with Aristaichmos. According to the *Index Academicorum*, he preceded the archon Nikomachos of 134/3 by "about twenty-four years"; furthermore, the philosopher Philon of Larisa, who was born in the year of Aristaichmos, died at the age of 74 when Niketes was eponymous archon, that is to say, in 84/3.¹⁸ These testimonia are more compatible with the year 159/8 (which happens to be the only one vacant) than with any other except 158/7, which, however, is already occupied by Pyrrhos.

Nine of the nineteen archons are thus matched with their years. Observations on the documents concerning the festival of the Theseia, *IG* II², 956–965, provide some additional information. These documents are decrees honoring the sponsors of the games (the *agonothetai*), followed by records of those victorious in the various contests. These inscriptions have been thoroughly discussed by August Mommsen¹⁹ and more recently by Chrysis Pélékidis.²⁰ In three of them the date, as indicated by the name of the eponymous archon, is preserved. *IG* II², 956 is from the year of Aristolas, 161/0, 957 from that of Anthesterios,

¹⁴ This follows from *I. Délos*, no. 1505, lines 34–35.

¹⁵ *IG* II², 2323, lines 223 (Aristolas), 230–232 (Anthesterios–Kallistratos–Mnesitheos). *SEG* XXV, 194, lines 483–485. From the inventories *I. Délos*, nos. 1416 and 1417 it is apparent that Anthesterios and Kallistratos held office in that order; see the comments on *I. Délos*, no. 1416, p. 54.

¹⁶ J. Tréheux as cited by B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley 1961, p. 184; cf. T. Dorandi, "Filodemo e la fine dell'Academia (PHerc. 1021, XXXIII–XXXVI)," *Cron. Ercol.* 16, 1986 (pp. 113–138), pp. 114–115. I have not been able to elicit more information from Professor Tréheux.

¹⁷ See also *IG* II², 979 (M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* I, Brussels 1981, no. 101).

¹⁸ Dorandi, *Cron. Ercol.* 10, 1980, p. 163, T 47; *idem*, *Cron. Ercol.* 16, 1986, p. 114: Φίλων δ' ὁ διαδεξά[με]νος Κλει[τό]μαχον ἐγενν[ή]θη μὲν ἐπ' Ἀρισταίχμ[ο]ν, π[α]ρεγένε[το] δ' εἰς Ἀ[θ]ήν[α]ς π[ε]ρὶ [τ]ῆ[ς] [τ]α[ρ]α[ρ]α καὶ εἰ[ς] [κ]οσιν ὑπάρχων ἐ[τ]ῶν κατὰ Νικόμαχον. Dated to the year of Aristaichmos is the fully preserved decree of the Athenian cleruchs at Delos in honor of Euboulos of Marathon, *I. Délos*, no. 1498.

¹⁹ *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum*, Leipzig 1898, pp. 291–297.

²⁰ *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 av. J.-C.*, Paris 1962, pp. 229–233.

157/6, and 958 from that of Phaidrias, to be determined. While Theseia had been celebrated annually since 457 B.C., those attested for the 2nd century, between 161/0 and *ca.* 130 B.C., were something new and different, as Pélékidis has shown. Numerous testimonia show that they were celebrated with great pomp and display. Pélékidis argues convincingly that these were new, penteteric Theseia, Greater Theseia, introduced only in the 2nd century (they are not yet mentioned among the penteteric festivals enumerated in the *Athenaion politeia*²¹), not long before their first attestation in 161/0, most likely in connection with the return of Skyros, the island of the hero Theseus, to Athenian domination in 167/6.²² Whether the new festival was first celebrated in 165/4 or in 161/0 (the year of the first preserved record) is unknown. The rich documentation in subsequent years, when compared with the extremely meager evidence from earlier centuries, makes it virtually certain that the victor lists of the 2nd century indeed bespeak a new and more lavish festival than the old annual one. Pélékidis' hypothesis has therefore been accepted by all those who have taken notice of it²³ and corroborated by Philippe Bruneau, who pointed out that Theseia at Delos are attested only after 167, first in dedications dated 154/3 and 148/7.²⁴

Pélékidis further assumed that the celebration of the Theseia in the year of Phaidrias followed that of the year of Anthesterios at an interval of four years, so that Phaidrias would be the eponymous archon of 153/2. Meritt, however, preferred for Phaidrias the second penteteric celebration after Anthesterios, that is to say, the year 149/8.²⁵ This choice cannot be easily justified. A span of eight years between the two occasions seems too long, since two participants who were boys of the first age group under Anthesterios were still boys in the year of Phaidrias.²⁶ For this reason, Köhler and Kirchner (although they did not know that the festival was held only every four years and not annually) concluded that the documents *IG* II², 957 and 958, or the archons Anthesterios and Phaidrias, were "three or four years" apart.²⁷ It follows that Phaidrias, as Pélékidis argued, belongs to 153/2.

²¹ *AthPol*, 54.7.

²² It is generally assumed that Skyros, although not mentioned together with Delos and Lemnos by Polybios (XXX.20), was returned to Athens in 167; see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybios* III, Oxford 1979, p. 443, with bibliography.

²³ Among them are B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 33, 1964 (pp. 168–227), p. 205; O. Reinmuth, *Gnomon* 38, 1966, p. 799 ("most convincingly"), and Bruneau, *Recherches*, p. 35. H. W. Parke, however, in his discussion of the Theseia, does not seem to be aware of the problem (*Festivals of the Athenians*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1977, pp. 81–82), nor are H. Herter ("Theseus," *RE*-Supplement 13, 1973 [cols. 1045–1238], cols. 1226–1229), and D. G. Kyle (*Athletics in Ancient Athens*, Leiden 1987, pp. 40–41). E. Simon (*Festivals of Attica. An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison 1983) does not discuss the Theseia.

²⁴ Bruneau, *Recherches*, p. 35: "le groupement de dix inscriptions sur un laps de temps relativement court n'est pas fortuit et doit correspondre à un renouvellement des fêtes athéniennes de Thésée. L'apparition des Théséia déliennes a toute chance d'en être solidaire."

²⁵ Meritt (footnote 23 above), pp. 205–206; Meritt, 1977, p. 184.

²⁶ These are Εὐαρχίδης Ἀνδρόεον of the tribe Antiochis (Παλληνεύς) in *IG* II², 957, col. I, line 84 among the παῖδες τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας, in 958, col. I, line 64 among the ἔνοι ἔφηβοι and in col. II, line 43 among the παῖδες ἐκ πάντων, and Μνησίθεος Μνησιθέου of the tribe Oineis in *IG* II², 957, col. II, line 29 among the παῖδες τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας, in 958, col. II, line 53 among the παῖδες ἐκ πάντων, where he must have belonged to the oldest age group of the boys, since he was victorious in wrestling. See also Roussel, *DCA*, p. 359.

²⁷ See Kirchner's notes to *IG* II², 958. Meritt's objections, and his attempt to define the age groups

The results of the discussion up to this point can be summarized as follows:

159/8	Aristaichmos	149/8	
158/7	Pyrrhos	148/7	Archon
157/6	Anthesierios	147/6	Epikrates VIII
156/5	Kallistratos	146/5	
155/4	Mnesitheos III	145/4	
154/3		144/3	Theaitetos
153/2	Phaidrias	143/2	Aristophon III
152/1		142/1	
151/0		141/0	
150/49		140/39	Hagnotheos VI

It then follows that Speusippos with his secretary from tribe V cannot belong to 153/2, where Meritt puts him²⁸ and where he would belong had the secretary cycle remained as regular as it was from 200/199 to at least 160/59. The year 153/2 is occupied by Phaidrias. Perhaps instead of counting down from Mnesitheos, one has to count back from 147/6, for which year a secretary from tribe VIII is attested. That would bring Speusippos to the year 150/49. If that were right, it would follow that the regularity of the cycle was violated between the summer of 154 and the summer of 150. If the same method is applied to Metrophanes and his secretary from tribe I, and if one then counts backwards from Hagnotheos VI in 140/39, at which time the cycle was again regular, this would put Metrophanes in 145/4.²⁹ If that, too, were correct, then the time of irregularity would be limited to the years between 154 and 145. The fact that Aristophon in 143/2 is now known to have had a secretary from tribe III makes it unlikely that it extended beyond 145. None of these assumptions, however, can be regarded as certain.

differently ([footnote 23 above], pp. 203–206), do not seem to me to carry substantial weight. G. Bugh, who is preparing a new study of the Theseia documents, has kindly told me that he agrees with Kirchner's reasoning and disagrees with Meritt's. R. S. Fisher has attempted to corroborate Meritt's dating of Phaidrias to 149/8 ("A New Priest of Sarapis on Delos," *ZPE* 58, 1985, pp. 117–118). He demonstrated that *I. Délos*, no. 2083 is from Phaidrias' year and that the priest of Sarapis of that year was from tribe VI (Akamantis). Contrary to his view, however, this has no bearing on Phaidrias' date, as a glance at the list of priests of Sarapis shows which ones are attested after 167 (W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932, p. 156): all that can be said is that the priests were chosen according to a tribal cycle during the years from 137/6 to 92/1, but not before. A similar conclusion had already been put forward by Roussel (*DCA*, pp. 347–350).

²⁸ Most recently, Meritt, 1977, p. 183.

²⁹ This year is assigned to him also by Meritt (1977, p. 184). Roussel thought both 146/5 and 145/4 possible but somewhat preferred the earlier year. Important is his observation that Metrophanes can only be a few years later than Archon (148/7), since a transaction pending from Archon's year was recorded in that of Metrophanes (*I. Délos*, no. 1442, B53–54). Roussel comments (*DCA*, p. 363): "le délai de transmission doit avoir été très bref." See also F. Durrbach and P. Roussel, *I. Délos*, no. 1442, p. 151. For one day in Metrophanes' year, Timyllos, son of Timyllos Ἐρχι[εύς] was president of the Athenian assembly (*IG* II², 967, line 6 = *Agora* XV, no. 238). About seventy years later, the president once was N., son of Timyllos Ἐποιάδης (*IG* II², 1036, lines 9–10). The suspicion that the earlier document may have to be emended to Ἐρ[οιάδης] is justified, as a study of the squeeze reveals: it only shows EP, while the two following letters are completely worn.

II

Three years in the late 150's are still vacant: 154/3, 152/1, and 151/0. Three of the archons not yet assigned so far have the strongest claims to these open years: Andreas, Lysiades, and Zaleukos. The chronology of Andreas has recently been discussed in connection with the publication of a new document from his year; all indications are that he comes before rather than after 150 and, as has long been recognized, not much later than Kallistratos (156/5).³⁰ Lysiades was in office before Archon (148/7), according to *I. Délos*, no. 1505, lines 33–34.³¹ It was during this year that the Eumolpids honored the *hierophantes* Aristokles who had already taken this office in 183/2 and who was followed in it, at the earliest during Lysiades' year, by his brother Amynomachos, who had moved to pass the decree in his honor.³² It seems advisable not to move Lysiades further away from 183/2 than absolutely necessary, that is to say, to put him as near as possible to 155/4.

Zaleukos, too, precedes Archon, since during his year, as during the time of Delos' independence before 167, there still were three *argoranomoi*,³³ whereas in the year of Archon, and always from then on, there were only two.³⁴ Moreover, the year preceding Archon, 149/8, can hardly have been Zaleukos' year, for Gorgias from Ionidai was *agoranomos* under Zaleukos and gymnasiarch under Archon: there ought to have been one year without office between these two, in which Gorgias would give account for the former and compete for the latter office.³⁵ It follows that Zaleukos was eponymous archon of Athens not later than 150/49.

III

So far, four archons have been assigned to the 140's: Archon 148/7, Epikrates 147/6, Theaitetos 144/3, and Aristophon 143/2. Five names are available for the remaining six years: Aristophantos, Epainetos, Metrophanes, Mikion, Speusippos, and in addition to them, the archon (name lost) of *IG II*², 968, line 19, together with his secretary from tribe V. It is not difficult to assign this inscription to a specific year, because the decree in honor of

³⁰ C. Habicht, "Eine Liste von Hieropoioi aus dem Jahre des Archons Andreas," *AM* 97, 1982 (pp. 171–184), pp. 174–177. *I. Délos*, no. 1421, Ab, col. I, line 10 (and commentary, p. 82) shows that he was very close in time to Kallistratos.

³¹ The fragment of a decree from Lysiades' year, published by Meritt ("Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 34, 1965 [pp. 89–99], p. 89, no. 2 [= *SEG XXII*, no. 107]), associates a secretary named Diodo[ros —] with the archon. He does not appear in Meritt's latest list (1977, p. 184).

³² B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 11, 1942 (pp. 275–303), pp. 293–298; K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (*TAPS* 64, part 3), Philadelphia 1974, pp. 24–27; see also C. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Munich 1979, p. 152, note 10.

³³ *I. Délos*, no. 1500, lines 26–27; no. 1883.

³⁴ *I. Délos*, no. 1505. Roussel, *DCA*, pp. 182–183.

³⁵ *I. Délos*, no. 1500, line 26; no. 1833 (*agoranomos*): no. 1952 (gymnasiarch). Gorgias gave accounts for each office at the end of the year: *I. Délos*, no. 1500, line 17; no. 1504, lines 29–30. The decree in his honor, *I. Délos*, no. 1504, is from the year of Epikrates which followed the year during which Gorgias was gymnasiarch. S. V. Tracy doubts my assumption that Gorgias had to be for a year without office in between the positions he held: "I do not think this is a necessary assumption or even very likely."

Miltiades of Marathon³⁶ mentions Theaitetos in line 37 as the archon of a preceding year. That leaves as possibilities only 142/1 and 141/0. Since the text also indicates that Miltiades was *agonothetes* of the Greater Panathenaia in a year later than 144/3 (lines 41 ff.), that year must be 142/1, the year in which the Greater Panathenaia were celebrated. It follows that 141/0 must be the year of the honorary decree and of the still unknown archon. This agrees with the fact that the secretary comes from the expected tribe: he is a member of the deme of Boutadai, tribe V, and this fits with the tribe, VI, of the secretary from the following year, that of Hagnotheos, 140/39. Meritt has argued that Dionysios must have been the archon's name, and this is certainly correct, for the archon of 135/4, "Dionysios after Timarchides", is by this qualifier distinguished from another archon Dionysios, who cannot have been in office much earlier; in that event there would have been no need for such an addition to the later archon's name.³⁷

For Mikion there is only the attestation of *I. Délos*, no. 1899, a dedication offered in his year by a priest of the "Great Gods". Attempts have been made to determine the year of the priest (and, by implication, that of the archon), by inserting him into a cycle of priests.³⁸ This approach is no longer feasible, since among the handful of priests connected with certain archons³⁹ only those of the 120's show that a cycle was in operation (the priests of 128/7, 126/5, and 120/19 were members of tribes VII, IX, and III respectively), whereas the dates of the earlier priests, from the first twenty years after 167, do not reflect any such scheme. The only indication for the time of Mikion's archonship remains the fact that the father of the priest of his year is attested as guarantor in the inventory dated to the year of Anthesterios, 157/6.⁴⁰ This seems to favor for Mikion a date as late as possible within the 140's.

A lengthy list of members of a procession (*pompastoloi*) is dated to the year of Aristophantos, *I. Délos*, no. 2609. It contains the names of several known persons but only a few indications that are helpful in determining its approximate date. Line 17 mentions Nikolaos, son of Olympos from Phlya, who was ephebe in Archon's year, 148/7 (*I. Délos*, no. 1952, line 2), and *hieropoios* in the year of Theaitetos, 144/3 (*I. Délos*, no. 2593, line 11), as well as in that of Theodorides, 127/6 (*I. Délos*, no. 2596, line 17). It is tempting

³⁶ The inscription of the crown (lines 69–71) has been completed by a new fragment (*SEG* XXIX, no. 119). See also T. L. Shear, Jr., *Hesperia* 40, 1971, p. 258.

³⁷ Meritt, 1977, p. 184: "The archon Dionysios, restored here, justifies the epithet of him of 135/4." Otherwise, one would have to go back to 194/3 B.C. to find another archon Dionysios, for whom see Habicht (footnote 2 above), pp. 165–168. M. J. Osborne, "The Archonship of Nikias Hysteros and the Secretary Cycles in the Third Century B.C.," *ZPE* 58, 1985 (pp. 275–295), p. 278, note 11. The archon Dionysios of 141/0 is the one in *I. Délos*, no. 1750, lines 7–9, who held office while Euagion, son of Alketes of Kothokidai, was *epimeletes* of Delos.

³⁸ So, for instance, W. S. Ferguson, "Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents. I," *Klio* 7, 1907 (pp. 213–240), p. 222 (the archon was at that time still known by the name of "Meton"); Roussel, *DCA*, p. 366; Ferguson (footnote 27 above), pp. 159 and 179.

³⁹ See the list of the known priests in Bruneau, *Recherches*, p. 397. Several of them, however, are not yet associated with specific archons.

⁴⁰ *I. Délos*, no. 1416 B, col. I, line 73. The priest was Ariston, son of Ariston of Steiria, his father Ariston son of Charias.

to assume that this Nikolaos, born in 166/5, ought to have been of age when he was *pompoptolos*; and this in turn would bring Aristophantos in a year later than 148/7. The assumption, however, is unwarranted, because children too could be *pompoptoloi*.⁴¹ The observation that the son of another person mentioned in this list, Charias, son of Charias from Aithalidai, was Athenian strategos in 98/7 is of no great help either.⁴² It simply makes it more likely that Aristophantos belongs to the 140's.

The chronicler Apollodoros narrates that, in the year of Aristophantos, a young man of 22 years (whose name is lost) came to Athens and remained as a student of Karneades for seven years. After that, he returned to Asia Minor, where he met with great success as a teacher, but from where he returned once more to Athens. He was made an Athenian citizen and opened his own school of philosophy in the gymnasium Ptolemaion.⁴³ Apollodoros particularly praises his extraordinary memory, and although many scholars have wanted to identify the man with Charmadas mainly for that reason,⁴⁴ the connection is far from certain.⁴⁵ Since Karneades retired in 137/6 or 136/5 from the directorship of the Academy, the seven years mentioned cannot fall later than 142 to 135⁴⁶ and are hardly earlier than 149–142, since there is hardly room for the archon Aristophantos in the 150's. Roussel wanted to place him close to 141/0.⁴⁷ The best possibilities seem to be the years 146/5 or 142/1.

Two literary sources mention the archon Epainetos: Apollodoros in a list of students of Lakydes⁴⁸ and Philodemos in the *Index Academicorum*.⁴⁹ Both say that during his year as archon, the academic philosopher Apollonios died. Apollodoros narrates that other pupils of Lakydes died under the following archons: Eupolemos (185/4), Alexandros (174/3), Xenokles (168/7), and Nikosthenes (167/6), all of these earlier than Apollonios in Epainetos'

⁴¹ Roussel, *DCA*, p. 364 and note 7. See also Bruneau, *Recherches*, p. 323.

⁴² S. V. Tracy, *IG II² 2336* (*Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 139), Meisenheim 1982, pp. 218–219. The father, Charias, son of Philion, of Aithalidai appears in *I. Délos*, no. 2609, line 23.

⁴³ Apollodoros, *FGrHist*, no. 244, F 59. J. Glucker (*Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Göttingen 1978, p. 109) mistakenly makes him the pupil of Karneades for eight years.

⁴⁴ F. Bücheler was the first to propose this identification. He was followed by F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, Berlin 1902, p. 391, no. 102; U. von Wilamowitz, "Lesefrüchte," *Hermes* 45, 1910 (pp. 387–417), p. 414, note 1; Roussel, *DCA*, p. 364; Dinsmoor (footnote 3 above), p. 192; and most recently, without comment, by Glucker (footnote 43 above), pp. 109–110. Although more than forty pupils of Karneades are known (alphabetical list in H.-J. Mette, "Weitere Akademiker heute," *Lustrum* 27, 1985 [pp. 39–148], pp. 122–123) and their large number makes any identification hazardous, there are indications in favor of Charmadas: first the fact that the man in question must have been very notable (Jacoby *ad FGrHist*, no. 244, F 59, p. 743); second that he was famous, as was Charmadas, for his phenomenal memory (for testimonia see Jacoby, *loc. cit.*). While this is also true for Metrodoros, Charmadas was best known for this ability.

⁴⁵ Jacoby, *ad FGrHist*, no. 244, F 59. M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, III–IV, Brussels 1983, T 119.

⁴⁶ Wilamowitz (footnote 44 above) dates his resignation to 136/5, H. von Arnim to 137/6 (*RE*, s.v. Karneades [1919], col. 1965); he is followed by Mette (footnote 44 above), p. 121. Both G. Kolbe and P. Roussel thought it possible that the anonymous man might have studied with Karneades until the latter's death in 129/8 (see *DCA*, p. 364). This could bring the archon Aristophantos down to 136/5, which seems very unlikely.

⁴⁷ *DCA*, p. 364.

⁴⁸ *FGrHist*, no. 244, F 47 (the last critical edition of the text is that by H.-J. Mette [footnote 44 above], pp. 42–43, T 2 a).

⁴⁹ *Index Academicorum*, S. Mekler, ed., Berlin 1902, col. 21, lines 18–20 (Mette, *op. cit.*, p. 43, T 2 b).

year. According to Apollodoros, the year of the archon Theaitetos (144/3) was later than this year, and the implication is, much later.⁵⁰ The context suggests that Epainetos closely followed upon the archons Xenokles (168/7) and Nikosthenes (167/6).⁵¹ It was, therefore, natural for scholars to date Epainetos in the 160's. Ferguson in 1932 put him in 164/3,⁵² whereas Dinsmoor in 1931 opted for 160/59.⁵³ Later, Dinsmoor and Meritt both down-dated him, without any new evidence, only because they thought there was no longer room for him before 160. Dinsmoor in the end assigned him to 154/3, and Meritt first to 151/0 and then to 152/1.⁵⁴

Those late dates, however, are incompatible with the context in Apollodoros' narrative which requires for Epainetos a year soon after 167/6 and certainly not later than 160. On the other hand, all the years from 167/6 to 160/59 seem to be occupied by other archons. For all these archons, with the exception of Poseidonios (162/1), the tribes of their secretaries are attested; furthermore, the sequence Euergetes–Erastos–Poseidonios–Aristolas was unquestionably a series of archons following each other in direct succession (164/3–161/0).⁵⁵ In addition, it seems that Nikosthenes of 167/6 with a secretary from tribe III was followed by Achaïos with a secretary from tribe IV and he in turn by Pelops, whose *grammateus* came from tribe V, after whom, with Euergetes VI in 164/3, the series of the four archons began.

A weak link, however, in this sequence is, surprisingly enough, Achaïos in 166/5. S. V. Tracy has shown that a document dated to his year, *Agora* XV, no. 216, was inscribed by a mason whose career did not extend beyond 185 B.C.⁵⁶ This necessitates Achaïos' transfer from 166/5 to a much earlier year. With 166/5 thus becoming vacant, it could very well have been Epainetos' year. It would follow that three of Lakydes' pupils died in three consecutive years: Agamestor in 168/7, Telekles in 167/6, and Apollonios in 166/5. The year 166/5 seems in fact to be the year of Epainetos.⁵⁷

If this is so, then one of the nineteen archons available for the nineteen years from 159 to 141 (p. 238 above) disappears with Epainetos, and the question arises whether he can be replaced. Demetrios, displaced by Achaïos from 190/89, might seem an obvious candidate. He is attested as archon by two decrees honoring prytaneis, *Agora* XV, nos. 171 and 172, and by the fragment *Agora* inv. no. I 6081 (*Hesperia* 26, 1957, p. 30, no. 3). Meritt proposed for him, at different times, the years 159/8, 198/7, and 190/89.⁵⁸ The demotic of his

⁵⁰ Wilamowitz (footnote 44 above), p. 414: "Also, was immer μετὰ Θεαίτητον passierte, lag lange Jahre hinter den Dingen und Personen, die Apollodor bis zu der Stelle behandelt hatte; damals war Karneades längst Schulhaupt." Similarly, F. Jacoby's comments on *FGrHist*, no. 244, F 47, p. 739.

⁵¹ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 409. Jacoby, *loc. cit.*: "auf den nicht lange nach 168/7 unter archon Epainetos gestorbenen Apollonios."

⁵² Ferguson (footnote 27 above), p. 29.

⁵³ *The Archons of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, p. 261.

⁵⁴ Dinsmoor (footnote 3 above), p. 192. Meritt (footnote 16 above), p. 188; Meritt, 1977, p. 183.

⁵⁵ *IG* II², 2323, lines 220–223 (*SEG* XXV, no. 194, lines 432–436).

⁵⁶ S. V. Tracy, "The Date of the Athenian Archon Achaïos," *American Journal of Ancient History* 9, 1984 [1988], pp. 43–47.

⁵⁷ Epainetos' secretary should then come from tribe 4.

⁵⁸ *Hesperia* 26, 1957, p. 72; (footnote 16 above), pp. 185–187; Meritt, 1977, p. 180.

secretary is not known.⁵⁹ While one of the decrees from his year, *Agora* XV, no. 171, was inscribed by a mason who was active until *ca.* 147 B.C., the other two were cut by another whose attested activity seems to have ended by *ca.* 160 B.C.⁶⁰ If this is correct, Demetrios can hardly have held office in 154/3 or later but must be assigned to an earlier year.

IV

The results of the foregoing discussion can be summarized as follows (archons appearing in the left-hand columns seem to be fairly securely dated, whereas the dates for those in the right-hand columns are only approximate):

159/8	Aristaichmos	149/8		Lysiades
158/7	Pyrrhos	148/7	Archon	
157/6	Anthesios	147/6	Epikrates VIII	
156/5	Kallistratos	146/5		Aristophantos
155/4	Mnesitheos III	145/4		Metrophanes I
154/3		144/3	Theaitetos	
153/2	Phaidrias	143/2	Aristophon III	
152/1		142/1		Mikion
151/0	Andreas	141/0	[Dionysios] V	
150/49	Zaleukos	140/39	Hagnotheos VI	
	Speusippos V			

V

Several documents datable to the time between 159 and 141, but not attributable to any of the archons, are of special interest in connection with the chronology of the archons of the period.

1. A Delian dedication dated to 154/3 through the gymnasiarch Dionysios, son of Philokrates of Phlya, in which the name of the archon is lost.⁶¹
2. The decree by the Athenian assembly in honor of the Thessalian Kleomachides, son of Kratinos from Larisa, *ca.* 150 B.C., in which the name of the archon, *ca.* nine letters long, is likewise lost, but in which the tribe of the secretary is attested as VII.⁶² Meritt dated the decree to the year of the archon Diokles (139/8); Habicht (who identified Kleomachides as the man honored) preferred 151/0 in view of the known dates of Kleomachides' family. He restored the name of the archon as Epainetos, whom Meritt had dated to 151/0.⁶³ This is no longer feasible, since Epainetos, in fact, seems to belong in 166/5 (pp. 244–245 above). Since, however, Epikrates in 147/6 had a secretary from tribe VIII, the decree for Kleomachides with his secretary from tribe VII might be assigned to 148/7, the year of the archon Archon. It does not matter that his name, in the genitive, has only eight letters instead of nine. It is, however, far from certain whether the cycle of the secretaries was operating at any time between 154 and 141.

⁵⁹ Tracy (footnote 56 above), pp. 46–47, note 15.

⁶⁰ S. V. Tracy in his forthcoming study of Athenian masons 229–86 B.C.

⁶¹ *I. Délos*, no. 1951.

⁶² *IG* II², 933 and B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 29, 1960 (pp. 1–77), p. 76, no. 153, as joined by C. Habicht, "Ehrung eines thessalischen Politikers in Athen," *ZPE* 20, 1976, pp. 193–199.

⁶³ Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 55. Habicht, *op. cit.*, pp. 196–197 and Meritt once more (1977, p. 191).

3. The decree honoring three supervisors of the emporium at Delos, *I. Délos*, no. 1507, comes from the year following that of the archon Metrophanes. It was passed by the assembly of Athens when Perigenes, son of Thalesigenes from Trikorynthos, was president. The same man proposed a decree from the year of Epikrates, 147/6 (*I. Délos*, no. 1504, line 32). He seems, therefore, to have been a member of the Council twice, and in this connection the date of Metrophanes is of additional interest.⁶⁴

CHRISTIAN HABICHT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
Princeton, NJ 08543-0631

⁶⁴ Lists of citizens serving twice in the Council are given by P. J. Rhodes, "Ephebi, Bouleutae and the Population of Athens," *ZPE* 38, 1980 (pp. 191–201), pp. 197–201; "More Members Serving Twice in the Athenian Boule," *ZPE* 41, 1981, pp. 101–102; "Members Serving Twice in the Athenian Boule and the Population of Athens Again," *ZPE* 57, 1984, pp. 200–202. The latter two papers contain suggestions made by D. M. Lewis and myself; other instances could be added.