

TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS DIOTEIMOS BESAIEUS

AFTER conferring with Meritt about its restoration and interpretation, I publish this note, at his request, on a text from the Athenian Agora (Inv. No. I 839). This document was edited and described by him above, p. 95, No. 24. A. E. Raubitschek had previously mentioned this inscription in *Hesperia*, XXXV, 1966, p. 245, identifying the person honored as a possible son of Dioteimos. A study of the document itself supports his claim, in conformity with the nomenclature of Roman names. Therefore, a new version is presented here, with Meritt's approval and suggestions:

Τιβέριον Κ[λαύδιον]
 Τιβερίον Κλ[αυδίου]
 Διοτείμο[ν υἱὸν Σώ ?]
 στ[ρ]ατογ [Βησαίεα]
 5 Δ[.]ο[ρ][--- Ξυπε]-
 ται[ὼν ἀνέθηκεν].
vacat

No attempt will be made to complete the dedicator's name. The dedicatee may perhaps be mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 3938 (*s. I p.*): [- Θ]εόφιλον καὶ Κλαύδιον Σ[-]. In that case, he is to be identified probably as a son of Dioteimos I.

Meritt dated the inscription about the middle of the first century after Christ and referred for a probable identification to [Τι]βέριος Κλαύ[διος Τιβερίον] Κλ[αυδίου] υἱὸς Θεοφίλο[ν υἱὸς Δι]ότειμο[ς Βησα]ιεύς of *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, p. 67, No. 18, line 2. Raubitschek published this document and has contributed further to the history of the family from Besa.¹ He has identified Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos, son of Tiberius Claudius Theophilos, with Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos of *I.G.*, II², 1980 and 3930 (both documents dating from the middle of the first century after Christ).

This identification, however, seems to be questionable and for this reason I have entered two Τιβέριοι Κλαύδιοι Διότειμοι from Besa in my dissertation,² one being the grandfather and the other the grandson respectively. I shall elaborate my reasons for such a distinction.

A fragment, *I.G.*, II², 3580, incorporated by A. E. Raubitschek in his restored text, was dated by J. Kirchner on epigraphical grounds as *ante med. s. II p.*, commenting "At propter litteraturam titulus initio saeculi II recentior haberi vix potest" (against P. Graindor's restoration of the name [Φιλ]ότειμο[ς] in line 1).³ Kirchner's

¹ *Hesperia*, XXXV, 1966, p. 245.

² *The Early Expansion of Roman Citizenship into Attica during the First Part of the Empire* (200 B.C.-A.D. 70), Yale University, 1964 (unpublished), pp. 344, No. 593 and 357, No. 629.

³ Cf. also J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 84, note 27a.

comment may be stretched for a date in the middle of the first century, but the award of *civitas* to the family must also be considered.

Claudius was undoubtedly the one who honored this family with Roman citizenship, but Nero may not be ignored entirely.⁴ Both emperors were generous with the *civitas*, and the Claudii are numerous in Attic inscriptions.⁵ Raubitschek noted that "An important event in the history of this family was the grant of Roman citizenship to Dioteimos, son of Theophilos, from Besa."⁶ It is evident, however, from the text that the father Theophilos was also a *civis*. Thence, there emerge two possibilities, either both father and son received the *civitas* simultaneously, or the father was given citizenship first (or was already a *civis*), with the son inheriting it from him. The latter procedure is probably valid in this case, as will be seen below from the identity of Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos.

Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos (I) of *I.G.*, II², 3930 has been identified as a son of the hoplite general Theophilos, son of Theopeithes, from Besa (*I.G.*, II², 4478, dated at the beginning of the first century after Christ). Consequently, the age of this Theophilos (II), who may have received also the *civitas*, must be examined as approximately as possible. Theophilos (III), son of Dioteimos (I), was ephebe about A.D. 40/1-53/4 (*I.G.*, II², 1980, lines 6-8). This would place his birth at about A.D. 22/3-35/6, and that of his father, following a thirty-year cycle, at about 8/7 B.C.-A.D. 5/6. The birth of Theophilos (II) would be placed at about 38/7-25/4 B.C., and that of his father Theopeithes at about 68/7-55/4 B.C. His grandfather Theophilos (I) would have been born about 98/7-85/4 B.C. By the year A.D. 40 then, Theophilos (II) would have been at least 64-65 years of age. And if the archon Theopeithes of about 37/6 B.C. is identical with the father of Theophilos (II),⁷ we may have to move the age limits still further back, unless Theopeithes served as archon before his fortieth birthday.

I have already ascribed the award of the *civitas* to this family to Claudius (or Nero). At least when Theophilos (III) was an ephebe, neither he nor his father was a *civis*. No Roman names are recorded. Nor was Dioteimos (I) a *civis* when he was hoplite general in A.D. 41/2 (*I.G.*, II², 3268, lines 9-11).⁸ Dioteimos (I) is probably identical with the *paidotribes* of *I.G.*, II², 1969, line 5, and 1970, line 5.⁹ Both these inscriptions date from the year A.D. 45/6. If the identification is right, we may assume that the *civitas* came into the family after A.D. 45/6, and the *ephebeia* of Theophilos (III) may be dated also after this year. Thus, the chances that Theophilos (II) may

⁴ See also Raubitschek, *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, p. 70.

⁵ Elias A. Kapetanopoulos, "The Romanization of the Greek East: The Evidence of Athens," *Bull. American Soc. Papyrologists*, II, 2, February 1965, p. 51.

⁶ *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, p. 70.

⁷ Above, p. 95, No. 23. For the family's stemma prior to Dioteimos I and the sequence of numbering that should be followed, see J. Sundwall, *N.P.A.*, p. 95.

⁸ *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, pp. 68, 70; Raubitschek's date of this document is correct.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

also have received the *civitas* are lessened. It should be mentioned that the office of *paidotribia* is not recorded in the document, *Hesperia*, XII, No. 18. Raubitschek remarked that this office was unimportant to be cited in the *cursus honorum*.¹⁰ And I am aware of no Attic document where the *paidotribia* is included in the *cursus honorum*.

Another factor which must be considered here and which is relevant to a dating of *Hesperia*, XII, No. 18 is the erasure in lines 13-14 (see the "Restored Drawing" there on p. 69). It has been proposed that Nero's name may have been inscribed therein.¹¹ However, it is not wholly clear why we should have such a long erasure, when only the name of Nero would have sufficed.¹² It is my suspicion that something else was inscribed there which demanded a longer erasure. Nor can the mentioning of the Metroön (lines 11-12) be helpful in dating the inscription, not without a definite or approximate date of its adornment. Finally, Raubitschek has recently suggested new restorations for lines 19 and 20¹³ which would appear to imply perhaps a later date than the middle of the first century for the inscription.

The above observations lead to the conclusion that the *civitas* was awarded first to Dioteimos (I) (as Raubitschek has concluded but interpreting the evidence differently), and perhaps also at the same time to his son Theophilos (III), but not to Theophilos (II), sometime before the end of Claudius' reign, or even under Nero. I should say also here that Theophilos (II) is not attested with a Roman name in any other document, which would have left no doubt as to his being a *civis*. The award of the *civitas* to Dioteimos (I) may be taken as an indication that the family began to grow in prominence only with him. Hence, both the evidence and the question of age seem to favor a date for the document, *Hesperia*, XII, No. 18 at the beginning of the second century after Christ and an identification of Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos as a grandson of Dioteimos (I), as I have proposed in my dissertation. This would give us two hoplite generals by the name of Dioteimos from Besa. Dioteimos (II), son of Theophilos (III), would have been born about A.D. 52/3-65/6 and this would be in agreement with the new date, since adequate time is allowed for the offices which he held.

As for the date of I 839, let me say that it is contingent upon the correct identification of Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos, to wit, whether he is Dioteimos (I) or Dioteimos (II). Whether the document could be dated on epigraphical considerations alone is equivocal.

ELIAS KAPETANOPOULOS

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 70.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 71.

¹² Cf. *I.G.*, II², 1989, line 1; 1990, line 1; 3182, line 1; 3278, lines 1-2.

¹³ *Hesperia*, XXXV, 1966, p. 245, No. 5.