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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tibērion } & \ K[\lambda\alpha\iota\deltaion] \\
\text{Tibērion } & \ K[\alpha\iota\deltaion] \\
\text{Dioteimos } & \ [\nu \ \upsilon\ Σ\omega \ ?] \\
\text{στρατατ} & \ K[\beta\eta\sigmaα\iota\alpha\varepsilonα] \\
5 & \ Δ[\ldots]\ θ[-\ldots\ Ε\upsilon\pi\epsilon\-] \\
& \ \tauαι[\omega \ \alpha\nu\ \alpha\nu\\epsilon\thetaη\kappa\epsilon\nu].
\end{align*}
\]

vacat

No attempt will be made to complete the dedicator’s name. The dedicatee may perhaps be mentioned in \textit{I.G.}, II², 3938 (s. I p.): \([-\ Θ]ε\phi\l\o\] \ καὶ \ Κλα\υ\θιον \ 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 \([\text{Tibērion } \ K[\lambda\alpha\iota\deltaion]} \ Κλ[\alpha\iota\deltaion] \ Θε\phi\l\o][\nu \ \upsilon\ Δι] \ οτε\emph{m}\o[\sigma \ Β\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\ο\varsigma \ ο\nu\varsigma \ \textit{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.\footnote{Hesperia, XXXV, 1966, p. 245.} He has identified Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos, son of Tiberius Claudius Theophilos, with Tiberius Claudius Dioteimos of \textit{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 \textit{Tibērion } Κλα\υ\θίον \ Δι\o\tε\emph{m}\o\i\o from Besa in my dissertation,\footnote{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of Roman Citizenship into Attica during the First Part of the Empire (200 B.C.-A.D. 70), Yale University, 1964 (unpublished), pp. 344, No. 593 and 357, No. 629.} one being the grandfather and the other the grandson respectively. I shall elaborate my reasons for such a distinction.

A fragment, \textit{I.G.}, II², 3580, incorporated by A. E. Raubitschek in his restored text, was dated by J. Kirchner on epigraphical grounds as \textit{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 \[Φ\lambda] \ οτε\emph{m}\o[\varsigma \ in line 1]).\footnote{Cf. also J. H. Oliver, \textit{Hesperia}, XI, 1942, p. 84, note 27a.} Kirchner’s
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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. 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. However, it is not wholly clear why we should have such a long erasure, when only the name of Nero would have sufficed. 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 20 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.
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