

## HOPLON, AN ATHENIAN ARCHON OF THE THIRD CENTURY B. C.

AN inscription picked up by a visitor in May 1968 on the west side of the promontory of Sounion near the ship sheds was published by P. G. Themelis in *Δελτ.*, XXIV, 1969, *Χρονικά*, pp. 89-90, pl. 68, a. The stone is described as a slab of gray Hymettian marble, broken all around, 0.205 m. high, 0.225 m. wide and 0.06 m. thick. Only the beginning of a six line inscription is preserved. It is transcribed as follows:

ΕΠΙ ΟΠΛΩΝ [ ΠΙΤΑΝΟΨΙΩΝΟ [ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΗΣ ΚΑΤ [ ΠΡΟΣ ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣ Δ [ ΤΟΚΟΝ ΞΕΝΟΙ Ν [ ΕΥΘΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ [ 	Ἐπὶ ὀπλῶν [ Πιτανοψιῶνο [ς κειμένης ΚΑΤ [ πρὸς δραχμὰς δ [έκα τόκον ξένοι Ν [ Εὐθυκλέους [ 
---	---

In the commentary it is suggested that line 1 might be restored *ἐπὶ ὀπλῶν [στρατηγού του δέινος]* and understood as a reference to the Hoplite General, an officer known from other Attic inscriptions, including one from Sounion. It is further observed that if the Euthykes of line 6 is an eponymous archon we should be obliged to date the inscription in 398/7 B.C., but that the shapes of the letters do not agree with so early a date.

On December 22, 1970, I visited Sounion with Markellos Th. Mitsos, the former Director of the Epigraphical Museum, and examined the stone which is kept in the small storeroom on the site. Mr. Themelis, who is now studying abroad on a fellowship, and Mr. Liagouras, the Epimelete in charge of Attica, gave their permission.

I should like to offer a completely different interpretation of the inscription from that suggested by Themelis. The stone is clearly a horos, a rough slab such as these horoi usually are and smoothed only in the area actually inscribed. The material is, I think, a local limestone and not Hymettian marble. The stone is broken at the right but roughly finished at top and left. It is uncertain whether it is finished or cleanly broken at the bottom; in any case there were never more than six lines of text. The text too indicates a horos, a *hypothekē*, for the word ΚΕΙΜΕΝΗΣ in line 3 must be restored *ὑπο*κειμένης, and the mention of money below bears this out. The first line and a half give the date by archon and by month. I would restore:

Ἐπὶ Ὀπλῶν[ος ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς ]
Πιτανοψιῶνο[ς · ὄρος οἰκίας ὑπο-
κειμένης κατ[- - - - -]
πρὸς δραχμὰς Δ[- - - - -]

τόκον ξένοι Ν[ - - - - - ]  
 Εὐθυκλέους[ - - - - - ]

No archon Hoplon is known, nor has the name been found in Attica as far as I can discover though it occurs elsewhere. There is, however, a strange name ΟΠΑΩΝ which has been read in an inscription of the year of Diokles, 215/4 B.C. (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1539, line 7). The name Opaon is not attested anywhere else as far as I have found and it is indeed a rather unlikely name. I feel sure it should be read ΟΠΑΩΝ. I have examined with Mitsos at the Epigraphical Museum the stone on which the name occurs, and one cannot really tell whether the critical letter is Α or Λ. There is, however, no clear trace of a cross stroke for an alpha, but the space at the apex of the triangle inside is damaged which gives the impression of an alpha. This would account for the reading first made by Koumanoudes in 1876 and followed by subsequent editors. What is really significant, however, is that this man Opaon-Hoplon is identified in the inscription as an Areopagite. This means that he had once been an archon, not necessarily an eponymous archon, of course, but at least an archon, for the Areopagus was composed of ex-archons. Now, however, we have an eponymous archon named Hoplon on the stone from Sounion which from its letter forms would go well in the late third century B.C., and I have no doubt that he is the same person as the Areopagite Opaon-Hoplon known from the inscription of 215/4 B.C. His demotic is Phalereus.

There are two vacant years in the archon list shortly before 215/4 according to the table in B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 234-235, namely 217/6 and 223/2. The vacant years in the 230's have seemingly now been filled (*Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, pp. 434-435) but are in any case rather early for present purposes. Hoplon should, therefore, belong in either 217/6 or 223/2 B.C. The name would in fact fit exactly in line 8 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 794, as restored by S. Dow, *H.S.C.P.*, XLVIII, 1937, pp. 108-109. This is a decree of the archonship of Hagnias (216/5 B.C.) honoring the ephebes of the previous year (217/6). Dow had restored Euandros in line 8 as the archon of the previous year, but Euandros has since been moved to 212/1. On the other hand, the name of the archon of 223/2 is estimated by S. Dow to have had 9½ letters in the genitive case (*Prytaneis*, 1937, pp. 76-77, No. 30; cf. Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. xxiv). This is too long for Hoplon by two or three letters and would seem to exclude him from 223/2. The year 217/6 B.C. therefore appears to be the most likely year for Hoplon's archonship.

The last letter of line 3 is probably Τ; the left tip of the horizontal and bottom tip of the vertical seem to be preserved. One might expect here a name and demotic in the dative case. Alternatively one might restore κατ[ὰ τὰς συνθήκας] except that this phrase is usually continued with the words τὰς κειμένας παρὰ τῷ δέϊνι which is far too long for the available space.

The delta at the end of line 4 I take to be a digit of an acrophonic numeral rather than the start of the word *δέκα*.

I do not see how to construe the words *τόκον* and *ξένοι* in line 5. They do not appear on other horoi. The last letter in the line might be N or M.

Euthykles of line 6 is probably a creditor, or perhaps better a relative of a creditor since the name is in the genitive case.

EUGENE VANDERPOOL

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES  
ATHENS