

A NEW EPHEBIC INSCRIPTION FROM THE ATHENIAN AGORA

(PLATE 50)

AN ephobic stele dated in the archonship immediately preceding Diodotos, of blue Hymettian marble, was found August 4, 1970, over a drain on the Panathenaic Road at the northeast corner of the Royal Stoa in Section ΒΓ.¹ The top, bottom, and left side are broken off, but the right side is preserved. The back is rough picked. The face of the stone is cut off 0.16 m. above the first inscribed line and six lines, which contained the names of the ephobic instructors, have been purposely gouged out. An uninscribed lump of rock belonging to the stele measures approximately 0.13 × 0.18 × 0.095 m.

Height, 0.869 m.; width, 0.47 m.; thickness, 0.125 m.

Height of letters, 0.005–0.006 m.; line interval (center to center) 0.009 m.

Inv. No. I 7181.

Pl. 50

a. 229/8 a. Archon Heliodoros.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. 47–60.

- [Ἐπὶ Ἡλιοδώρου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ] τῆς Ἀκα[μαντίδος[...^{ca. 17}... πρυτανείας ἦι]
 [...^{ca. 18}... ἐγραμ]μάτευεν Βοη[δρομιῶνος ...^{ca. 13}...]
 [...^{ca. 11}... τῆς πρυτανεί]ας βουλὴ ἐν τῷ Παν[αθηναϊκῷ σταδίῳ]
 [τῶν προέδρων ἐπειρήφιζε]ν Νικόστρατος Μενεμάχου Ἀχα[ρνεύς
 5 [καὶ συμπρόεδροι^{vv} ἔδο]ξεν τῷ βουλευί καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. Σωσιγ[έν
 [ης ...^{ca. 18}...]^s εἶπεν^v ἔπειδὴ οἱ ἔφηβοι οἱ ἐπὶ Διοδό[τ]
 [ου ἀρχοντος τὰς θυσίας τὰ]ς καθηκούσας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας ἀρξάμενο[ι]
 [ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ καὶ τὰ]ς ἐγγραφὰς ἐκεῖ συνετέλεσαν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ
 [δήμου προαίρεσιν ἐπόμπευ]σαν δὲ καὶ τὰς πομπὰς τὴν τε τῶν Σεμνῶν Θ[ε]
 10 [ῶν καὶ τοῦ Ἰάκχου ὡς μάλισ]τα τοῖς πατρίοις ἀκολούθως εὐτακτοῦντ[ε]
 [ς ἤραντο δὲ καὶ τῷ θυσίῳ τοῦ]ς βοῦς ἀπεδήμησαν δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἐλευσίνα εὐσχ
 [ημόνως ὅπως ἂν εὐσεβῶς] ἔχει πάντα τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς λελειουργ
 [ήκασιν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μυστ]ηρίοις καθάπερ ἠγγέλθη αὐτοῖς διετέλεσαν
 [δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν εἰς τὰ] γυμνάσια ἔδραμον δὲ καὶ τὰς λαμπάδας^v
 15 [τοὺς δρόμους καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶ]νας ἠγωνίσαντο καλῶς καὶ εὐσημόνως
 [τοῖς Ἐπιταφίοις δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς] ὄπλοις ἀπόδειξιν ἐποιήσαντο ἐπεμελ[ή]
 [θησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν] πόλεων πειθόμενοι τοῖς στρατηγοῖς κα[ί]
 [τῷ κοσμητεῖ ἐλειούργησα]ν δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἡφαιστιείῳ διετέλεσαν δὲ κα[ί]
 [τὴν ἀσκησιν εὐτάκτως ποιοῦν]τες μετὰ τῶν ὄπλων οὐθενὸς αὐτοῖς μεριζ[ο]

¹ Professor T. Leslie Shear, Jr. has kindly given me permission to publish this inscription; I am especially grateful to him for his careful reading of the manuscript which has resulted in catching and correcting some inaccuracies. Work was done on the inscription while I was the recipient of a grant from the Research Institute of the University of Texas at Austin and Visiting Professor at the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.

- 20 [μένου ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου· ἐποιήσα]ντο δὲ καὶ πρὸς τῷ μελέτει τῷ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦ[ν],
[ἐπ' ἐξόδωι τῆς ἐφηβείας τὴν ἀπόδει]ξιν τῷ βουλευί τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὄπλοις ἀκολουθ[ω]ς
[τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τοῖς ψηφίσι]μασι τοῖς εἰς πολεμικὴν χρεῖαν καθήκουσιν κα ὕ
[θάπερ ἀποδεδειγμένοι ὑπ]έρ πατρίδος μέλλοντας ἀγαθοὺς ἀγωνίστας·
[γινόμενοι δὲ καὶ πειθόμε]νοι τε καὶ ἐπιμελεῖς ἀκολουθῶντες δὲ ταῖς ἐγγραφῆ
25 [αῖς ἐν ἀκροπόλει εὐδόξως τ]ὰ ἐξιτητήρια παρασκευάζονται ποιεῖν ἵνα
[τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν μετὰ] πασῆς εὐκοσμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰς χλαμύδας ὕ
[εὐσχημόνως παρέχ[ω]σι]ν ὕ ὅπως ἂν οὖν αἰεὶ τοῖς ἐφηβεύουσιν ἐφάμιλλ
[λον ἢ εἰδόσιν τοὺς πειθαρ]χοῦντας τοῖς χειροτονουμένοις ἐπὶ τὴν εὐ-
[ταξίαν τιμηθέντας, ἀγαθῷ τυ]χεὶ δεδόχθαι τῷ βουλευί τοὺς λαχόντας ὕ
30 [προέδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσα]ν ἐκκλησίαν χρηματίσαι περὶ τούτων γνώμην ὕ
[δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλ]ῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι δόκεῖ τῷ βουλευί ἐπαι ὕ
[νέσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ Διοδότου ἐ]φηβεύσαντας καὶ στεφανῶσαι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι
[εὐταξίας ἔνεκα καὶ εὐσεβ]είας καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἣν ἔχοντες διατετελέκα ὕ
[σιν εἰς τὴν βουλήν κ]αὶ τὸν δῆμον καὶ ἀνειπεῖν τοὺς στεφάνους Διονυσίων
35 [τε τῶν ἐν ἄστει καὶ] Παναθηαίων καὶ Ἐλευσινίων τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν·
[τῆς δὲ ἀναγορεύσειω]ς καὶ ποιήσεως τῶν στεφάνων ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς στ
[ρατηγούς καὶ τὸ]ν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν· ὑπάρχει δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ
[προεδρίαν ἐμ πᾶ]σιν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν οἷς ἡ πόλις τίθησιν· δοῦναι δ' αὐτοῖς κα
[ὶ ἀνάθημα ἐν τόπωι] οὗ ἂν αὐτοὶ αἴρωνται· ἐπαινε[σαι δὲ] καὶ τὸν παιδοτρῆ
40 [βην...^{ca. 13}.....]ου Ἀχαρν[έα] ὅτ[ι το]ῖς νό[μοις τοῦ δήμου] καὶ τοῖς ψη
[φίσμασιν----- ca. 38 -----]δὲ καὶ τὸν
[----- ca. 43 -----]ἀκον]τ[ι]στήν
[----- ca. 50 -----]να
[----- ca. 49 -----]ου
45 [. ^{ca. 6}... κα]ὶ τὸν γραμ[ματέα--- ca. 25 - στε]φ[α]ν[ο]ν
[ῶσαι ἕκ]αστον αὐτῶν [θ]αλλο[ῦ] στεφάνωι· ἀν]αγράψαι δὲ τό[δε τὸ] ψήφ[ι]
[σμα καὶ] τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρ[ο]τα[ν]είαν
[ἐν στή]λει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἀγορᾷ· τὸ δὲ γενόμενον ἀνάλω[μα]
[μερί]σαι τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. *vacat*

vacat 0.027
in tribus linearibus
circulis
50 ἡ βουλή
ὁ δῆμος
[τ]ὸν κοσμη
[τ]ὴν Νικόβου
λον Ἐργοχά
55 ρου Ὁῆ
θεν

vacat 0.037
in tribus linearibus
circulis
57 ἡ βουλή
ὁ δῆμος
τοὺς ἐφή
60 βους

vacat 0.027
in tribus linearibus
circulis
61 οἱ ἔφη
βοι τὸν κο
σμητὴν Νι
κόβουλον Ἐρ
65 γοχάρον
Ὁῆθεν

[ΟΙ ΕΦ]ΗΒΕΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΠΙ ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ

	[[Ἀντιγονίδος]	82	Ἀκαμαντίδος
	[---]ος Σωφίλου Ἀγρυλῆθεν		Οἰνείδος
70	[---]ετος Φίλωνος Λαμπτρέύς		Εὐκρίτος Εὐκρίτου Ἐπικηφίσιος
	[[Δημητριάδος]	85	Ἐργοχάρης Νικοβούλου Οἰῆθεν
	[---] Φιλωτάδου Φυλάσιος		Στησίλεως Νικοβούλου Οἰῆθεν
	[---Δη]μητρίου Ἀτηνεύς		Ἀνθέμιων Θεοφῶντος Περιθοίδης
	[----Δη]μητρίου Ἀτηνεύς		Οἰνόβιος Οἰνοβίου Ἐπικηφίσιος
75	[-----]φίλου Μελιτεύς		Δημήτριος Μηνοφίλου Ἀχαρνε[ύς]
	[Ἐρεχθείδος]	90	Κεκροπίδος
	[-----]ου Κηφισιεύς		Λυσῖνος Κηφισοφῶντος Ἀθμ[ονεύς]
	[-----] Κηφισιεύς		Ἴπποθωντίδος
	[Αἰγείδος]		Κόνων Ξενοφάντο[υ-----]
80	[-----] Ἐρχιεύς		Ἄβας Κλεάνδρο[υ-----]
	[-----]του Ἐρχιε ^v		Αἰαντ[ίδος]

This is the first text to attest the archon Diodotos. His existence was necessarily implied by the archon Diodotos ὁ μετὰ Φαναρχίδην whose name appears in Agora I 973 b + I 5457, part of a prytany stele, other fragments of which had been published as *I.G.*, II², 916, *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, no. 49 and *Athenian Agora*, XV, no. 187.² The text was formerly dated 192/1.³ The discovery of a new secretary necessitated the displacement of Diodotos ὁ μετὰ Φαναρχίδην from that year and he was reassigned to 180/79.⁴ Meritt tentatively placed Diodotos with a question mark in 202/1 without giving any reason other than the necessity of dating him earlier than his like-named successor.⁵

We are now in a position to determine the date of Diodotos more precisely. It is clear that he must be dated earlier than 201/0 since the names of the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias have been erased. The character of the writing indicates a date in the second half of the third century B.C. and an earlier rather than a later date in that period. Unfortunately the name and the deme of the secretary of the Boule are not preserved to help us in dating the decree, and we are left with the evidence to be gathered from the prosopographical data and from such indications in the content of the decree as may be significant for that purpose.

² B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora*, XV, *Inscriptions, The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton, 1974.

³ Meritt, *Athenian Year*, p. 235; Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1940, pp. 114–115.

⁴ *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, p. 89; *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, pp. 238–239.

⁵ *Athenian Year*, p. 235.

Happily there are valuable prosopographical indications for closely approximating, if not actually fixing, the date of Diodotos' archonship. The father of the first ephebos under the tribe Demetrias, Philotades Phylasios (line 72) was surely the polemarchos of 228/7 (archonship of Leochares), Philotades Phyla(sios), whose name, demotic and title appear in *I.G.*, II², 1706, line 13; the father of Konon, the first ephebos under the tribe Hippothontis, Xenophantos (line 93), may, with reasonable certainty, be identified with Xenophantos Keiri(ades), the archon basileus three years later in the archonship of Niketes, 225/4 (*I.G.*, II², 1706, line 42), especially since a Konon, son of Konon of the deme Keiriadai is known from *ca.* 150/49 (*I.G.*, II², 958) as well as a Konon who was lessee of property in Delos, *ca.* 219/8 (*Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, p. 330, no. 137).

The minimum age qualification for holding the office of archon was in all likelihood thirty, since Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 63, 3) tells us that jury service in the dikasteria was limited to citizens of that age, and by analogy we may assume with Kahrstedt⁶ and Hignett⁷ that the same age was required for all magistracies.

If a man was archon in 228/7 and had become archon at any age from 30 to 70 and had a son at any age from 25 to 35, the ephebate of that son would fall in some year between 255/4 and 205/4, a span of 45 years in which Diodotos' archonship must be placed. The most probable assumption for the age at which, on the average, a man would hold the office of polemarchos or basileus (40–50) and have a son born to him (25–35; age as late as 40 is excluded because it would put the ephebate after the abolition of the tribes of Antigonis and Demetrias) would narrow the possibilities for that son's ephebate to the years 235/4 to 215/4. The unmistakable indications of the existence of war in the language of the decree in this inscription (see pp. 256–258) would further restrict the dating of Diodotos to one of the five closing years of the Demetrian War, 234/3 to 230/29, perhaps most likely to 230/29, one of three years in that period which were unoccupied until 1969, but for which candidates have since been found. With a son enrolled in the ephebia at age 18 in 230/29, the polemarchos Philotades Phylasios would have held office at age 45 and had a son at 25; the archon basileus, Xenophantea Keiri(ades), would have been functioning at age 42 and had a son at 25.

A prosopographical item strengthens the suggested dating. The restoration (albeit with a question mark) of the patronymic of an ephebos of Hippothontis in the archonship of Menekrates, 220/19, [. . . : ? . . .] Κλεά[νδρου? Ἀμαξ]αντεύ[ς],⁹ if correct, makes it possible to recognize in him a brother of our second ephebos from Hippothontis, Abas Kleandro(u---) in line 94, and to restore the demotic Hamaxanteus for him. To make the difference in their ages as small as would be likely, the latest year in the Demetrian War, 230/29, would be most reasonable for Diodotos.

⁶ *Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens*, II, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1936, p. 18.

⁷ *History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford, 1970, p. 224.

⁹ *Hesperia*, XV, 1946, p. 192, no. 37, line 26.

An examination of the recent filling of the unoccupied years in the series of archons of the late third century before Christ is in order. The discovery of an inscription from the archonship of Philinos, with the full name of the prytany-secretary hitherto unknown, displaced Philostratos in 254/3 and made it necessary to find another year for him.¹⁰ Philostratos was one of four archons under whom Kallisthenes served as a military officer. The citations, which honor him for his service on the base at Rhamnous, from left to right consist of one by the Hippeis, another by the Boule and the Demos for his service under Philostratos as phylarch, two by the Boule and the Demos as strategos under Phanostratos and under Pheidostratos, and two as hipparch in the year of Antimachos.¹¹ Kolbe¹² felt that the rank of hipparch was held before that of strategos, i.e. that Antimachos preceded Phanostratos and Pheidostratos as archons. J. Pouilloux¹³ accepted the sequence and followed Meritt's¹⁴ dating of the archons,—Philostratos 254/3, Antimachos 251/0, Phanostratos 238/7 and Pheidostratos 234/3.

In 1968, E. Vanderpool published an inscription from Eleusis which contained a decree honoring the treasurer of a thiasos for helping the members of the association in time of war.¹⁵ The date of the treasurer's appointment was given in line 2 as [--- ἐπ' Ἀ]ριστίωνος ἄρχοντος. Vanderpool suggested that the new Athenian archon, as he conceived him to be, be placed in the earliest possible year of the Demetrian War because it was at the beginning of the war that the people of Eleusis were in trouble (*I.G.*, II², 1299) and suggested 238/7 as his year, thus displacing Phanostratos. Since Phanostratos and Pheidostratos were the only archons in the period "not at all firmly anchored" he added, "Phanostratos and Pheidostratos may be placed tentatively in 234/3 and 233/2 B.C."

In his discussion of the displacement of Philostratos from 254/3 by Philinos and of Phanostratos by Aristion, Meritt suggested shifts which would keep the career of Kallisthenes within the reign of Demetrios II and preserve the sequence of the four archons, under whom he served, as adopted by Pouilloux.¹⁶ He accomplished this by assigning, without giving a specific reason for the changes, Philostratos, who was displaced from 254/3 by Philinos, to 234/3; Antimachos from 251/0 to 233/2; Phanostratos, who was displaced by Aristion from 238/7 to 232/1; and Pheidostratos from 234/3 to 230/29 (or to 231/0, if Jason held the archonship in 230/29). Since the archons of 239/8 and of 237/6 to 235/4 are fixed in the years given, the list of archons in the

¹⁰ J. S. Traill, *Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, p. 418, no. 1.

¹¹ *I.G.*, II², 2854.

¹² *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1936, p. 2172.

¹³ *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris, 1954, p. 122.

¹⁴ *Athenian Year*, p. 234.

¹⁵ *Δελτιον*, XXIII, 1968, pp. 1-6.

¹⁶ *Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, pp. 434-435.

decade of the Demetrian War was thus made complete, with no room for Diodotos whose inclusion in the period 234/3–230/29 is so clearly indicated in this inscription.

Obviously one of the archons whom Meritt assigns to the period 234/3–230/29 must be removed to make room for Diodotos. Only Jason is definitely connected with this period on evidence from the *Index Stoicorum*, col. XXVIII, albeit with no definiteness for a specific year,¹⁷ since Vanderpool reports¹⁸ that in Agora I 5796, where Pheidostratos' name occurs as archon, the demotic of the secretary which was read $\epsilon[\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma]$ does not exist and that the secretary's patronymic cannot have been Ktesippos.¹⁹ Pheidostratos' connection with the secretary-cycle for the year 234/3 has disappeared.

To be sure, Pheidostratos could be moved to some year as yet unoccupied. But the shifting of his name involves the names of the three other archons under whom Kallisthenes served, preferably placed so that Philostratos in whose year Kallisthenes was phylarch comes first in the series and precedes Antimachos in whose year Kallisthenes was hipparch.

Pouilloux²⁰ has questioned the inclusion of Aristion in the list of Athenian archons, since a private association passed the decree in the Eleusinian inscription and in such a document the title archon may often mean the head of the group in question. Pouilloux rightly maintains that Aristion should not necessarily be considered an archon eponymous until we possess indubitable evidence that he actually was. Although Meritt²¹ cites Pouilloux's article, he makes no comment on it and apparently accepts Aristion as an archon of Athens.

If we remove Aristion from the archons in the period of the Demetrian War, the four archons comprising the period of Kallisthenes' military career may still be fitted into the decade, but only by breaking the sequence of archons followed by Pouilloux. Antimachos must be placed in 233/2, position V of the secretary cycle. Philostratos should then be assigned to Phanostratos' old year from which Aristion has been taken, 238/7, and Phanostratos given 234/3, Pheidostratos 232/1, Jason 231/0 and Diodotos 230/29. With the exception of Jason and Diodotos, the remaining three names should be accompanied by question marks to indicate their tentative placement in these years.

PROSOPOGRAPHICAL DATA

Two of the names occurring in this inscription appear among the contributors to the epidosis for the safety of the city and defense of the country which was collected

¹⁷ Meritt, *Athenian Year*, pp. 224–226.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.* (note 15), p. 3 and note 14.

¹⁹ Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. xxiii.

²⁰ "Un nouvel archonte d'Athènes au III^e siècle dans un décret d'Eleusis?", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, IV, 1969, pp. 1–6.

²¹ *Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, p. 435, note 24.

in the archonship of Diomedon while Eurykleides was treasurer of the military funds.²² Ferguson,²³ following the accepted dating of the time, put the contribution in 232/1 about two years before the death of Demetrios II and associated it with the danger to the crops on the Thriasian and Athenian plains by reason of the raids of Aratos. However, the date 247/6 advocated by Pritchett-Meritt²⁴ has now for some time been accepted for the archon Diomedon. The contributor Kephison Athmoneus²⁵ is almost certainly to be identified with Kephison, the father of the ephebos Lysinos Athmoneus in line 91. A Kephison, son of Lysinos, appears in an unidentified list of names on a fragment dated by letter forms in the late third century B.C.²⁶ but the editor restored the demotic Lamptreus following the demotics of the two preceding names. The name Lysinos (tribe Kekropis) occurs in a catalogue of the middle of the fourth century B.C.²⁷ The second contributor Sosigenes Paianicus²⁸ bears the same name as the orator of this decree (line 5) but his deme name is not preserved.

Lines 1, 6. The archon Diodotos may well have been a later member of the wealthy family known from Lysias, XXXII, 4, in the orator's time represented by Diodotos and his brother Diognetos.²⁹ The deme of the family is not known.

Prominent men by the name of Diodotos are attested in four of the demes in which the name occurs:

Hamaxanteia. Diodotos, son of Philinos, syntrierarch before 334/3 (*I.G.*, II², 1623 *Ab*, lines 99 and 115–116) and Diodotos, son of Theodoros, a possible descendant, who was councillor of Hippothontis in 178/7³⁰ and in the middle of the second century was secretary of a board of Peiraieus magistrates.³¹ The mint magistrates named Diodotos in 183/2, 175/4 and 167/6, who were perhaps the same man (as M. Thompson suggests), may be identical with the councillor of 178/7.³²

Phrearrioi. Diodotos, son of Diognetos, secretary of the prytaneis in 250/49.³³

Phlya. Diognetos, son of Diodotos, who was concerned in a law suit against the naval epimeletai in 349/8.³⁴

Oion. Diodotos of the deme of Oion, whose name appears on a gravestone (*I.G.*, II², 7071) was possibly connected with the family of the orator Aischines.³⁵

²² *I.G.*, II², 791 and *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 287, no. 56.

²³ *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911, pp. 203–204.

²⁴ *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. xxii.

²⁵ *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 291, no. 56, col. II, line 60.

²⁶ *Hesperia*, III, 1934, p. 60, no. 49, line 5.

²⁷ *I.G.*, II², 2385, line 86.

²⁸ *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 291, no. 56, col. II, line 69.

²⁹ Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford, 1971, p. 154, no. 3895.

³⁰ *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, p. 120, no. 64, line 56.

³¹ *I.G.*, II², 1711, lines 7, 17–18; Davies, *loc. cit.*

³² *New Silver Coinage of Athens*, New York, 1961, p. 560.

³³ *I.G.*, II², 778, 780–782.

³⁴ *I.G.*, II², 1620, lines 41f.; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 130, no. 3874.

³⁵ Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 543, no. 14625.

Line 4. The proposer of the decree, Nikostratos, son of Menemachos Acharneus, was very likely a member of the family of Pythodoros (II) son of Nikostratos (I) Acharneus (*P.A.*, 12413 with stemma) whose latest descendant by that name was Nikostratos (IV), son of Pythodoros (III) Acharneus, councillor of Oineis in the period 290/89–280/79.³⁶ Our Nikostratos would belong to the second generation after the councillor of Oineis.³⁷

Line 69. Sophilos, the father of the ephebos from Agryle, may possibly be the same man as the councillor of Antigonis with that name in the period 210/9–201/0.³⁸ Sophilos of Kollyte who was one of the contributors in the epidosis of 247/6³⁹ was a contemporary and may have been related since Agryle and Kollyte were for a time in the same tribe of Aigeis.

Line 70. (Ark)esilas, son of Philon, the sophronistes of the tribe Antigonis in 305/4⁴⁰ may be an earlier relative of the ephebos whose father was Philon of Lamprai. But the sophronistes was more likely from the deme Paiania, since the name Arkesilas occurs only in that deme in the tribe Antigonis.

Lines 73–74. The two sons of Demetrios Ateneus are connected with Nikasion son of Demetrios Ateneus (*P.A.*, 10725), orator of a decree in Skyros *post* 196/5 (*B.C.H.*, III, 1879, p. 63).

Line 87. An earlier ancestor of Anthemion, son of Theophon Perithoides may be recognized in the supervisor of the dockyard in 356/5, Anthemion Perithoides (*I.G.*, II², 1617 *c*, line 77; 1622 *d*, line 483).

The decree honoring the epheboi was, from the first extant decree of that kind in 305/4,⁴¹ regularly passed by the Ekklesia and incorporated the *προβούλευμα* of the Boule. This is also true of the inscriptions of the third century B.C. which preserve the pertinent section: 266/5, *I.G.*, II², 665, lines 4–5; 259/8, *I.G.*, II², 700 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 110–114, no. 20, line 4; 246/5, *I.G.*, II², 766 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 114–115, no. 21, lines 3–4, 6; 237/6, *I.G.*, II², 787, lines 4, 7; end third century, *Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, p. 218, no. 14, lines 3–6 (only the probouleumatic formula preserved in part).

Here, however, the decree is proposed and passed by the Boule (line 3) although it is introduced by the formula [ἔδο]ξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳι (line 5) and includes the probouleumatic formula (lines 29–31). The only other instance of the passage of

³⁶ *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, p. 36, no. 3, line 6.

³⁷ Cf. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 481, no. 12413 and D. M. Lewis, *Hesperia*, XXVIII, 1959, pp. 232ff.

³⁸ *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, no. 39, line 21 = *I.G.*, II², 912, line 21.

³⁹ *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 287, no. 56, col. II, line 77.

⁴⁰ Reinmuth, *Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.*, *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. XIV, Leiden, 1971, p. 88, no. 17 = *I.G.*, II², 478, line 33.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, no. 17 = *I.G.*, II², 478, lines 2, 8–9.

this decree by the Boule in the third century is recorded in *I.G.*, II², 794 which Dow revised and dated in 216/5.⁴²

The reason why the Boule and not the Ekklesia passed the decree in honor of the epheboi in these years is not clear. Some two centuries later we find the same procedure. In 79/8 (*I.G.*, II², 1039) the decrees concerning the epheboi are headed βουλῆς ψηφίσματα (line 2) and begin δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι (lines 8, 39–40, 60) without the addition of καὶ τῶι δήμωι or the occurrence of the probouleumatic formula. Similarly in 38/7 (*I.G.*, II², 1043), after [β]ουλῆ ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι ἢ [μεταχ]θεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ Πα[ναθη]-ναϊκοῦ σταδίου (lines 4–5), the decrees begin δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι (lines 10, 36; restored in 53, 69). The two last mentioned inscriptions show other departures from the usual procedures and formulas, which, together with the passage of the decrees by the Boule, have been explained by the fact that an aristocratic and not a democratic government was in control in the year 79/8 shortly after Sulla and in 38/7 while Antonius was in the ascendancy in the East.⁴³

A similar situation very likely existed in the year following the archonship of Diodotos, 229/8, and possibly also in 216/5. In the extremely perilous circumstances which prevailed in 229/8, one can well conjecture that the Boule may have taken control, bypassing the Ekklesia, in order to cope with the emergency.

The place of meeting of the Boule in 229/8 was the Panathenaic Stadium instead of the usual Bouleuterion and so almost certainly in 216/5. For the latter year Dow combined the suggestions of Koehler and Dinsmoor to restore in *I.G.*, II², 794, line 4 βουλῆ ἐν τῶι Ἐλευσινίωι καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ], an unparalleled restoration, which Pélékidis⁴⁴ rightly rejected for βουλῆ ἐν τῶι Παναθηναϊκῶι σταδίωι], and this restoration is supported by the clear reading of that place of meeting here. Pélékidis, reviving the suggestions of Pittakis and Dumont (correctly in my opinion), also restored καὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐποίησαντο ἐν τῶι Πα[ναθηναϊκῶι] τῆ βουλῆι, in the inscription of 106/5 (*I.G.*, II², 1011, lines 21–22), adducing for the use of τὸ Παναθηναϊκόν alone to designate the Stadium Philostratos, *Vit. Soph.*, II, 1, 15, p. 245, ed. Kayser. But the session of the Boule in 106/5 was held for the review of the epheboi and was not the occasion for the passage of decrees in their honor. Ephebic decrees passed by the Boule at a session in the Panathenaic Stadium are now known for the years 229/8 (this inscription), 216/5,⁴⁵ 192/1,⁴⁶ 38/7,⁴⁷ and by the Boule, place of meeting not stated, in 79/8.⁴⁸ A meeting of the Ekklesia in the Panathenaic Stadium is attested for 188/7.⁴⁹

⁴² *Harv. St. Class. Phil.*, XLVIII, 1937, pp. 108–109.

⁴³ Reinmuth, *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 262–272.

⁴⁴ *Rev. ét. gr.*, LXIII, 1950, pp. 112–117.

⁴⁵ *I.G.*, II², 794; *Harv. St. Class. Phil.*, XLVIII, 1937, pp. 108–109.

⁴⁶ *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. 114 + *I.G.*, II², 916 + *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, no. 49.

⁴⁷ *I.G.*, II², 1043.

⁴⁸ *I.G.*, II², 1039.

⁴⁹ *I.G.*, II², 893; cf. Pélékidis, *op. cit.* (note 44), p. 118.

Noteworthy, too, is the fact that here only, if our reading of line 40 is correct, the praise of an instructor, the paidotribes, includes a causal clause, "because he (acted in obedience to ?) the laws and decrees of the Demos."

This is one of the most complete ephebic texts of the third century B.C. Of the 31 ephebic documents which can be dated in that century only three consist of more than a few words or lines of the decree, fragmentary rosters or an isolated citation.⁵⁰ It is invaluable in its contribution to our knowledge of the activities for which the epheboi were praised and for the formulas employed in expressing commendation in this transitional phase of the institution.

As can readily be seen in my study of the ephebic inscriptions of the fourth century B.C.⁵¹ the record of the epheboi of that period consisted of an annual anathema for each tribe, set up by that tribe. It usually contained a decree praising in general terms the sophronistes and/or the epheboi (in the first extant inscription the kosmetes is praised) together with a roster of the epheboi.

The inscription of 305/4 (*I.G.*, II², 478 as revised by Reinmuth, *Eph. Inscr. of the Fourth Cent.* B.C., p. 86, no. 17), however, showed a change. After a decree of the Boule and the Demos in praise of the kosmetes, sophronistes, instructors and epheboi, it listed the epheboi of all tribes on the same stone and gave clear indication that the term of ephebic service had been reduced to one year. The words which survive in the few lines of praise of the epheboi indicate the commendation is restricted to their *σωφροσύνη*, *εὐταξία*, and obedience to the laws with no specific mention of their activities.

The first extant inscription of the third century B.C. which gives us the decree of praise at any length mentions their obedience to the laws and to the kosmetes and then specifically their continuing service during the year in guarding Mouseion Hill under the command of the strategos, *πο[λέμου κατέ]χοντος τὴν πόλιν*, i.e. at the outset of the Chremonidean War (*I.G.*, II², 665, lines 8–12). The body of the decree of 259/8 is only partly preserved⁵² but the mention of *δρόμοι* (line 14) and *ἀπόδειξις* (line 17) adumbrate the fuller description of their activities in later decrees. The inscription of 246/5⁵³ again lacks the larger portion of the decree and gives only a general reason for crowning the epheboi with a golden crown *κατὰ τὸν [νόμον]*, namely [*εὐταξίας ἔνεκεν*] *καὶ φ[ι]λοτιμίας* (lines 14–15).

The original purpose of organizing the ephebic corps was doubtless to train young men for war and to use their services during the period of training for guard duty in Attica. In times of war the corps was on "active duty" as a component of

⁵⁰ *I.G.*, II², 665 (266/5); *I.G.*, II², 700 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 110–114, no. 20 (259/8); and *I.G.*, II², 766 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 114–115, no. 21 = *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, pp. 5–7 (246/5).

⁵¹ Above, note 40.

⁵² *I.G.*, II², 700 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 110–114, no. 20.

⁵³ *I.G.*, II², 766 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 114–115, no. 21.

the levy of fighting men. In the third century B.C. it no longer included all young men 18–20 years of age but only a select few who had enrolled, presumably voluntarily, in that military training unit, which, however, was subject to specific laws as to its duties and privileges, and to the commands of the people transmitted through the strategoi and the kosmetes. Of course, the small ephebic corps, which consisted as it did of fewer than fifty men, to judge from the surviving fragmentary rosters, could play only a most insignificant role in war. But even so, the primary military character of the ephebia is clearly shown in the inscription here published as it is also in the inscription of 266/5.

The language of the decree gives some indication that it had been passed at a time when the military training of the epheboi could be of immediate use to the state. To be sure, this was, in general terms, the situation in almost every year of the third century except perhaps the short period between 229/8, when Athens was freed from subservience to Macedonia, and 224/3, when Antigonos Doseon brought a large force of men to the Isthmus against Kleomenes and there was some reason to fear that he would respect the neutrality of Athens only so long as the Athenians were strong enough to preserve it.

In 230/29, however, Athens had a pressing need for defense against the repeated incursions of Aratos into Attica, which he hoped would force Athens to enter the Achaean League. Beginning as early as 239/8, the forces of the Achaean League under Aratos had again and again invaded Attica, ravaging the land and destroying the crops, so that in 230/29 the fields could no longer be cultivated and Athens, which was largely dependent on its own crops, was lacking even seed grain, while at the same time Aetolian pirates raided the coasts of Attica.⁵⁴

Although Aratos had been decisively beaten by Bithys, the general of Demetrios II, at Phylakia in 233/2, he recovered sufficiently to reach Corinth and advance toward Athens. He was in no position to take the city by siege, but he was able to demonstrate that he was still a threat to its continued independence. Demetrios was in no position to help. Indeed the army under Bithys was urgently needed to assist him against the Dardanians who were invading from the north and with whom Demetrios was to be wholly occupied until his death in 229/8. Athens was thrown upon its own resources for its defense. Its concern at this juncture was not for its role in peninsular and Aegean politics. The Chremonidean War had ended that. At stake was Athens' survival as an autonomous city.

This situation, it seems to me, is reflected in this inscription in the unique praise of the epheboi for the assiduity with which they engaged in military training, although the Demos had not specifically assigned to them more than their usual program (lines 18–20), *διετέλεσαν δὲ κα[ὶ τὴν ἀσκησιν εὐτάκτως ποιοῦν]τες μετὰ τῶν ὀπλων οὐθενὸς*

⁵⁴ Tarn, *C.A.H.*, VII, 744–747; Beloch, *Gr. G.*, IV, i, p. 633; ii, pp. 529–530; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 206f.; cf. *I.G.*, II², 834, lines 7–10.

αὐτοῖς μερζ[ομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου]. In the archonship of Menekles, 267/6, at the outbreak of the Chremonidean War, the epheboi had been commended for their specific service in assuming the guard of the Mouseion Hill, πο[λέμου κατέ]χοντος τὴν πόλιν, in compliance with the city's command (*I.G.*, II², 665, lines 8–13). Here they are praised for their voluntary assumption of training “above and beyond the call of duty” to meet a threat to the city. The decree goes on to emphasize that they made an [ἀπόδει]ξις τῆι βουλῆι pursuant to the laws and decrees τοῖς εἰς πολεμικὴν καθήκουσιν. An apodeixis ἐν τοῖς ὄπλοις before the Boule at the conclusion of the ephebate was a customary practice. This review of the ephebic corps seems to have been a more elaborate one (perhaps another restoration than ἐπ' ἐξόδωι is called for, especially since it makes this line a few letters longer than average), not only because to the customary statement that it was made according to the laws and the decrees is added “appropriate to the needs of war,” but also because the decree goes on to state that the review gave demonstration that the epheboi had, by their voluntary extra exertions, become valiant prospective fighters for their country (line 23), [ὑπ]έρ πατρίδος μέλλοντας ἀγαθοὺς ἀγωνιστάς.

Significant, too, in this decree is the statement that mindful of and obedient to the oath sworn at the time of their enrolment (line 24), [πειθόμε]νοι τε καὶ ἐπιμελεῖς ἀκολουθῶς δὲ ταῖς ἐγγραφ[αῖς], the young men were prepared to demonstrate at the conclusion of their ephebate (τά ἐξιτητήρια, which supports the restoration ἐπ' ἐξόδωι in line 21) both by their carriage and the care taken for the appearance of their uniforms that they had been faithful to their oath not only in letter but in spirit.

There had been times of crisis before. Contributions for the safety of the city and the defense of the country had been collected in the archonship of Diomedon, 247/6,⁵⁵ and while Antimachos⁵⁶ was archon. Indeed the situation in the years 232/1 to 230/29 was so much like that which is reflected in the inscription recording the epidosis in the archonship of Diomedon that it was originally dated in 232/1. But while the call for contributions in the year of Diomedon was made so that the treasurer would have funds enough to insure that during the remainder of the year the crops might be brought in with safety (lines 10–13), the situation in 230/29 seems to have deteriorated to such an extent that Ferguson⁵⁷ could describe it as follows: “The situation in the autumn of 230 B.C. was almost hopeless. The land lay untilled and the people had no seed grain.” In this critical year the epheboi rallied to meet the situation by rigorous training in order to acquit themselves well in what, in all likelihood, would be an assault on the city itself.

The next year brought relief. The Macedonian garrison was paid off with 150

⁵⁵ *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 287–292, no. 56.

⁵⁶ Now tentatively assigned to 233/2. Previously dated 257/6 and 251/0. *I.G.*, II², 768 and *Addenda*, 12–13; *I.G.*, II², 798 as revised in *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, pp. 583, 585; Meritt, *Athenian Year*, p. 234. See above pp. 250–251.

⁵⁷ *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 206.

talents to which Aratos himself made a contribution of twenty talents and Athens for the first time in 65 years had no foreign garrison within the borders of Attica. Demetrios II died at the end of the summer of 229/8, and for a few years Athens was free from an immediate threat to its autonomy.

In this new inscription for the first time we find mention of specific activities of the epheboi other than strictly military, activities which are routinely recorded in the inscriptions of the second and first centuries B.C.: their escort under arms in the parades which honor various deities (lines 9–10); their journey to Eleusis and participation in the Mysteries and the sacrifices there (lines 11–12); their paramilitary exercises in the gymnasia and competition in foot races and lampades (lines 14–15); their ἀπόδειξις ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις (line 16); their liturgical services at the Hephaistieia (line 18); and their practice in sailing boats (line 20). Some of these activities, if not all of them, were perhaps recorded in the missing parts of the decrees in the years 259/8 and 246/5 as is indicated by the preservation of the words δρόμοι and ἀπόδειξις in the former.⁵⁸

It is clear, however, that the military importance of the ephebia, declining but still prominent in the second half of the third century, was almost completely lost after Flaminius' proclamation of freedom for the Greeks in 196/5 and the alliance of Athens with Rome early in the second century B.C. Military activity and military training continue in the ephebia and the formulas recounting them are tralatitiously repeated in the inscriptions of that and the following centuries, but they are mere exercises which are not put into use in actual war. The form remains; the substance has disappeared. We find continuing mention of μελέτη, ἄσκησις ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις (e.g. 127/6, *Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, pp. 228–232, lines 16–17); φυλακή of the city and of the Peiraeus (185/4, *I.G.*, II², 900, line 18 and as late as 79/8, *I.G.*, II², 1039, line 50); apodeixeis before the Boule (119/8, *I.G.*, II², 1008, lines 29–30), originally a display of the proficiency the epheboi had acquired in their training, but also at purely ceremonial occasions at the Theseia and Epitapheia (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, line 23), while escorting Iakchos and Artemis Agrotera (119/8, *I.G.*, II², 1008, line 7), while acting as honor guard at sessions of the Ekklesia (127/6, *Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, pp. 228–232, lines 26–27); while making their ὑπάντησις τοῖς ἱεροῖς (100/99, *I.G.*, II², 1028, line 9) and τοῖς συμμαχοῖς καὶ τοῖς εὐεργέταις Ῥωμαίοις (*ibid.*, lines 14–15); expeditions to the fortresses and borders of Attica to familiarize themselves with the roads and the defences (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 53–55); and practice in sailing and launching boats (100/99, *I.G.*, II², 1028, line 37). Nothing more clearly indicates the quasi-military training than the record that in 123/2 the epheboi repaired an old catapult, provided the missing parts at their own expense and ἀνεώσαντο διὰ πλειόνων ἐτ[ῶν] τὴν τε χρῆσιν τοῦ ὀργάνου[υ καὶ μάθηον] (*I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 34–36).

From the very beginning of the ephebia, the epheboi participated actively in the

⁵⁸ Lines 14, 17, *I.G.*, II², 700 + *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 110–114, no. 20.

religious festivals and in the religious life of the city. This part of the program was of equal importance with its military aspects as is indicated by Aristotle's statement (*Ath. Pol.*, 42, 3), "These (the kosmetes and sophronistai) take the epheboi in a body, and after first making a circuit of the temples then go to the Peiraieus, and some of them garrison Munichia, others Akte." Their participation in religious festivals, parades and sacrifices, although not recorded at all in the decree of 267/6 (*I.G.*, II², 665) and only briefly in the new inscription (lines 12, 16, 18), is mentioned in great detail in the inscriptions of the second and first centuries B.C.⁵⁹

In the obsolescence of military training, extra-military activities proliferated. The epheboi made sailing trips to Salamis and to the Tropaion, took part in racing regattas, games and sacrifices at the Aianteia (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, line 31; 100/99, *I.G.*, II², 1028, lines 24–26); visited the burial mound of the heroes who fell at Marathon and the shrine of Amphiaraios (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 26–28); attended the schools of the philosophers and their public lectures (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 19–20; 106/5, *I.G.*, II², 1011, lines 22–23); contributed, pursuant to a decree, books to the library in the Ptolemaion (116/5, *I.G.*, II², 1009, lines 7–8; *Hesperia*, XVI, 1947, p. 170, no. 67, lines 7–8; 38/7, *I.G.*, II², 1043, line 50); and offered a phiale to the Mother of the Gods and to the Goddesses at Eleusis (123/2, *I.G.*, II², 1006, lines 23–25; 100/99, *I.G.*, II², 1028, lines 40–41). Gymnastic exercise, *ἄσκησις περὶ σῶμα*, received equal if not greater stress than *ἄσκησις ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις* (79/8, *I.G.*, II², 1039, line 48) and *τῶν ἵππων γυμνασίαι* is mentioned along with *ἐμπειρία ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις* (38/7, *I.G.*, II², 1043, lines 21–22). The military trappings of the ephebia became largely ceremonial and their guard of the city but little distinguishable from that of the Swiss guards at the Vatican today. After Sulla's stay in Athens, the military instructors in the ephebia, except for the *hoplomachos*,⁶⁰ were dropped. The ephebia became an institution resembling our private military academies today.

O. W. REINMUTH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

⁵⁹ A full account is given in Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique*, pp. 211–256.

⁶⁰ Reinmuth, *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, pp. 268–272.



O. W. REINMUTH: A NEW EPHEBIC INSCRIPTION FROM THE ATHENIAN AGORA