

## MID-THIRD-CENTURY ATHENIAN ARCHONS

**F**URTHER PROGRESS in the study of the Athenian archons in mid-3rd century has been made during the past decade by three scholars in particular, whose principal works I enumerate here. Heinz Heinen published his *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* as a Beiheft to the journal *Historia* in 1972; Georges Nachtergaeel solved the problem of the periodicity of the Aitolian Soteria in a convincing article on the date of the archon Polyeuktos in *Historia* (Vol. 25) in 1976; and Christian Habicht has made an exhaustive study (*inter alia*) of the years from 261 to 230 in a special section (Chapter IX) of his *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* which appeared as Vol. 30 of *Vestigia* in 1979.<sup>1</sup>

These scholars published no consecutive list of archons from 265 to 231 B.C., nor did they use several criteria which have been earlier proposed, which might help determine a sequence and which, in my judgment, deserve some consideration. In their study in 1940<sup>2</sup> Pritchett and Meritt called attention to the fact that certain types of inventory and official records were dated either at their beginning or end, or both, by the time limits of the prytany secretaries. Their second chapter (pp. 22–46) was devoted to what they called “The Controlling Cycles.” Much that was written in this chapter is now out of date, but the conclusion reached (p. 34) that the inventories of the priests of Asklepios in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B* began with the archonship of Peithidemos (line 145, correctly read as Π[ε]ιθιδήμων) and covered the years down to Diomedon (line 162, correctly read as [Διο]μέδωντος), still stands. The archon Diomedon began a new secretary cycle, somewhat disorganized, to be sure, but still a new cycle. It is my belief that Peithidemos also began a secretary cycle in 265/4, though we do not know the name of the secretary. If Peithidemos is dated in 268/7, as Heinen and Habicht would have it, his secretary must have come from the phyle Hippothontis (X) in series with the secretary Θεόδωρος Λυσιθέου Τ[ρ]ι[κ]λο[ρ]ύσιος (XI) of the year of Menekles (267/6) and the secretary Ἴσοκράτης Ἴσοκράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (XII) of the year of Nikias Otry-

<sup>1</sup>The following abbreviations will be used for works frequently cited:

- Agora XV* = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora, XV, Inscriptions. The Councillors*, Princeton 1974.  
*Chronology* = W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge, Mass. 1940.  
Nachtergaeel = G. Nachtergaeel, “L’Archonte athénien Polyeuctos et la périodicité des sôtéria étoliennes,” *Historia* 25, 1976.  
*Untersuchungen* = H. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, *Historia*, Einzelschriften 20, Wiesbaden 1972.  
*Vestigia* 30, 1979 = C. Habicht, *Vestigia*, 30, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Munich 1979.

Throughout, the reader is referred to the chronological table, pp. 94–96 below.

<sup>2</sup>*Chronology*.

neus (266/5), and Peithidemos could not have initiated the new cycle which began in 265/4. The archon in 264/3 was Diognetos, known from the Marmor Parium. He is also named in an Athenian decree (*IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 688) from which the name of the secretary is absent. It may not be without significance that the name of the secretary was suppressed, as in the previous year, because of some circumstance connected with the war. Yet the cycle was maintained unbroken down as far as Diomedon. As Ferguson remarked in 1911 *à propos* the peace of the year of Antipatros,<sup>3</sup> “the lot was retained for the election of magistrates, and the old system of rotation of offices appears after 262/1 B.C. as before.” Apollodoros says that Antigonos in the year of Antipatros established a garrison on Mouseion Hill, discharged the magistracies, and restricted all political activity to one man.<sup>4</sup> Yet it is obvious that the archon Antipatros remained in office, and the inscriptions give evidence that the tribal cycles were continued unbroken until the year of Diomedon. The known irregularities come after Diomedon.

In the theories put forward by the above-mentioned scholars the archon Diogeiton, whom I in 1977 had assigned to the year 268/7, has been displaced to some later date to make room for Peithidemos; to what later date is not specified, but since his prytany secretary came from the deme Keiriadai (phyle X, Hippothontis) the only available date for him, other than 268/7, is, in accordance with the secretary cycle, 256/5. But, as will appear in the course of this paper, this year is pre-empted by the archon Athenodoros, who must, as Habicht correctly observes, be moved earlier than my proposed (1977) date for him in 240/39.<sup>5</sup> As for the archon Diogeiton, he has been dismissed to some unspecified year after the Chremonidean War, in spite of my claim that no year except 268/7 is available for him.<sup>6</sup> This brings a conflict with Athenodoros in whose favor the paramount claim of the secretary cycle must be honored. Habicht would like to justify a late date for Diogeiton by a prosopographical reference to the orator of a decree of his year.<sup>7</sup> The orator in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 772 of Diogeiton’s year was Ἀκρότιμος Αἰσχίου Ἴκαριεύς. The grant of proxeny to him in Thermos in 238/7 (see footnote 7 above), cited as evidence for a late date for Diogeiton, is more than balanced by the fact that the father of Akrotimos, Αἰ[σ]χίας Ἀκροτίμου (Ἴκαριεύς) (*Agora XV*, no. 61, line 4), was a member of the Council in 304/3. The date of the son’s proposal of a decree in the year of Diogeiton in 268/7 is thus admirably suitable 36 years later. S. V. Tracy’s date for the

<sup>3</sup>William S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London 1911, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup>Quoted by Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 45, note 47.

<sup>5</sup>*Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 137.

<sup>6</sup>B. D. Meritt, “Athenian Archons 347/6–48/7 B.C.,” *Historia* 26, 1977, p. 191.

<sup>7</sup>*Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 116, note 11: “Diogeiton hat einen Grammateus aus der Phyle X und kann, da Athenodoros der einzige weitere Archon der Jahre 261–230 ist, für den ebenfalls ein Schreiber aus der X bezeugt ist, innerhalb dieser Jahre jedenfalls Platz finden, um so eher, als, wie deutlich werden wird, bisher keinem einzigen Archon dieser Zeit ein bestimmtes Jahr mit Sicherheit zugewiesen worden ist. Für die Notwendigkeit der Herabdatierung Diogeitons spricht über das von Heinen Bemerkte hinaus, dass Ἀκρότιμος Αἰσχίου Ἴκαριεύς, der als Antragsteller in Diogeitons Jahr erscheint (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 772), im Jahre 238/7 in Thermos mit der aitolischen Proxenie ausgezeichnet wurde (*IG IX I<sup>2</sup>*, 73). *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 772 ist von der Hand des ‘Cutter 4’ und daher nicht später als 240 (unten Anm. 136).”

style of the mason who cut *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 772 between 273/2 and 240/39 may be a fact of interest, but it is not determinative for the date of the text.<sup>8</sup> If Akrotimos was 35 years old in 268/7, he would have been 65 years old in 238/7 and of suitable age to receive a grant of proxeny in that year.

Nachtergaeel's fixing the date of the Soteria in the year 245/4 makes it possible to continue the use of the secretary cycle as an aid in the dating of the archons of mid-3rd century without the assumption of any break in the cycle until Diomedon. I have been forced earlier to assume such breaks because of the acceptance of an erroneous date for Polyeuktos, which in turn has depended on an erroneous date for the Soteria. There exists in mid-3rd century an obvious period of seeming confusion in the cycles between Diomedon and Lysias, but there is no evidence to guarantee a break either before Diomedon or after Lysias. In view of the reliability of the cycle down to Diomedon and again after Lysias it is better method to make use of it before and after this period of confusion. Nachtergaeel has named the archons whom he thinks certain from Thersilochos down to Eurykleides as follows:

247/6	Thersilochos	VI
246/5	Polyeuktos	VII
245/4	Hieron	VIII
244/3	Diomedon	III
243/2	Philoneos	?
242/1	Theophemos	?
241/0	Kydenor	VI
240/39	Eurykleides	?

Then follows his judgment about the years which precede and which follow this group:<sup>9</sup> “*La période de dix à quinze ans qui précède ces archontes et celles qui leur fait suite demeurent des ‘zones d’incertitude’.*” This is too pessimistic an evaluation of the available evidence. The phyle of Diomedon's secretary is now known as Antiochis (XII) with the name Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένον Ἀ[λωπεκῆθεν].<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the dates as given by Nachtergaeel are one year too low. The closed sequence which begins with Thersilochos should have his date as 248/7 in accordance with the secretary cycle which comes down from 291/0 with no irregularity. This means that the Athenians accepted the Soteria one year and 16 months before the first celebration in 245/4. This possibility was not envisaged by Nachtergaeel who writes simply:<sup>11</sup> “*L’année de Polyeuktos, qui précède cette première célébration, se place donc en 246/5 ou en 242/1.*” Habicht finds it natural to suppose that the acceptances from Athens and from Smyrna are close in point of time.<sup>12</sup> Strictly speaking, the date of Polyeuktos in Athens cannot be thus tied to the date of the acceptance from Smyrna. Nor, in the present state of our knowledge, can the date of the

<sup>8</sup>“Identifying Epigraphical Hands, II,” *GRBS* 14, 1973, pp. 191–192.

<sup>9</sup>Nachtergaeel, p. 77.

<sup>10</sup>*Historia* 26, 1977, p. 164.

<sup>11</sup>Nachtergaeel, p. 72.

<sup>12</sup>Natural, perhaps, but necessarily so? *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 134.

acceptance from Athens be tied to the date of the acceptance from any other Greek city. The acceptance from Smyrna made reference to the grant of asylum given to Smyrna by Seleukos II, who succeeded Antiochos II, in the spring or summer of 246.<sup>13</sup> But, as Nachtergaeel says, the date which he assigns to the Soteria (245/4) does not solve the problem of the chronology of the asylum granted to Smyrna and to the sanctuary of Aphrodite Stratonikis (*loc. cit.*). This has nothing to do with the acceptance of the Soteria by the Athenians in the archonship of Polyeuktos. Nachtergaeel also affirms his agreement with L. Robert and others who have followed him that “*la fondation des Sôtéria aitoliennes n’est pas antérieure à 246.*”<sup>14</sup> This is a conservative statement, which makes no undue claim, and may be accepted as correct, since Nachtergaeel has himself shown that the date of founding of the Soteria was 245/4. He suggests that the response to Delphi from Chios (*Fouilles de Delphes* III, iii, no. 215) may have been made soon before the festival in 245 because the Chians not only recorded their acceptance of the fête but promptly elected their three delegates to the first celebration.<sup>15</sup> This may be true, but it is not evidence for the date of Polyeuktos at Athens.

One must bear in mind the considerations of time and effort on the part of the heralds in making their announcement to the Greek cities. The heralds who announced the Pythia, for example, left Delphi six months before the Pythian celebration. They had as their duty to make the formal announcement of the time of the coming Pythia, a well-established festival about which the announcement was expected and eagerly awaited. The ambassadors who announced the first Soteria, on the other hand, had a much more serious task, requiring both time and discussion. The festival had to be explained and the time and conditions of the invitation had to be presented to each city now for the first time.

Athens was undoubtedly the first city to be visited. We know something of the circumstances, for the Athenian decree of acceptance (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 680) has been in part preserved. It was passed in the archonship of Polyeuktos on the 30th day of the ninth prytany of his archonship, which I have dated (see below, p. 95) in 247/6; the decree was passed, therefore, in the spring of 246. If it took six months to cover the route of the Greek cities when only a bare announcement was necessary, the estimate of 16 months or so which this date implies is none too much for the explanation and discussion which the announcement would inevitably call forth. The ambassadors evidently came to Athens at the time of the Dionysiac festival (Elaphebolion 10–16),<sup>16</sup> and the decree which crowned their mission with success passed after a lengthy visit to the city. The calendar of the year of Polyeuktos is instructive. The year was ordinary in the festival calendar, in which the days of the month and the days of the corresponding prytany marched *pari passu* (cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 679). But the embassy stayed not only for the Dionysia but for all the remaining days of Elaphebolion (except one). The date by

<sup>13</sup>Nachtergaeel, p. 73, note 82.

<sup>14</sup>Nachtergaeel, p. 66.

<sup>15</sup>Nachtergaeel, p. 77.

<sup>16</sup>Jon Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton 1975, p. 137.

month was *ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας*. This would normally mean Elaphebolion 22, but here the prytany date shows that *eight* extra days had been added to the festival calendar during the visit of the envoys. The day-date was the 30th, equated with the 30th day of the ninth prytany. Its name ought normally to have been *ἔνη καὶ νέα*. This irregularity in the calendar in the year of Polyeuktos is now at last explained by the time needed for the emissaries to complete their business about the Soteria. I once thought that the calendar count here showed a forward reckoning with *μετ' εἰκάδας*, but it is now known that the count with *μετ' εἰκάδας* was never forward.<sup>17</sup> The day-date was here named correctly only by the prytany. The month had to be conflated by the addition of eight intercalated days during the prolonged visit of the embassy.

The first celebration of the Soteria required *more* time and *more* delay than any subsequent celebration in making the rounds for the invitations. A reasonable estimate for the first Soteria is about 16 months. This satisfies the epigraphical requirement of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 680 and the implications of its text for the lengthy first visit to Athens. Later in this paper (pp. 85–86 below) I shall also bring to light other evidence from other Athenian decrees, notably *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1286 and 2856, which also demand the date 247/6 for Polyeuktos.

On the Salaminian stele (*SEG* II, 9) the record for Eurykleides is cut after that of Kydenor in a different hand, and one year may have intervened between them. In any case, as will appear below, two years must have elapsed between Kydenor and Lysias to make room for the archon Kleomachos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856) in whose year occurred one of the last generalships of Thoukritos, of whom more will be said below (pp. 85–87). The archon Polyeuktos must be dated in 247/6 not only because of the secretary cycle but also because seven archons (not six) come between him and Lysias in 239/8.

With Polyeuktos in 247/6 and Lysias in 239/8 the archon list is now complete for this span of eight years. The three archons Phanomachos, Lysiades, and Athenodoros whom I had inserted in my table in 1977 must find other berths. Habicht has demonstrated this convincingly,<sup>18</sup> though he errs in thinking that Athenodoros must belong in a Panathenaic year because of the praise of athlothetai in his archonship (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 784). Athlothetai are known for the Lesser as well as the Great Panathenaia and offer no grounds for the attribution of a date to the one known decree of his year.<sup>19</sup> Dinsmoor thought at first glance of the Great Panathenaia for Athenodoros, but he rejected the idea because it did not fit his reconstruction of the secretary cycle.<sup>20</sup> Habicht has suggested one of these possible Panathenaic years: 258/7, 254/3, or 250/49; but the evidence of the secretary cycle is more reliable. Athenodoros belongs in 256/5 because the secretary of his year comes from Hippothontis (X) and this is the only year between Peithidemos (265/4) and Heliodoros (229/8) to which the secretary cycle permits a

<sup>17</sup>B. D. Meritt, "The Count of Days at Athens," *AJP* 95, 1974, pp. 278–279.

<sup>18</sup>*Vestigia* 30, 1979, pp. 133–141.

<sup>19</sup>The Treasurers of Athena made a payment *ἀθλοθέταις ἐς Παναθήναια* in 415/4, for the lesser festival (*IG* I<sup>2</sup>, 302, line 57).

<sup>20</sup>William B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, p. 179.

secretary from this phyle. The necessity of dating Athenodoros here eliminates 256/5 as a possible date for Diogeiton and leaves him, therefore, in 268/7.

Heinen's argument that the archon Peithidemos must fall earlier than Menekles and Nikias Otryneus because decrees of these years show an Athens already at war is not compelling.<sup>21</sup> The name of the war as the Chremonidean War came from the fact that the Grand Alliance of 265/4 was proposed in a decree offered by Chremonides (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 686 + 687). Its name was given to it by Hegesander, quoted in Athenaios (vi. 250F): οἱ δὲ δημαγωγοῦντες, φησὶν, Ἀθήνησι κατὰ τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον πόλεμον κολακεύοντες τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τᾶλλα μὲν ἔφασκον πάντα εἶναι κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, τὴν δ' ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν φέρουσαν ὁδὸν Ἀθηναίους εἰδέναι μόνους. The crisis of the war marked by the Grand Alliance does not preclude the reasonable assumption of preliminary hostilities. This has, indeed, been a traditional interpretation. Ferguson recounts the events of the years of Menekles and Nikias Otryneus and concludes that the loyal Athenians may have been so incensed and exasperated by them that they were "driven into taking the fatal plunge" of concluding the alliance with Sparta and her allies as well as with Ptolemy of Egypt.<sup>22</sup> The record of these two years seems to lead up to rather than follow the crisis in the year of Peithidemos. In the early spring of 267/6 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 661) these preliminary hostilities began slowly. Otherwise the year must have been considered nearly normal. The ἐπιμεληταί of the Mysteries were praised for their sacrifice at the festival in Agrai "for the health and safety of the Council and Demos," as well as for their earlier sacrifice at the time of the Great Mysteries in Boedromion. There is no hint of war in the text of this decree. But still in the year of Menekles the epheboi were called on to defend Mouseion Hill in the heart of the city. This is made clear in a decree of the year of Nikias Otryneus (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 665) praising the epheboi of the year of Menekles for their good discipline while war was upon the city (πο[λέμου] κατέ[χοντος] τὴν πόλιν) and for doing all that the general ordered them to do for the defense of the Mouseion, as they had been charged by the Demos (κα[ὶ] ἄπαντ[α] τὰ παραγγελλόμενα ὑπὸ [τοῦ σ]τρατηγοῦ εἰς τὴν τοῦ Μ[ουσει]είου φυλακῆν). The defense and holding of Mouseion Hill were symbolic of the freedom of the city. In the year of Nikias Otryneus (266/5) Mouseion Hill had been taken by the Macedonians. In a decree of Posideion 12 (mid-winter) we are informed that Strombichos, who was being honored with a grant of citizenship to himself and his descendants (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 666, 667), though a former soldier of the Macedonian Demetrios, joined the Athenians when they took up arms in the cause of freedom (ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθ[ερίας]) and participated in the siege of Mouseion Hill. The Chremonidean War had in fact begun, but it got its name only after the patriot and orator Chremonides offered his resolution for the Grand

<sup>21</sup> *Untersuchungen*, pp. 115–117, 123, summarized by Habicht, *Vestigia*, 30, 1979, p. 116, note 11. Heinen gives a careful outline (*op. cit.*, pp. 102–110) of the new evidence as it has in the course of the years come to light (e.g., the secretary of the known year of Pytharatos, etc.). His account can be studied with profit; it reveals clearly how tangled the argument about the date of Peithidemos has become.

<sup>22</sup> William S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932, p. 74. This is one of his two suggestions, I think the better one.

Alliance in the early autumn (Metageitnion 9) of the following year. It is not correct to date the alliance with Sparta before the preliminaries and the exasperation which led up to it. It could have been no secret to Antigonos and the Macedonians that Athens wanted her freedom. Even before the archonship of Peithidemos she had made an alliance with Ptolemy (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 687, line 19) whose professed international policy was the liberation of the Greeks. It is quite understandable that Antigonos reacted vigorously to obvious evidence of revolt and seized the Mouseion. The Athenian response was the decree of Chremonides and the alliance with Sparta and increased aid from Ptolemy.<sup>23</sup>

There is further evidence about Peithidemos in the records of the Asklepieion (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B), too often neglected, which shows that a catalogue of objects to be melted down was set forth, in that part of the record which is pertinent here, in chronological order from the archonship of Peithidemos to (but not including) the archonship of Diomedon. The decree which authorized the record was passed in the archonship of Diomedon (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B, line 141), where the secretary's name is now known as Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομέδου Ἀ[λωπεκῆθεν].<sup>24</sup> The date at which the list begins is given in the decree itself as ἀπὸ Πε[ριθήμου ἄρχοντος].<sup>25</sup> The priests of Asklepios for these years are named in the epigraphical record which extends from line 187 to line 298 of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B. Somewhere in the fragmentary part of the inscription below the priesthood of Boiskos (lines 281ff.) must have come the record of the final years before the archonship of Diomedon. The priest Boiskos himself (line 281), from the deme Phlya (IX), belongs in 249/8. The key to the chronology of the priestly sequence in cyclical order is given by the known date of the priest Φυλεὺς Χαυρίου Ἐλευσίνιος (X) of the archonship of Isaios in 284/3 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1163). The dates used by Pritchett and Meritt in their *Chronology* for these years are all too high by two years, for the dates of the archons (including Isaios) were not correctly known in the first half of this century when their book was published (1940), before the discovery of the secretary Ἰσηγόρος Ἴσοκράτου Κεφαλῆθεν of the phyle Akamantis (VII) in the archonship of Pytharatos (271/0) in whose year the philosopher Epicurus died.<sup>26</sup>

The sequence of priests from Peithidemos down to Diomedon is unbroken from 265/4 to 246/5 though evidence for the last three names is missing. A new cycle begins in 245/4 in the year of Diomedon and his date is thus fixed both by the secretary cycle for the archons and by the cycle of the priests of Asklepios. The study of this roster of priests was made in detail by Pritchett and Meritt in their *Chronology* (pp. 47–84). Though they were mistaken in their belief then that Peithidemos belonged in 267/6 (with the archon Isaios wrongly dated in 286/5), their exposition still stands for the

<sup>23</sup>Heinen (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 110–117) has a different interpretation of the years of Menekles and Nikias Otryneus, but the events of their years seem unduly placid to follow the known turbulence of the year of Peithidemos and the incursions of Patroklos and Areus in response to the Grand Alliance.

<sup>24</sup>*Historia* 26, 1977, pp. 164, 176; J. Kroll, "An Archive of the Athenian Cavalry," *Hesperia* 46, 1977, pp. 121–122.

<sup>25</sup>*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B, line 145. The second letter of the name was epsilon (*Chronology*, p. 33).

<sup>26</sup>William B. Dinsmoor, "The Archonship of Pytharatos," *Hesperia* 23, 1954, pp. 288–289.

relative dates and may still be read with profit. One important correction must be made. The priest of 256/5 was not Θεόδωρος Μελιτ(εύς),<sup>27</sup> but rather the priest from the deme Xypete (X), name unknown, who appears in the decree now published as *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 775A* (lines 20–21). His name, whatever it was, and his demotic are to be restored in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B*, lines 235–236. The archon named in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 775B* is Lysiades, whose place in the archon list is now to be sought in some year soon after 256/5. His decree was cut on the same stone with *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 775A* and immediately below it. There will be more to be said of him later (see below, pp. 88–89).

The discovery of the decree of the archonship of Philinos with the secretary from Thorai (II) gives a new and welcome addition to the secretary cycle in mid-3rd century.<sup>28</sup> This discovery of Philinos with his secretary came only a few years after a new reading of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1279* by Yvon Garlan,<sup>29</sup> which connects the archon with the military career of Thoukritos of Myrrhinous. This Thoukritos is now known to have been elected hipparch in Philinos' archonship (*IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1279*, as corrected). He was later to hold generalships in the archonships of Kallimedes, Thersilochos, Kleomachos, and one other. These last four archons were inscribed on a monument from Oropos (*IG II<sup>2</sup>, 2856*) now in the museum at Rhamnous. Thoukritos (Θούκριτος Ἀλκιμάχου Μυρρινούσιος) had been in all four of these archonships στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν.

For Kallimedes and Thersilochos the secretaries are known, from phylai IV and VI respectively. Hence their positions in the secretary cycle are sure and they fall into place after the archon Philinos of 252/1 in the years 250/49 and 248/7. Thersilochos is otherwise known to have been archon in 248/7 in the year immediately preceding that of Polyeuktos (*SEG II, 9*), and it now remains to place in order the other years in which Thoukritos was general. The citations for these generalships are in a series of incised crowns on the dedication from Oropos, two to the right of the main panel which named Thoukritos as the general ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν and two to the left. Habicht thinks that the citations come in what he calls the natural order, from left to right, reading the unknown archon and Kleomachos on the left and then, in order, Kallimedes and Thersilochos on the right. The order of these last two is guaranteed by the text of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 780*,<sup>30</sup> but the order which places Kleomachos earlier has been derived from the assumption of a "natural" order in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 2856* and had seemed to gain support from the text of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1286*, which reads, in part,

ἐπειδὴ Θούκριτος πρό  
[τ]ερόν τε [κατασταθεὶς] ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου στρατ[η]  
5 [γ]ὸς [ἐπὶ Κλεομάχου καὶ Καλλιμήδου] ἄρχοντος κα[ὶ]

<sup>27</sup>He was an ex-priest who belongs properly 12 years earlier in 268/7.

<sup>28</sup>J. S. Traill, "Two New Prytany Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 38, 1969, pp. 418–420.

<sup>29</sup>"Études d'histoire militaire et diplomatique," *BCH* 89, 1965, pp. 339–344.

<sup>30</sup>*Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 126.



[πάλιν ἐπὶ Θερσιλόχου ἄρχοντ]ος διατετέλε  
[κεν ἀνῆρ ἀγαθὸς ὦν - - - - κτλ - - - -]

This version of the text was first published by Adolf Wilhelm in 1909.<sup>31</sup> His original version, without restoration of the significant lines 5 and 6, was printed in Athens in 1892.<sup>32</sup> In 1907 Johannes Kirchner,<sup>33</sup> in preparing for the Attic *Corpus*, gave a new study of the text with reference also to *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856 and with the identification of Thoukritos as the son of Ἀλκίμαχος Κλεοβούλου Μυρρινούσιος, a paredros of the archon Nikias Otryneus (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 668, line 19), a determination already made by him in his *Prosopographia Attica*; Kirchner still gave no restorations in lines 5 and 6. Kirchner's publication was followed in 1909 by a second text offered by Wilhelm in his *Beiträge*,<sup>34</sup> restoring the archons' names as they now appear in the *Corpus*. The names were drawn from *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856. It was Wilhelm's opinion that line 5 contained no designation of a title to be applied to the generalship to which Thoukritos had been appointed. The designation, for example, of στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆν χώραν τῆν παραλίαν, taken from the central panel of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856, was too long to be supplied in line 5 before the name of the archon. So Wilhelm omitted the title and, with reference again to *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856, supplied the name of a second archon.

The text as thus reconstructed is not satisfactory, in the first place because the Greek as restored is ungrammatical. Two archons in line 5 demand a plural ἀρχόντων instead of the singular ἄρχοντος which is clear on the stone. The names of Kallimedes and Thersilochos fit the reconstruction admirably, while the restored πάλιν at the beginning of line 6 indicates the lapse of a brief interval when Thoukritos was not a general, but it indicates also his later early resumption of this office. These conditions are met by the restoration of Kallimedes in line 5 and of Thersilochos in line 6, their dates being 250/49 and 248/7 respectively. The readings in lines 5 and 6, of course, should be

[γ]ὸς [ἐπὶ τῆν παραλίαν ἐπὶ Καλλιμήδου]ν ἄρχοντος κα[ί]  
[πάλιν ἐπὶ Θερσιλόχου ἄρχοντ]ος διατετέλε

No other archons are mentioned in the decree of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1286, and nothing is said of any previous record of Thoukritos. It is clear, therefore, that the dedicatory text of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2856, with its complete record of the generalships of Thoukritos, was cut later than the date of Thersilochos and that the archons Kleomachos and one unknown who were inscribed in crowns in the left panel of the dedication are later in date than Thersilochos.<sup>35</sup> The list of archons is complete now from Thersilochos down to Eurykleides. Their dates are known, and with Polyeuktos correctly dated in 247/6 there is

<sup>31</sup> *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Vienna 1909, p. 308.

<sup>32</sup> Ἐφ' Ἀρχ., 1892, pp. 147–152, no. 35.

<sup>33</sup> "IG. II 1194," *AthMitt* 32, 1907, pp. 470–472.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.* (footnote 31 above), p. 308.

<sup>35</sup> Habicht quite correctly calls attention to my recent lapse in dating Kleomachos earlier than Thersilochos in *Historia* 26, 1977, p. 174 (see *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 126).

only one possibility, to date Kleomachos in 240/39, perhaps interchangeable as to date with Eurykleides. This means that the name Eurykleides is to be restored as that of the “unknown archon” in the crown at the far left of the dedication *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 2856, where Kleomachos occupies the crown next to him on the right. The text of the indecipherable citation is to be read as follows:

[ἡ Βο]υλή     ὁ δῆμος  
 [στρ]ατη[γήσαντα]  
 [ἐπ’ Εὐρυκλείδου]  
 [ἄρχοντος]

This stone now reposes in the sanctuary at Rhamnous where it has been studied carefully by Eugene Vanderpool, whose accuracy of observation has been tested and proved many times. Many epigraphists have profited as I have, with gratitude, from his generous help and expert knowledge. He writes under date of February 6, 1980: “When I arrived at Rhamnous I found that the stone *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 2856 had been set up at a convenient height in the epigraphical shed and that water, charcoal, and a sponge had been provided; so everything had been made easy. But alas I could read very little, not even half of the letters previously recorded and *nothing new*. The surface of the stone in the left panel is in very bad shape and lichens growing on it have obscured what once might have been visible.”

The list of archons as now established from Thersilochos down to Lysias (239/8) is a strong confirmation, in retrospect, that the date of Polyeuktos was correctly fixed by the secretary cycle in 247/6.

The archon Eurykleides is also to be restored in a decree of the year of Lysias published in 1938,<sup>36</sup> as suggested by Habicht.<sup>37</sup> He notes quite correctly that this does not mean that Eurykleides has to be the immediate predecessor of Lysias. In our table (p. 95 below) Eurykleides (241/0) follows Kydenor (242/1). Kleomachos belongs in 240/39 immediately before Lysias (239/8). It is clear that what one might consider the “natural” chronological order from left to right was not followed in the case of *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 2856. One can only guess at the reason for the order. It may have been to give more prominence to the more recent citations of the honors to Thoukritos.

The father of Thoukritos was hipparch in 282/1.<sup>38</sup> It is appropriate that the son was hipparch a generation later (252/1) in the archonship of Philinos and that the generalships of the son spanned the years from 250/49 to 240/39, a generation, albeit a brief one, after the maturity of the father as paredros of the archon Nikias Otryneus in 266/5.

The way is now clear to disposing further of the three archons who, in my publication of 1977, are dated between Eurykleides and Lysias. Habicht deals with these in his account in *Vestigia* 30, 1979, pp. 133–141. The archon Athenodoros has been discussed

<sup>36</sup>B. D. Meritt, “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 125, no. 25, lines 11–12.

<sup>37</sup>*Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 141.

<sup>38</sup>*SEG XXI*, 525.

above (pp. 79, 82–83). He belongs in 256/5 on the evidence of his secretary from phyle X and the secretary cycle. Indeed, this is the only year between Diogeiton (268/7) and Leochares (228/7) which is available for him. Stephen Tracy used the supposedly reliable date of his archonship at about 240/39 (*IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 784) as the last example of an inscription cut by his Cutter 4 during the range of his activity from 273/2 to 240/39.<sup>39</sup> This inscription comes earlier in the career of Cutter 4 when dated, as here, in 256/5.

It was noted above (p. 85) that the archon Lysiades is to be dated in some year soon after 256/5 when the priest of Asklepios was ----- of Xypete whose name should be restored in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1534B, lines 235–236, and that the priest Theodoros of Melite (line 241) earlier thought to be the priest of this year is rather a dedicant who was an ex-priest of 268/7.<sup>40</sup> The years following 256/5 down as far as Thersilochos in 248/7 are all accounted for by named archons, or their secretaries, or both, with the exception of 253/2 and 251/0. In 1977 the archon Alkibiades was dated by me to the year 255/4, with the name restored in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 477. But there is good reason for dating *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 477 in some year soon after the Chremonidean War. It honors a man who, as ambassador, helped in restoring friendly relations between Athens and Antigonos. I made a study of this inscription in 1938,<sup>41</sup> in which I utilized Wilhelm's text as published in *SEG III*, 89 and argued for a name in 11 letters. I do so again now and am able to record that part of the last letter of the name is still preserved, a final upsilon.<sup>42</sup> The suggestion I made for the archon Alkibiades was in error. I withdraw it and repeat the attribution of *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 477 which I made in 1938 to the archonship of Polystratos (260/59) and for the association of this text in date with that of *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1283. Though I no longer hold to the date 255/4 for Alkibiades I believe that he belongs in mid-century and I shall offer alternatives in the table below (p. 94). One date which is *not* available is 253/2, for this date belongs to Lysiades, the second archon who must be moved, as Habicht rightly insists, from the years between 242/1 and 240/39. The date of Lysiades is determined by the cycle of the priests of Asklepios as three years after the priesthood of ----- *Ἐυπεταίων* of *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 775A. Lysiades, with his new date, thus comes between two intercalary years, and his year must of course have been ordinary in the festival calendar. The preserved calendar equation in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 775B permits this when restored as follows (lines 29–30): *Μουνηχιώνος ἐνάτει ἐπ[ὶ δέκα μᾶι καὶ εἰκο]στῆι τῆς πρυτανείας.*

The date of Lysiades is also fixed, within limits, by the prosopographical evidence of the *ἐπιστάτης* or *πρόεδρος* of the Council for the one day of the year on which the decree *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 775B was passed. The name of the *πρόεδρος* was [E]ὐχάριστος Χάρητος Ἀφιδναῖος (line 31). Habicht has made a convincing study of the career of his son, whose political activity came in the twenties. It is an impressive record. Chares, the son,

<sup>39</sup> *Loc. cit.* (footnote 8 above).

<sup>40</sup> His name appears in line 241 as *ἱερε]ὺ Θεόδωρο Μελιτ*. This is the same as *[ἱερε]ὺ(ς) Θεόδωρο(ς) Μελιτ(εύς)*. The record of his dedication comes late in the priesthood of ----- of Xypete. A similar late dedication was made by the ex-priest Autokles (line 267) during the active priesthood of Philokrates.

<sup>41</sup> "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 141–142.

<sup>42</sup> B. D. Meritt, "Philinos and Menekrates," *Hesperia* 38, 1969, p. 435, note 28.

proposed one decree in 228/7<sup>43</sup> and another in 220/19.<sup>44</sup> He was among the *συμπρόεδροι* in a decree which Sterling Dow has dated between 229/8 and 225/4.<sup>45</sup> He was also in 221/0 one of two Areopagitai who were members of a commission of five, the other three chosen from the entire citizen body.<sup>46</sup> One Chares, probably the son rather than the father of Eucharistos (though this is not absolutely certain), is now known as a cavalryman on a lead tablet from the Kerameikos which Habicht dates “*um oder kurz vor 250.*”<sup>47</sup> This is correct. The career of the son points unequivocally to a date for the father in the fifties. This is therefore the date of the archon Lysiades, who may now be fixed to the year 253/2, where the precision is provided by the evidence just rehearsed from the cycle of the priests of Asklepios.

The third archon, Phanomachos, who has to be removed from the date assigned to him by me (242/1) in 1977,<sup>48</sup> is to be dated now in 251/0, a year made available for him by the removal of Antimachos to 233/2.<sup>49</sup> He falls within the span of work of Tracy’s “Cutter 4” who was active from 273/2 to 240/39 (?).<sup>50</sup>

It is fortunate now that a new fixed point exists at mid-3rd century in the archonship of Philinos, who fits into the valid secretary cycle which comes down through the 3rd century from Charinos in 291/0 to (but not including) Diomedon in 245/4. The date of Philinos is 252/1 and his secretary is Θεότιμος Στρατοκλέους Θοραιεύς of the phyle Demetrias (II). The known phylai of the secretaries from Athenodoros (X) in 256/5 now run continuously to Hieron (VIII) in 246/5, as follows:

256/5	255/4	254/3	253/2	252/1	251/0	250/49	249/8	248/7	247/6	246/5
X	XI	XII	I	II	[3]	IV	[V]	VI	VII	VIII

Some of these dates have still to be considered. I begin with Euboulos in 254/3.

Euboulos is known from a decree honoring councillors of the phyle Aigeis<sup>51</sup> in which special praise was given to one of the councillors, Nikokrates. His full name and his deme are given in the list (lines 19–20): Νικοκράτης Δίωνος (Ἀγκυλεύς). He was chosen by lot to be councillor τ[ὸ]ν ἐν[ι]αυτὸν τὸ[ν] ἐ[π’] Εὐβούλου ἄρ[χ]ιοντος. As John Traill noted in his commentary in the original publication of *Agora XV*, no. 89 (= *Hesperia* 38, 1969, pp. 418–425), when comparing that text with *Agora XV*, no. 85 (= *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 678), “nowhere do we have such an unusual number of men who served their second possible term at the earliest possible interval.” In other words Philinos is to be dated either two years before or two years after *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 678. If Euboulos comes two years after Philinos he clashes with Kallimedes who has a known secretary from phyle

<sup>43</sup> *Agora XV*, p. 112, no. 120.

<sup>44</sup> *Agora XV*, pp. 122–123, no. 130.

<sup>45</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 852; “The Preambles of Athenian Decrees,” *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 364–365.

<sup>46</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 839, lines 47–52.

<sup>47</sup> *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 136.

<sup>48</sup> *Hesperia* 7, 1938, pp. 9–10; *Historia* 26, 1977, p. 176.

<sup>49</sup> Habicht (*Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 145) also dates Phanomachos before Thersilochos.

<sup>50</sup> *Loc. cit.* (footnote 8 above).

<sup>51</sup> *Agora XV*, pp. 93–95, no. 85.

IV. He must therefore come two years earlier than Philinos, and his date is thus determined as 254/3. This is the year of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* which has a secretary from Alopeke (Antiochis, XII), who also belongs in the year 254/3 in accordance with the secretary cycle. This combination is further confirmed by the fact that the name of the archon Euboulos may confidently be supplied in the second line of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*: [ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄ]ρχοντος. The name of the archon was restored as [ἐπὶ . . . ? . . . ἄ]ρχοντος by Sterling Dow in 1937.<sup>52</sup> Meritt and Traill restored [ἐπὶ Εὐβούλου ἄ]ρχοντος in *Agora XV*, no. 87. Now the restoration of the name of the archon as Euboulos has been questioned.<sup>53</sup> This skepticism is unwarranted, and it leads to embarrassing consequences. The two prytany lists are more than probably exactly two years apart, Euboulos being two years earlier than Philinos. The determining factor here is the text of *Agora XV*, no. 85, not the text of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*. *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* furnishes the secretary, complete with demotic, and the demotic dictates the same date that was derived from comparing the prytany lists. The date of Euboulos is already known as two years from Philinos; it can only be confirmed by the secretary cycle and *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*. This confirmation is gained when the correct restoration [ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄ]ρχοντος is made in line 2 of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*. That this phraseology is correct, with the elision of ἐπὶ to ἐπ', is shown by the text (quoted above) from *Agora XV*, no. 85. This stone is lost. It is therefore impossible to compare it with *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* as to style of lettering and workmanship. But *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* has, however, been studied by S. V. Tracy. He has made a careful determination of the number of letters in the archon's name.<sup>54</sup> Dow had estimated seven letters in his publication of 1937.<sup>55</sup> Tracy agrees with him, though he would allow (at most) seven and a half letters. I believe that the seven-letter count is correct, but this of course means eight if the preposition ἐπὶ is abbreviated. The content of *Agora XV*, no. 85 and the secretary cycle of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* combine to yield the date 254/3 for Euboulos. Tracy, on the basis of his study of the letter forms, wishes to downdate *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* by two generations, and he dates this inscription therefore in 195/4. This later date has been welcomed by Habicht<sup>56</sup> without realizing that it has the remarkable consequence of placing three intercalary years in succession in 196/5, 195/4, and 194/3. The criterion of letter forms, subjective as it is here, has proved deceptive. I have examined the photograph of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* in Dow's *Hesperia*, Suppl. I. It is not a large fragment and does not offer much range for comparison, but I have been able to find every letter in its text duplicated in the new text of the year of Philinos in 252/1 and do not believe that the date for *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* in 254/3 can be successfully challenged.<sup>57</sup> This is a good example to illustrate how

<sup>52</sup> *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, *Prytaneis*, Cambridge, Mass. 1937, p. 63, no. 21.

<sup>53</sup> *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 117, note 14, and pp. 122–123.

<sup>54</sup> "Five Letter Cutters of Hellenistic Athens," *Hesperia* 47, 1978, pp. 257–258. He writes, "Fortunately, it is possible to determine with great precision the length of the archon's name in the first line of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*." He means, of course, in the second line.

<sup>55</sup> See footnote 52 above.

<sup>56</sup> *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 153.

<sup>57</sup> The phi (there is only one in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702*) is like the phi in Νικόφημος of *Agora XV*, no. 89, line 73; and the square rho near the end of line 6 in *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 702* is like the rho in ἄρχοντος of *Agora XV*, no. 89, line 1 – definitely mid-3rd century.

two different criteria of dating have brought together an archon and his secretary and given to both “a local habitation and a name.”

The archon [. . .]βιος of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792 cannot by himself alone be dated precisely, but one of the *σιτώλαι* of his year is known as ἀγωνοθέτης of the Panathenaia in the year of Nikias Otryneus (266/5).<sup>58</sup> This was a year of the Great Panathenaia. Another of the *σιτώλαι*, Ἐρίωτος Δημοφίλου Μελιτεύς, is the same as the Ἐρίωτος Μελιτ(εύς) who made a contribution for the protection of the city and its countryside in the year of Diomedon (245/4).<sup>59</sup> The date of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792 is, therefore, near mid-3rd century. This also must be the date of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774, which I have associated with *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792.<sup>60</sup> Habicht wishes to break this association. But he has also shown that *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774, which refers to the treaty between Athens and Argos and the rebel Alexandros cannot be earlier than 249 B.C.<sup>61</sup> The archon whose name is to be supplied in line 1 of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 must fall within the range of the known archons following Kallimedes of 250/49. The only possibility, historically and epigraphically, is the as yet unknown of 249/8 itself, with the date of the inscription preferably late, rather than early, in the year. The only candidate is [. . .]βιος of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792, and herein lies the binding link between these two texts.

Habicht writes of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 that “vom Namen des Archons ist nur die Endung --ου erhalten.” But we do in fact know more than this. I have on two occasions studied the opening lines of this decree.<sup>62</sup> On the second occasion I verified the contact between fragments *a* and *b* and determined with great probability that the name of the archon contained seven letters: [. . . .]ου. Pritchett and I retained this reconstruction, which I consider correct, in our *Chronology* (p. 99). What is now new is that the unbroken sequence of the secretary cycle allows *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 and the [. . .]βιος of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792 to be dated in 249/8 rather than in 253/2. The name of the secretary is not known. Only the final four letters (--ιεύς) of his demotic are preserved. But the secretary cycle in his year was still in force, and they may be assigned to some demotic of the phyle Pandionis. The reasons for restoring the day-date of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 as in the month Skirophorion have been based on the epigraphical facts inherent in the spacing of the text.<sup>63</sup> There is no other archon, none except [. . .]βιος, in the legitimate range of time for *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 and 792 from Kallimedes (250/49) down to Kydenor (242/1) who has seven letters in the genitive of his name and whose secretary can show a demotic ending in --ιεύς. The opening lines of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774 are to be restored as follows:

[ἐπὶ . . . βίου ἀρχ[οντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθωντίδος δω]  
[δεκάτη]ς πρυτανε[ίας ἧι -----<sup>ca. 20</sup>-----]  
[. . . . .]ιεύς ἐ<γρ>α[μμάτευεν· Σκιροφοριῶνος ἐνδε]

<sup>58</sup> Δεινίας Δείνω[νο]ς Ἐρχιεύς of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 792 appears in *Hesperia* 37, 1968, p. 284 as Δ[ε]ινίας Ἐρχιεύς.

<sup>59</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 791, line 20.

<sup>60</sup> *Hesperia* 38, 1969, p. 436; *Historia* 26, 1977, p. 175.

<sup>61</sup> *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 125.

<sup>62</sup> “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 4, 1935, pp. 551–552, and 7, 1938, pp. 144–145.

<sup>63</sup> *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 552, and 7, 1938, p. 144.

[κάτῃ δω]δεκάτῃ τ[ῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία κυρία·]  
 5 [τῶν προέδ]ρων ἐπεψ[ήφισεν -----ca. 19-----]  
 [. . . . .<sup>9</sup>. . . . .]ος καὶ σ[υμπρόεδροι· -----ca. 14-----]  
 [-----ca. 7----- Ἀ]λαιεὺς [εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ πρότερον-----]<sup>64</sup>

We know more now than we did when I made my first suggestion in 1935. Even then I was able to free the text from a patronymic and gain a demotic. This was welcome progress. I offer now the text as indicated above, which seems to me justified by the limitations of time for the substance of the decree and the absence during this time of any other available candidate. The letters in line 3 deserve some further comment. Only the vertical stroke, as of iota, is preserved in the first space. But this could have been part of nu, as the reading was indeed given before my study of 1935. The second preserved letter I read in 1935 as epsilon instead of the omikron as earlier given, and some scholars whose judgment I respect have since then claimed that they believe omikron possible. I believe that the letter is epsilon, as I read it in 1935, and that omikron is not possible. Its position on the stone dictates that it be part of a demotic and not part of a patronymic. When the lines are plotted out, as I have shown them here, it is obvious that a patronymic is impossible and that the letters following belong to the word ἐ-γρα[μμάτευεν]. Of these the gamma and the rho exist only as vertical strokes. A bare tip of the alpha is preserved. A correct epigraphical reading, observing the approved critical conventions, is ἐ<γρ>α[μμάτευεν].

For the sequence of archons after Lysias (239/8) there is a beginning at least of unanimity among scholars.<sup>65</sup> The first four archons after Lysias are

238/7	Aristion
237/6	Kimon
236/5	Ekphantos
235/4	Lysanias

I have suggested for the four intervening years between Lysanias (235/4) and Jason (230/29) the following sequence:<sup>66</sup>

234/3	Philostratos
233/2	Antimachos
232/1	Phanostratos
231/0	Pheidostratos

These four archons figure in the military career of one Kallistratos, son of Kleoboulos, of Prospalta (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2854). They mark his rise from phylarch in 234/3, through the intervening stage of hipparch in 233/2, to his two successive generalships in 232/1 and 231/0. Another military man was general in the archonship of Antimachos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 3460), but his name is not known and he plays no part in fixing the date of the archon-

<sup>64</sup>For the rest of the text see *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 774.

<sup>65</sup>Habicht, *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 144.

<sup>66</sup>*Historia* 26, 1977, p. 177.

ship. Prosopographically there is a connection between the Councillor Κηφισόδο[τος Δελυί[ου] (Βουτάδης) of 303/2<sup>67</sup> and the thesmothetes of the archonship of Pheidostratos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 2855) who made a dedication which is now preserved in the museum in Syracuse, Δεινίας Κηφ[ισο]δότου Βουτάδης. Clearly the thesmothetes was the son of the Councillor, and Habicht writes: “*Ist dies richtig, so kann das Jahr des Pheidostratos jedenfalls nicht viel nach 250 fallen.*”<sup>68</sup> But this is by no means a certain conclusion. The age of the Councillor in 303/2 is not known (he may have been thirty-six as well as fifty), and the fact that his son was a thesmothetes at the time of his dedication implies that he was a man of mature years (if he was born about 290 his age in 231/0 would have been about sixty). There is nothing impossible, or even improbable, in the father-son relationship. Another clue to the date of the archon Antimachos lies in the fact that a certain Lykomedes, who had been priest of Asklepios in 265/4,<sup>69</sup> was later sponsor of a decree in the archonship of Philinos in 252/1<sup>70</sup> and again in the archonship of Antimachos<sup>71</sup> in 233/2. There is nothing here to preclude the dates I have suggested. It is not known at what age Lykomedes was priest of Asklepios and there would be nothing remarkable in the fact that his political activity could extend at least from 252/1 to 233/2. However this may be, the advocates of dating Antimachos and his group earlier than 250 have not indicated, exactly, how they would dispose the archonships. The secretary cycle was clearly being followed before Diomedon (see the table, pp. 94–95) and the secretary of the year of Antimachos came from the phyle Pandionis (V). The only legitimate date for Antimachos in the mid-century would be 261/0, a date which must be reserved for Arrheneides. It is not possible to date this group in the years immediately following the Chremonidean War, and the suggestion of a vague early date for them is to be rejected.

The archon Thymochares of *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 700 belongs in 257/6 because his year was intercalary, and his assignment carries with it, of course, the dating of Antiphon in 258/7. Two archons have not as yet been accounted for, Lykeas and Alkibiades. There are also two years in mid-3rd century, 263/2 and 259/8, for which no archons have as yet been assigned. Lykeas should probably be close to Polystratos, for both *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1283 and 1284 have the same orator, Σωσίας Ἴπποκράτου, otherwise unknown. Lykeas and Alkibiades may be assigned tentatively, and interchangeably, to these two years, but one or the other of them could belong in 255/4.

All the known archons of mid-3rd century have now been passed in review and possible combinations of archons and secretaries have been suggested. The result, in my opinion, justifies the use of the secretary cycle as employed here as an aid in dating the texts. It will be noticed also that the sequence of ordinary and intercalary years

<sup>67</sup> *Agora* XV, p. 76, no. 62, line 186.

<sup>68</sup> *Vestigia* 30, 1979, p. 136.

<sup>69</sup> *Chronology*, p. xix. The date, which we equated with the archonship of Peithidemos, is now corrected to 265/4 (see above, pp. 84–85).

<sup>70</sup> *Agora* XV, p. 98, no. 89, line 23.

<sup>71</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 769, lines 9–10.



follows the normal pattern for the tenth Metonic cycle, as well as for the ninth, except that Kallimedes in 250/49 and [. . .]βιος in 249/8 show I\* O instead of O I. The remarkable regularity of the calendar is another indication in favor of the order of the archons not only where the cycle has been operative but even in the years of confusion (255/4–240/39).<sup>72</sup>

THE ATHENIAN ARCHONS 265/4–230/29 B.C.

Type	Year	Archon	Secretary	Phyle
I*	265/4	Peithidemos	Secretary's name not inscribed <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 686 + 687, 1534B; <i>SEG</i> XXIV, 154; <i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 111; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 174; see above, pp. 78–79, 83–84 and below, p. 97	1
O	264/3	Diognetos	Secretary's name not given <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 688; Marmor Parium; see above, p. 79 and below, p. 96	2
I	263/2	Lykeas or Alkibiades see above, pp. 88, 93		3
O	262/1	Antipatros Apolodoros, frg. 44; <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 1217, line 3, 1282; see above, p. 79 and below, p. 98		4
Here begins the tenth Metonic cycle				
O*	261/0	Arrheneides	Secretary's name not given Apolodoros, frg. 44; Diogenes Laertius, vii.10; see above, p. 93 and below, p. 96	5
I	260/59	Polystratos	[. . . . . <sup>9</sup> . . . . . Φ]ανοπόν[πο]υ Π[ο]τά[μιος] <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 477, 1283; <i>Hesperia</i> 7, 1938, pp. 141–142; <i>Chronology</i> , p. 98; see above, p. 93 and below, pp. 97	VI
O	259/8	Lykeas or Alkibiades see above, pp. 88, 93		7
O	258/7	Antiphon <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 700 plus <i>Hesperia</i> 7, 1938, pp. 110–114; see above, p. 93		8
I*	257/6	Thymochares	Σώστρατο[ς] Ἄ[ρ]ι[στ] . . . . . <sup>16</sup> . . . . . <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 700 plus <i>Hesperia</i> 7, 1938, pp. 110–114; see above, p. 93	9
O*	256/5	Athenodoros	Ἄρκετος Ἄρχίου Ἀμαξαντεύς <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 784; see above, pp. 79, 82–83	X

<sup>72</sup>But see below, p. 98.

O	255/4	? ? ?	[----]ης Λυσιστράτου Μαρ[αθώνιος]	XI
			<i>Agora XV</i> , p. 93, no. 84, but for the archon Lykeas see above, pp. 88, 93	
I*	254/3	Euboulos	[. . .]ων Μιλτιάδου Ἄλωπεκῆθεν	XII
			<i>Agora XV</i> , p. 96, no. 87, and pp. 93–95, no. 85, line 11; <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 702; see above, pp. 89–91	
O	253/2	Lysiades	Ἄριστο[. . . . . <sup>16</sup> . . . . .]	1
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 775B; see above, pp. 85, 88–89	
I*	252/1	Philinos	Θεότιμος Στρατοκλέους Θοραιεύς	II
			<i>Agora XV</i> , pp. 97–99; <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 1279 as read in <i>BCH</i> 89, 1965, pp. 339–344; see above, pp. 85, 93	
O	251/0	Phanomachos		3
			<i>Hesperia</i> 7, 1938, pp. 9–10, see above, p. 89	
I*	250/49	Kallimedes	[Καλ]λίας Καλλιᾶδου Πλωθεύς	IV
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 777, 780, 2856; see above, pp. 86–87, and for the calendar see also below, p. 98	
O	249/8	[. . .]βιος	[-----]ιεύς	V
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 774, 792; see above, pp. 91–92	
O*	248/7	Thersilochos	Διόδωτος Διογνήτου Φρεάρριος	VI
			<i>SEG II</i> , 9, 10; <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 778, 780–782, 2856; see above, p. 86	
O*	247/6	Polyeuktos	Χαιρεφῶν Ἀρχεστράτου Κεφαλήθεν	VII
			<i>SEG II</i> , 9; <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 679–681; see above, pp. 80–82, 87	
I*	246/5	Hieron	Φαινύλος Πανφίλου Ὁῆθεν	VIII
			<i>SEG II</i> , 9, III, 92; <i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 683; see above, pp. 80–82	
O*	245/4	Diomedon	Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένου Ἀ[λωπεκῆθεν]	XII
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 791, 1298, 1534B; see above, pp. 80, 84	
I	244/3	Philoneos	[-----]δήμου Ὑ[βάδης]	VI
			<i>Chronology</i> , pp. 22–23; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 176	
O*	243/2	Theophemos	Προκ[λ]ῆς Ἀπ[. . . . . <sup>15</sup> . . . . .]	?
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 795; see above, p. 80	

## Here begins the eleventh Metonic cycle

O	242/1	Kydenor	Πολυκτῆμων Εὐκτιμένου Εὐπυρίδης	VI
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 766; Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον, Α', 1965, pp. 193–197; see above, p. 80	
I*	241/0	Eurykleides		?
			<i>SEG II</i> , 9; see above, p. 87	
O	240/39	Kleomachos	Ἀφθόνητος Ἀρχίου Κήτιος	VI
			<i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i> , 770, 2856; see above, pp. 82, 87	

I*	239/8	Lysias	[. . . . . ! <sup>6</sup> . . . . . Ἀφιδ]ναῖος	XI
			<i>Hesperia</i> 7, 1938, pp. 123–128; see above, p. 82	
O	238/7	Aristion		12
			Δελτ 23, 1968, pp. 1–6; <i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 436; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 176; see above, p. 92	
O	237/6	Kimon		1
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 787; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 176; see above, p. 92	
I*	236/5	Ekphantos	[. . . ? . . .]ος Δημητρίο[υ] Ἴπποτο[ο]μ[ά]δης	II
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 787, 788; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 176; see above, p. 92	
O	235/4	Lysanias	Εὐμηλος Ἐμπεδίωνος Εὐωνυμεύς	III
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 788; <i>Agora</i> XV, pp. 109–111, no. 115; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; see above, p. 92	
O	234/3	Philostratos		4
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 2854; <i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 435; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; see above, p. 92	
O*	233/2	Antimachos	Χαιρ[ι]γένης [Χαι]ριγένου Μυρρινούσιος	V
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 798, 2854; <i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 435; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; see above, pp. 92–93	
I	232/1	Phanostratos		6
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 2854; <i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 435; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; see above, p. 92	
O	231/0	Pheidostratos		7
			<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> , 2854, 2955; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; see above, pp. 92–93; interchangeable with Jason	
I	230/29	Jason		8
			<i>Hesperia</i> 38, 1969, p. 435; <i>Historia</i> 26, 1977, p. 177; interchangeable with Pheidostratos	

The decree of the archonship of Arrheneides (261/0) quoted by Diogenes Laertius shows in its preamble the normal structure of the assembly, with proedroi, symproedroi, and functioning prytanies. Only the secretary is missing, as he was also in the year of Diognetos (264/3) in the one partially preserved inscription of his year (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 688), which reads as follows:

ἐπὶ Διογνήτου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς]  
 [Ἄ]ντιοχίδος δωδεκάτης πρυταν]  
 [ν]είας· Σ[κιροφοριῶνος ----]  
 [. . .]μ[-----]

The name of the secretary was also missing from the preserved stelai of the year of Peithidemos.<sup>73</sup> In sequence of time the name of the secretary is first recorded again in 260/59 in the archonship of Polystratos.<sup>74</sup> Obviously the name to be inscribed was not known when the time came to inscribe it. These years were during the war and immediately thereafter. Our lack of knowledge of the names of secretaries for these years must be due to confusion and stress within the city during its long siege, not to political imposition from without. Indeed, it was Antigonos himself who asked the Demos to vote a decree in honor of Zeno in the first year of the peace. Whatever magistrates he abolished, he did not abolish the machinery of government.<sup>75</sup>

This peculiarity in the record of these years is easier to explain if it all is concentrated in one group of years. This is a further indication that Peithidemos belongs in 265/4 and not in 268/7. It would be extraordinary to find a hiatus of one year in the normal record in 268/7, to be followed by two normal years when Menekles and Nikias Otryneus were archons, then to have the hiatus resumed two years later, to last for the duration of the war. It is more reasonable to leave the archon Diogeiton in 268/7 and date Peithidemos in 265/4, where the evidence of *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1534B* shows that he begins a secretary cycle, which he would not do if dated in 268/7.

The publication of the Rhamnousian decree in honor of Epichares in the archonship of Peithidemos has thrown much light on the bitter fighting in the countryside.<sup>76</sup> It mentions his successful defense of the fortress, his elaborate provision for sustained resistance, his ransoming of prisoners with his own funds, his punishment of those from the city who had aided the pirates (τοῖς πειραταῖς) in entering the country, and his construction of shelters for the troops of Patroklos who had come to the aid of the Athenians. The text of this Rhamnousian decree has become available since the publication by James R. McCredie of *Fortified Military Camps in Attica*,<sup>77</sup> but it does much to strengthen his delineation of the events of the war. The invasion of king Areus of Sparta in 265/4 failed to collaborate successfully with Patroklos. Areus returned toward home and lost his life to the forces of Antigonos at Corinth in the late summer of 264 B.C. Athens, after a long siege, capitulated in the spring of 261 B.C. In this Heinen is surely right.<sup>78</sup> The first half of the Delian year of Tharsynon (261 B.C.) is equated with the second half of the year of Antipatros at Athens (262/1) and in the overlapping months the war came to an end.<sup>79</sup> In 1961 I used the evidence of a choregic dedication

<sup>73</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>, 687*; *Hesperia* 5, 1936, pp. 418–419 (but see now *Hesperia* 38, 1969, pp. 110–112). In the former text there were 37 spaces left blank for the later inscribing of the phrase ἦν ---- *nomen* ---- ἐγραμμάτευν; in the latter, only 30 spaces were left for the same phrase. In both cases the amount of space left was simply the remainder of a line.

<sup>74</sup> See above, p. 94

<sup>75</sup> See above, p. 79

<sup>76</sup> *SEG XXIV*, 154, also in full in *Untersuchungen*, pp. 152–153.

<sup>77</sup> *Hesperia*, Suppl. XI, Princeton 1966.

<sup>78</sup> *Untersuchungen*, p. 186.

<sup>79</sup> For the overlap see Alan Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology*, in Müller's *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* I, vii, Munich 1972, p. 99.

on Delos to show that in the archonship of Tharsynon the blessings of peace were realized and recorded epigraphically:<sup>80</sup>

[ἐπ' ἄρ]χοντος Θαρσύνουτος τοῦ  
 Χ[οι]ρύλου ὑγίεια εἰρήνη πλοῦτος  
 ἐγένετο.

Heinen stresses this evidence, with the conviction, which he argues convincingly, that the peace was indeed the peace restored between Athens and Antigonos after the Chremonidean War and with the correct observation that the Delian evidence accords just as well with the date 262/1 as with the date 261/0 for the archonship of Antipatros at Athens.<sup>81</sup> The date 262/1 is suggested for the archon Antipatros in the table presented above (p. 94). This table gives the archons arranged in accordance with the secretary cycle, barring the known divergence from Diomedon down to Lysias, and throughout the tenth Metonic cycle, as well as the ninth, the ordinary and intercalary years conform accurately to the normal sequence known for the years of the Metonic cycle, except for the transposition to I\* O instead of O I in the years 250/49 and 249/8. Even here the years of the Metonic cycle may have been normal if extra days were intercalated into the month Elaphebolion<sup>82</sup> in the archonship of Kallimedes.<sup>83</sup>

The Egyptians, already allied with Athens in the year of Peithidemos, and already harassing the forces of Antigonos in Attica with their fleet, were actively supported by, among others, Epichares and his soldiers at Rhamnous. The loyal Athenians gave aid and comfort to Patroklos. Meanwhile Areus brought his infantry into Attica, found the way to Athens itself blocked by Macedonian forces, stopped, encamped, and waited. As McCredie recounts the events, Patroklos brought his forces to the very edge of the Attic plain, establishing a strong-point even at Heliopolis, prepared to attack the Macedonians from the rear if Areus pressed on to his attack. For whatever reason, the combined attack was not made, and at the end of the campaigning season Areus, with provisions exhausted (Pausanias, III.6.6), withdrew toward Sparta. He was pursued by the Macedonians and Antigonos, at whose approach the disloyal Gallic allies of Antigonos slaughtered themselves at Megara.<sup>84</sup> The two armies met in battle at Corinth and Areus

<sup>80</sup> *IG XI 2*, 114, cited in B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1961, p. 226.

<sup>81</sup> *Untersuchungen*, pp. 186–189, with his criticism of my change of view (which I here retract) in his note 381 on p. 188.

<sup>82</sup> This is the month in which such intercalations are apt to occur because of possible irregularity connected with the Dionysiac festival (Meritt, *op. cit.* [footnote 80 above], pp. 33, 147–148, 149–150, 161–165, 208).

<sup>83</sup> If seven extra days were intercalated into Elaphebolion before the 21st in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 780, the year might be taken as ordinary. The equation in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 777 would then have to read, perhaps, Μουνηχι[ῶνος δεκάτη ἰσταμένου ἑνδεκάτη τῆς πρυτανείας]. These suggestions, however, have not been adopted in the table on p. 95. The year 250/49 is shown as intercalary.

<sup>84</sup> The slaughter is recounted by Justin, xxvi.2.1–6, who epitomizes Trogus in the prologue to his Book xxvi, in part as follows: *Sexto et vicesimo volumine continentur haec. Quibus in urbibus Graeciae dominationem Antigonus Gonatas constituerit. Ut defectores Gallos Megaris delevit regemque Lacedaemonium Area Corinthi interfecit, dehinc cum fratris sui Crateri filio Alexandro bellum habuit.*

was slain.<sup>85</sup> There is no evidence that Areus made more than one incursion into Attica or that he returned safely to Sparta from it. This ended the help to Athens from their Spartan allies.

The Egyptians remained, but they were no match for the Macedonians. Antigonos returned from Corinth to the siege of Athens, which capitulated in the early summer of 261 B.C. after holding out two and a half more years (Pausanias, III.6.6 says ἐπὶ μακρότατον). As McCredie says, the prolonged Athenian resistance is easier to understand if Athens had at least one ally. And the military career of Areus is easier to understand if he made only one campaign, that of 264 B.C.. After the death of Areus at Corinth Antigonos had to deal with an invasion of Macedonia by his cousin Alexander of Epirus (see footnote 84) and his preoccupation with this struggle doubtless gave the Athenians borrowed time to hold out as long as they did.<sup>86</sup>

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN  
Department of Classics  
Austin, Texas 78712

<sup>85</sup>For the death of Areus at Corinth see Plutarch, *Agis* III.4.

<sup>86</sup>The concluding years of the Chremonidean War are discussed by Heinz Heinen, *Untersuchungen*, p. 213, but he extends the war unduly to include *three* campaigns by Areus against Antigonos in Athens.