

S. C. HUMPHREYS

PHRATERES IN ALOPEKE, AND THE SALAMINIOI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 243–248

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



### Phrateres in Alopeke, and the Salaminioi

It does not seem to have been pointed out that David Lewis' identification of [Kt]esikleides Ktesonos in *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 2345.35* as belonging to Alopeke<sup>1</sup> allows us to identify Alopeke as the main base of the phratry whose members, grouped by thiasoi, are listed in *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 2345*. (The daughter of Ktesikles of Alopeke, *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 5560*, may be related to Ktesikleides.) Phrateres who do not belong to Alopeke are listed with their demotic: six from Agryle, next door to Alopeke; one from Kedoi, which is unlocated but as a city deme of Erechtheis could well have lain between Agryle and Themakos or Euonymon; one from Euonymon; outliers from Kephisia and Paiania.<sup>2</sup>

This is the pattern we should expect both from what we know in general about the phratry system and from the structure of our list, in which indications of identity other than personal names— i.e. patronymics and demotics—are provided only sporadically, partly to distinguish homonymous pairs, partly it seems to mark off small groups united by closer ties within a thiasos, and also—*ex hypothesi*—to identify those who did not belong to the main deme group. Attic phratries were almost certainly fewer in number than demes, and therefore larger; they would thus have drawn their members from more than one deme, but would nevertheless have had a cult centre which would also be the centre of one of the constituent demes. Koutsopodi/Katsipodi, where the stone was found (Eustratiades, *AE* 1872, 386-91 no. 419) is currently identified as the deme centre of Alopeke, which should lie between Phaleron and Athens and adjoin Diomeia (Hdt. 5.63; *AM* 1895, 507, accepted by Traill). Eustratiades noted when he published the stone that the identification of Agryleans by demotic implied that Koutsopodi was not Agryle, a conclusion reiterated by de Sanctis (*Atthis*, p. 86 in 1975 ed.). Ferguson's complicated and implausible theory (*CP* 1910, 272-5) that this phratry arose as a confederation of hunters and pastoralists who roamed over Hymettos and worshipped Artemis Agrotera at Agrai (which he seems inclined to assign to Agryle) is not like to find many takers today. C.W. Hedrick (*The Athenian Phratry*, Diss. Penn. 1984) has repeated the attribution to Agryle with different but equally unconvincing arguments. In my view it cannot stand.

---

<sup>1</sup> *BSA* 1955, 13-14; *Agora* XV 55.37, cf. 46.54.

<sup>2</sup> In lines 13-14 we have -aios Paianio and [Eu]phrosynos Paianio. The demotic of Paiania is of course Paianieus, and it is possible that Paianio(u) is a patronymic, though as far as I know Paianios is not attested as an Attic name (Pape-Benseler has one in Elis). However, a Euphrosynos of Paiania was sent as an envoy to Keos, probably in the 350s (*IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1128.39 f.*), and it is tempting to assume that our Euphrosynos is the same man, though admittedly the name is known from several other demes.

Prosopography supports the Alopeke identification; several men on the list can be linked to or identified with known members of that deme. Demophilos Leo- of line 17 will be the Demophilos of Alopeke who paid 101 drachmas in the late 340s on behalf of Leostratos of Alopeke, epimeletes of the dockyards in 360/59 (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1622.558-63). He appears again as [Dem]ophilos Leostratou, councillor for Alopeke c. 321 (*Agora XV.55.39*). Chion, line 85, will be the grandson of the Chion whose son Lysiades I of Alopeke is commemorated on *IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 5565, dated between 410 and 390, and father of the Lysiades II son of Chion of Alopeke who frees a slave in the 330s or 320s (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1559.93). Pantar[etos], line 57, will be either Pantaretos I son of Antiphilos of Alopeke, *PA* 11606, amphictyon on Delos 390/89 - 389/8 (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1634.3) or, more probably, a grandson, Pantaretos II. The Antiphilos of line 52 will be a son of the amphictyon.

Aristeides son of Phoruski(des), line 67, will be an ancestor of the 3rd c. secretary Phoruskides son of Aristomenes of A[lopeke] (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 791) and his son [Aristomenes?] Ph[o]ruskid[ou A]lopeke[then], now known as a cavalryman (Kroll, *Hesp.* 1977 nos. 54, 60, 65b; G.R. Bugh, *The Horsemen of Athens*, 1988, no. 212).<sup>3</sup>

Other names are less distinctive, but cumulatively make a respectable showing. The numerous names based on the root Kephiso- in our list can be paralleled by -phon Kephiso(u), councillor for Alopeke in 303/2 (*Agora XV.62.305*). Androkleides, line 47, could be the Androkleides who was councillor for Alopeke c. 330 (*ibid.* 46.51). The Glaukippos named without patronymic in line 15 could be Glaukippos son of Glaukon of Alopeke, named on a dedication of the mid fourth century (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 2826); but since there are two other men named Glaukippos in our list (lines 41, 86), this suggestion can hardly carry much weight. Theodosios, line 16, could be the Theodosios of Alopeke who frees a slave with Peithenous and Lysistratos of Alopeke in the 330s or 320s (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1569.33); the name-root -peithes turns up in lines 4 and 6 of our list. The Euxitheos of line 75 could be the father of Chairestratos Euxitheou of Alopeke, councillor in 334/3 (*Agora XV.44.53*), but we also have [Eu]xitheos son of Hagnon in line 21, and again the name is very common. The same goes for Sosidemou, line 27, who could be the father (or son) of Pytheas Sosidemou of Alopeke, superintendant of waterworks in 333/2 (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 338, *SEG* 34.68; see now Habicht, *ZPE* 77.83-7). Antiphanes son of Aresias, leader of a thiasos (lines 44-5), could be the father of Theodoros Antiphaneos of Alopeke, councillor in 334/3 (*Agora XV.44.56*). Hagnotheos son of Hagnon, line 19, might be the Hagnotheos of Alopeke who was secretary to the epistatai at Eleusis in 336/3 (*IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1543-4). Theopompos, line 23, could be the Theopompos who was councillor for Alopeke c. 330 (*Agora XV.46.56*). Diokles, line 54, could be Diokles of Alopeke, general in 357/6 and trierarch (*APF* 3990); if Diphilos Diokleous in line 66 is his son it is odd to find him in a differ-

---

<sup>3</sup> I am not particularly impressed by the appearance of a metic Phoruskos living in Alopeke c. 343 (Walbank, *Hesp.* 1983, *Stele Ic* col. III 7-8); the name is attested in Pallene, Leukonoion and Phaleron in the 4th c. and in Krioia in the 3rd (*PA, Agora XV s.v.*).

ent thiasos. Timokrates son of Ariston, line 65, might be connected with the Ariston of Alopeke who worked on the Erechtheion in the early fourth century (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1654), and/or with the Ariston of Alopeke who was sued by Aristogeiton *bouleuseōs* (*PA* 2149). Antiphon son of Nantes, line 51, might be related to Antiphon son of Solon of Alopeke, councillor 334/3 (*Agora* XV.44.56). Marginally more promising, perhaps, is the possibility of a link between Eudromos, line 87, and Antibios son of Eudramon of Alopeke, buried after the middle of the fourth century (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5548, with a wife also from Alopeke). Gnathios, line 71, may be linked with -sos Gnath[ ], councillor for Alopeke in 303/2 (*Agora* XV.62.303). Arcestratos son of Spoudides, line 25, might be related to Arcestratos son of Kriton of Alopeke, trierarch in 357/6 (see *APF* 8823); we also have a Kriton in line 61, but he is in a different thiasos from Arcestratos and his contribution of 7 dr. to the common cause seems stingy for a trierarchic family.

All these common names could probably be paralleled at about the same period from any deme of the size of Alopeke,<sup>4</sup> and I have to admit that there are no Alopeke parallels for the more unusual names in our list—[Ak]ryptos, A[m]yntor, Kaineus, Philodamidas. There is an Akryptos of the fourth century in Anagyrous, *PA* 482, and a Kaineus son of Hierokles buried in the Kerameikos c. 350 (*AM* 1970, 102 n. 4; he has no demotic and M. J. Osborne, *Anc. Soc.* 1988, no. 249, is wrong in saying that he has been attributed to Halai). The other names have as yet no parallels from the classical period. (Kirchner suggested that [Dio]timos Olym-piodoro(u) in line 22 could be Diotimos III of Euonymon, the well-known general, but as *APF* 4386 points out, the general was son of Diopethes; both names are very common.)

I have another suggestion to make which is more adventurous. We have a Diogenes as thiasos-leader in our list (58-9) who might be Diogenes son of Diogeiton, councillor for Alopeke in 334/3 (*Agora* XV.44.51), brother of Pos[ei]d[on]nios Diog<eito>nos of Alopeke for whom we know of a lost fourth-century (?) tombstone (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5575). In line 62 we have a Diodotos. As is well known, Lysias 32 was written for a lawsuit of 401/0 concerning the affairs of two brothers, Diogeiton and Diodotos, who made most of their wealth by lending money on trading voyages. Diogeiton had a single daughter by his first marriage, whom he married to his brother, and two or more sons by a second wife, born between 418 and 400 (*APF* 3885). Diodotos had two sons, the elder of whom came of age in 401/0. The two men

---

<sup>4</sup> However, Agryle can produce very few parallels for the names on the list. Demophilos son of Pantaleon of Agryle was secretary to the council in 343/2 (*Agora* XV.34.4), but as has been seen we have a better identification in Alopeke. Timokrates son of Ariston on our list (line 65) could be identified with the Timokrates of Agryle who was councillor in (?) 336/5 (*Agora* XV 42.20); Ariston son of Ariston, councillor for Erechtheis in 335/4, might come from Agryle but there is no strong reason for arguing that he does (*Agora* XV 43.10). There is a Hagnotheos in Agryle in the late 3rd c. (*PA* 148); the name is common. Since we can positively identify three of the five men assigned to Agryle in our list with members of that deme recorded in other sources— Hippon (line 78) as councillor in (?) 336/5, *Agora* XV 42.21, Demon and Demaretos as Salaminioi (see below), the very low number of possible Agryle identifications for the other names on the list should weigh heavily against the view that the deme centre was in Agryle.

in our text could therefore be an elderly son of Diogeiton and a grandson of Diodotos; Diodotos' sons, being orphans, might well have married relatively early. It seems entirely appropriate that Lysias' Diogeiton should have named a son in honour of Poseidon. The appearance of Diodotos in the same thiasos would indicate that the breach between the two branches of the family had healed.

This identification, if accepted, would put the date of our text between c. 350 and 330. Kirchner's date *ante med. s. IV. a.* was presumably based more on prosopographical than on epigraphic grounds. Genitives in -o are no problem in the third quarter of the century in a document from a local group, which has many abbreviations (Threatte I, 256-8). However, as Ferguson pointed out in *Hesperia* 1938, three of the phrateres from Agryle can probably be identified as men who took the oath of reconciliation on behalf of the Salaminioi of the Seven Tribes in 363/2. Stratophon of Agryle, line 77 of our list, will be Stratophon son of Straton, line 76 in Ferguson's text (*LSS* 19.75); Demon of Agryle, line 78 will be Demon son of Demaretos of the Salaminioi (Ferguson line 79), and the name in line 83 of our text will probably be his son Demaretos II. That would perhaps lead us to date our text in the 350s at the latest. It also raises the question whether all the Salaminioi belonged to this phratry.

The Salaminioi were responsible both for the sanctuary of Eurysakes in the city, in Melite, and for the temple of Athena Skiras at Phaleron; this is quite consistent with membership of a phratry whose centre lay on the road from the city to Phaleron. By 507 there were members of the genos in eight tribes, the largest group being settled in Sounion (Leontis), where the genos also (in the fourth century) had cult interests.

Most explanations of this distribution of members have started from the assumption that the genos was created in the seventh or sixth century and that its emergence was somehow connected with the Athenian struggle to gain control of Salamis. Ferguson suggested that two groups of Athenians particularly interested in the island, one based in Melite and the other in Sounion, had joined forces and legitimized their position by claiming descent from Eurysakes, a son of Ajax. Nilsson (*AJP* 1938) thought that the Salaminioi had been deported from Salamis after the Athenian conquest. This view has the advantage of explaining why the genos had no cult centre or cult interests on the island itself, which is hard to understand either on Ferguson's view or in the more complicated scheme of Guarducci (*RFIC* 1948). However, the prominent position of the genos in cult at Phaleron<sup>5</sup> would be surprising for a group which had lost its land and had been deported.

---

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that the Salaminian priestess of Aglauros, Pandrosos and Kourotrophos did not necessarily carry out her duties on the Acropolis, as assumed by Ferguson. Sacrifices to Aglauros in rural Attika are now attested at Erchia (*LS* 18, Skirophorion 3, possibly the date of the Arrhephoria) and Thorikos (*SEG* 33.147, 35.112, at the Plynteria, Thargelion 25), and Kourotrophos is ubiquitous. It is certainly odd that the Salaminian calendar records no sacrifices to Aglauros and Pandrosos, but by the 4th c. responsibility for some cults may well have been taken over by the demes in whose territories the Salaminian sanctuaries lay.

All these theories which posit a late origin for the Salaminioi could quite easily incorporate the assumption that the genos was split between several phratries, although the question has not always been explicitly put. Zambelli (*RFIC* 1976) firmly takes this view; he thinks that the Salaminioi of the Seven Tribes had immigrated to Attika in the eighth or seventh century and had acquired their genos status by campaigning for the recovery of the island in the sixth century (the Sounion branch would have been incorporated later). Bourriot (*Recherches sur la nature du genos*, 1976) would presumably take the same view, since he thinks the genos may have emerged as late as the fourth century, though he does not develop this idea in any detail.

Bourriot's demolition of the narrow stereotype of the genos, based on Fustel de Coulanges, which led Ferguson and others to see the Salaminioi as anomalous and therefore late, leaves the coast clear for reconsidering the case for an earlier date. None of the attempts to link the genos with the sixth-century conquest of Salamis has been really persuasive. I suggest that the nucleus of the genos may have migrated from Salamis to Athens in the dark ages, settling close to the Acropolis at first and later moving out to Alopeke. Their cult of Eurysakes may have been inspired by the Iliad; Eurysakes is clearly in origin a riddling reference to Ajax himself, one of the kennings popular with epic poets and their audiences, only later rationalized as the son of the hero. Doubtless some Salaminioi moved on from Alopeke to Phaleron, as trade began to play a larger part in Athenian life, but most of the demes in which Salaminioi are attested as members cluster in the city and the nearby plain (Skambonidai, Boutadai, Acharnai, Epikhephisia, Agryle); this pattern suggests that the group was thoroughly incorporated into the city elite. I assume that they were recognized as Eupatridai when the Eupatrid Estate was formally defined, a development which I would date in the early seventh century (Humphreys, *Sociologia del diritto* 8, 1983). The move of one branch to Sounion may have taken place only when the silver mines in the area began to attract interest, in the sixth century. This branch prospered, and by the fourth century its lands were the economic mainstay of the genos; on the other hand, the city branch had the éclat of managing the Oschophoria, in which the state had come to take an interest at some point during the sixth or fifth century. By the fourth century the cult of Eurysakes was overshadowed by the Oschophoria and by the festival of Herakles in Sounion, and Eurysakes is the only element in the ritual calendar of the genos which connects it to Salamis. This does not suggest to me that the Salaminioi played a conspicuous part in the recapture of the island in the sixth century.

With this early dating goes the view that all Salaminioi should have belonged to one phratry, although only three can be identified in our list. However, this text (now fragmentary) is not at all likely to have been a complete membership record. It probably contained listings for eight thiasoi, with a total of c. 150-200 names. There may have been thiasoi in the phratry which did not appear on the list at all, and those which do appear may not have been fully represented. Twelve names have figures after them, ranging from 5 to [10]5; this suggests that the stone recorded contributions to some common enterprise, probably repairs or new building

work in a sanctuary in Alopeke.<sup>6</sup> Phrateres who lived at a considerable distance, and seldom came to Alopeke, will not have contributed, nor will the poorer members of the group. The Salaminioi of Sounion had their own cult interests, and probably had their own thiasos or thiasoi.

Ann Arbor, Michigan

S. C. Humphreys

---

<sup>6</sup> As Eustratides suggested, a norm was probably set for contributions, perhaps of 10 drachmai; only sums larger or smaller would be specified. Euphronios' *pais* in line 73 will be a son too young for phratry membership whose father or guardian nevertheless paid a contribution on his behalf; contributions on behalf of children are often mentioned in *epidosis* lists.