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The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities: I

(A) Introduction

The eponymous official or magistrate after whom the year was named in Greek cities or associations is well known to all epigraphists under various titles: archon, prytanis, stephanephoros, priest, etc. Some details about them have appeared in many articles and in scattered passages of scholarly books. However, not since the publication of Clemens Gnaedinger, De Graecorum magistratibus eponymis quaestiones epigraphicae selectae (Diss. Strassburg 1892) has there been a treatment of the subject as a whole, although the growth of the material in this regard has been enormous. What is missing, however, is an attempt to bring the material up to date in a comprehensive survey covering the whole Greek world, at least as far as possible. The present article, of which this is only the first part, will present that material in a geographically organized manner: mainland Greece and the adjacent islands, then the Aegean islands, Asia Minor and Thrace, Syria, Egypt, Cyrene, Sicily, and southern Italy. All the epigraphic remains of that area have been examined and catalogued. General observations and conclusions will be presented after the evidence as a whole has been given.

I. Earliest Examples of Eponymity

The earliest form of writing appeared in Sumer and Assyria sometime within the last half of the fourth millennium BC, and from there it spread westward. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the Mesopotamian civilizations also made the earliest use of assigning names or events to years in dating historical records. From perhaps about the middle of the third millennium an Old Sumerian text carries the date ‘At that time Entemena was ensi of Lagash, Enetarzi was šanga of Ningirsu—year 19’, a formula that has its parallel in Greek historical

1 The old account by E. Saglio in Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des antiquités s.v. Eponymos, 735-736, is merely an explanation of the term with a few notes, and the one by J. Oehler in RE s.v. Eponymos, cols. 244-245, is no better. There are some useful observations by A. Ronconi in the Enciclopedia italiana s.v. Eponimo, 119-120, but that is all. Just as inadequate is the entry by H. Kaletsch in Der Kleine Pauly s.v. Zeitrechnung, cols. 1476-1479. Useful, from a particular perspective, is Laqueur in RE s.v. Lokalchronik, cols. 1083-1088, as are also several entries in RE under the headings of stephanephoros, prytanis, etc. It would serve no purpose to list here all the scholars whose remarks on eponymous officials have been useful to the present writer—they will be mentioned in the proper places—but I must single out L. Robert, whose innumerable comments on the subject were always much to the point: e.g. in Études épigraphiques et philologiques, Paris 1938, 143-150 (Roman emperors as eponyms); Hellenica 2.50-64 (divinities holding eponymous offices); Revue de Philologie 85 (1959) 199-205 (Review of G. Mihailov, I. Bulg. I); Gnomon 35 (1963) 67-68 (false eponyms). He had intended to present a ‘tableau’ of the eponymous officials as a whole, but unfortunately it never appeared: cf. Hellenica 10 (1955) 289 n. 1.
documents 2000 years later. Most common in the oldest Mesopotamian period was the practice of naming each year after some political or sacral event, as was the case in Babylonia. There the practice began in the kingdom of Akkad, i.e. since about 2600 BC, although the count by regnal years was introduced in the Kassite Dynasty of later times. Details, however, varied from city to city. In Assyria the king was the high priest of the god Asshur and seems to have been crowned anew year by year. As king he gave his name to the first year of his reign, whereas the following years were named after the Assyrian officials called the \textit{li-i-mu} (or \textit{li-im-mu}), who held office for one year only. The next king in the succession began a new eponym period. Such lists of eponym periods also served as king lists. Similar practices are known to have been followed in Cappadocian documents from Kül-tepe, most likely because of the close connection between colony and the Assyrian motherland. In Egypt the dating also in early times was coordinated with the listing of events, as seen in the so-called Palermo Stone of the middle of the third millennium BC. Only later did the Egyptians date their monuments and documents by regnal years. Thus, the Greeks and Romans had merely followed along in a long tradition of eponymity apparently as old as the necessity of preserving a sequence of time for historical or sacral purposes, a tradition that may have occurred naturally to man after the formation of political life.

II. Ancient Lists of Eponymous Greek Officials

Both literary and epigraphic sources mention the compilation of lists or records of some sort of eponymous officials by ancient Greek writers. Charon of Lampsakos is said to have written the \textit{Prytaneis of the Lacedaemonians} (\textit{FGrHist} 262 T 1). Well known is the collection of Athenian archons by Demetrius of Phaleron (Diogenes Laertius, \textit{Lives} 1.22 [Thales]), and Plutarch (\textit{Aristeides} 5.9-10). A certain Ktesikleides also seems to have listed the Athenian archons (Diogenes Laertius, \textit{Lives} 2.56 [Xenophon]). Philochoros may have done the same or at least wrote about them in the fourth century (\textit{FGrHist} 328 F 72). Phainias of Eresos wrote at least two books on the \textit{Prytaneis of Eresos} (Athenaeus 333a). Hermogenes son of Charidemos, a physician of Smyrna whose writings, listed in \textit{IGRR} IV 1445, include πίνακα(κα) Ἐρῳμαῖων καὶ Ζμυναῖων διαδοχή(ν) κατὰ χρόνονς. Charon of Naukratis compiled a list

---

2 I quote the entry in the Sumerian text from M.B. Rowton in \textit{CAH} 2 1.1.220 n. 3.


4 For the lists of Assyrian eponymous \textit{li-i-mu} see the basic article of Ungnad, \textit{op. cit.}, 413-457. The great canon of these eponyms begins in 911 and reaches to 648 BC. For further observations see Rowton in \textit{CAH} 2 1.1.193ff. and Falkner in \textit{Arch. f. Orient f.} 17 (1954) 100-120. A convenient example is in Pritchard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 274, no. 6. Even more instructive is the use of an eponym to date an Old Assyrian legal document of the nineteenth century BC: in Pritchard p. 543, no. 3.

5 The Palermo Stone was published by H. Schäfer in the \textit{Abh. der preuss. Ak. der Wiss.} (Berlin 1902). There is a photograph in \textit{CAH} 2, Plates to Vol. 1, no. 25.
of eponymous priests in Alexandria (*FGrHist* 612). These facts and others indicate a wide interest in keeping such records for historical or sacral purposes. In addition, a most important inscription from Rhodes (*SIG*3 723) contains some regulations for the compulsory up-dating of the list of eponymous priests. A passage of the *Monumentum Archilochi* that was engraved in the first century shows knowledge of the Parian archons back to the seventh century (*IG* XII 5.445). It will be useful to assemble here references to the lists of eponymous Greek officials extant on stone and papyri.

**ATHENS.** Earliest are three fragments published by D.W. Bradeen in *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 187-208 (*SEG* XXI 96) which contain the names of the eponymous archons of 597/6 to 595/4, 551/0 to 546/5, and 490/9 to 489/8 BC. Next is a fragment published by B.D. Meritt in *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 59-65 (*SEG* X 352) with the archons’ names from 527/6 to 522/1 BC. All four are in Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 6. They seem to have been engraved about 425 BC, probably as part of a stele. The remaining epigraphic lists of the Athenian archons belong to the Hellenistic age: *IG* II2 1706, 1713-1715, 1717 to 1722, 1724-1730, 1734-1736. Of these the longest is 1706 (229/8 to 213/12 BC). No. 1713 has preserved six to eight names for each of five columns, their dates ranging from 129/8 BC to AD 30/1. No. 1714 displays the names of the archon basileus, the polemarch, the six thesmothetai, and the herald of the Areopagus, but does not contain, nor did it ever contain, an entry for the eponymous archon at its head. Its date is the year of anarchy in Athens, 88/7 BC. No. 1715 has only a single entry. Nos. 1717-1730 are mere fragments to the beginning of the first century after Christ, and nos. 1734-1736 are tiny pieces to the reign of Claudius or Nero. There is a fine analysis of all these lists by S. Dow in *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 140-90.

**MILETUS.** The longest and most complete of all lists of eponymous officials on stone is the one from Miletus. Beginning in 525/4 BC the Milesian eponym was chosen or elected from a private society of sacred singers and dancers called the molpoi. Later the society became public. The senior members were called stephanephoroi and they formed a committee of six: five proseteroi and one aisymnetes. The aisymnetes was the eponymous official of the city. The coming of Alexander the Great and the subsequent liberation of Miletus from the Persians caused the city to have the first great stele engraved with the names of the eponyms from 525/4 BC to the year 334/3 BC, when Alexander himself was made the eponymous aisymnetes. Each year thereafter the names of the successive eponyms were added down to 314/3 BC, when Asander was aisymnetes. It was Asander who came to terms with Antigonus,

---

7 See the revised reading of the stone by Hiller von Gaertringen in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 (1929) 349 ff.
8 Cf. F. Jacoby, *Aththis* (Oxford 1949) 364 n. 64; revised reading reported in *SEG* XV 518.
agreed to turn over to him all his soldiers, and declared that the would leave the Greek cities of Caria free (Diodorus 19.75.1). This is mentioned at the beginning of the second stele for the year 313/12 BC: Όδε μολπόν ἡμισμνήσαν· Ἰππόμαχος θήρωνος ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἡ πόλις ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη.11 The stele then lists all the eponyms down to 260/59 BC; the third, with a small lacuna at the beginning, from 232/1 to 184/3 BC; the fourth form 89/8 to 54/3 BC; the fifth from 53/2 to 18/7 BC; the sixth from 17/6 BC to AD 20/1; and the seventh form AD 21/2 to 31/2.12 Further details on the eponyms will be found in the Register, below, s.v. Miletus.

LINDOS. Second only to Miletus in the fulness of its list of eponymous officials, Lindos on the island of Rhodes had erected a series of stone stelai in its sanctuary of Athena Lindia containing the list of its eponymous priests of the goddess from 406 BC to AD 27. The opening year of that list becomes significant when we realize that the synoikismos of Lindos, Camiros, and Ialysos took place in 408-407 BC. That event marked the beginning of a new era (Diodorus 13.75). The list, as we have it, begins in 375 BC and continues to 357, then 339-326, 293-275, 270-247, 244-238, and 170 BC to AD 27. An unusual feature of the list is the presence in the margin of the letter delta to mark every tenth name and an eta (+ multiples of it) to mark every hundredth name. This permits us to see that the list began in 406 BC. And undoubtedly the list continued on after AD 27, for the use of the same eponymous priests in many documents continues into the third century after Christ. After the final publication of the list by Chr. Blinkenberg (Lindos II: Inscriptions, Tome I, Berlin-Copenhagen 1941, no. 1) another fragment was published by M. Segre in La Parola del Passato 3 (1948) 64-80, containing the names of 24 priests in succession and dating from the period of the great gap between 238 and 170 BC.

THASOS. Engraved on marble blocks and forming part of the wall of a public building, a list of the Thasian eponymous archons had been on view in the agora from about the middle of the fourth century. As presently known, the list begins about the middle of the sixth century and continues with numerous gaps to approximately 255 BC. In addition, there are small fragments carrying it on into the Roman imperial period.13

CAMIROS. Inscribed on the pillars and epistyle of a public building, the list of eponymous damiourgoi of Camiros extends from 279 BC to the beginning of the Roman period and

11 A. Rehm, Milet I 3: Das Delphinion in Milet (Berlin 1914) no. 123.
then continues, on a stele, for the years approximately AD 55-90 and AD 150-190. Most dates are provisional.14

RHODES. When the previously independent cities of Lindos, Ialysos, and Camiros became one state with Rhodes as the new federal capital in 408-407 BC, each of them retained its own eponymous official. However, the eponymous official of the new Rhodian state was the priest of the Sun (Halios). A list of these priests on a stele was found in 1944 and published by L. Morricone in the *Annuario* 27-29 (1949-1951) 351-380 (also in *SEG* XII 360). The stele, broken off at the bottom, is in two columns and lists the priests from 408/7 to 299/8 (or 293/2) BC, with a gap from 368/7 to 334/3 (or 328/7) BC. The list begins with a heading: Ἄλιο ἱερής τοῖς.15

TAUROMENIUM. Among the many lists of officials discovered at Tauromenium in Sicily there is one which is peculiar: *IG* XIV 421, a marble cippus. It begins with the heading: Στραταγείος διὰ πέντε ἐτῶν. This is followed by Ἐπὶ Ἰστιείου and then the names of two men. There are 120 such entries in all. Clearly the eponymous officials are used to date the names of the strategoi. The first 101 entries follow each other in succession, then three gaps separate the others. F. Sartori (*Athenaeum* 42 [1954] 360-77) thinks that the list began about 270 BC, while G. Manganaro (*Archeologia Classica* 15 [1963] 20-22) prefers about 241 BC. Clearly this is not a list of eponyms but rather a list of strategoi arranged chronologically by the eponymous officials, whose title is never revealed. Guarducci (*Epigrafia* II 346) and Manganaro both believe, however, that their title is a priesthood, probably that of Apollo who figures prominently in the coinage of the city.

PRIENE. Small fragments of a list of eponymous stephanephoroi from Priene are extant (*I. Priene* 141-142). The first is a tiny piece of stone engraved with the name of Zeus in three successive lines, the third showing a numeral in the typical pattern of eponyms in which the god held the office for a number of times: Ζεύς τὸ γ’. The second is a series of fragments containing names in sequence, among which are those of the emperor Tiberius holding the office (of stephanephoros) for the second time, Germanicus Caesar, Tiberius for the [third] time, Gaius Caesar Augustus, and Germanicus. The naming of Roman emperors in a list of officials from a Greek city ordinarily means that it is a case of the highest Greek official, regularly the eponymous.

SPARTA. There is no extant list, large or small, of the eponymous ephors at Sparta, but there are a few indications that a list on stone of the eponymous patronomoi had existed. The Spartan patronomoi supplanted the ephors as the eponymous magistrates by the first century BC, perhaps even by the second century. *IG* V 1.48 lists six of them in succession, followed by their synarchoi, and A.M. Woodward published a short fragment listing seven patronomoi 14 See M. Segre and I. Pugliese Carratelli in *Annuario della Regia Scuola Archaeologia de Atene* 27-29 (1949-1951) 145-57, nos. 3-4. 15 There is a photograph in Guarducci, *Epigrafia* II 345.
followed by the name of a secretary. The difficulty with all lists of magistrates from Sparta is the fact that ‘it was a common practice to record lists of more than one board of magistrates together’ (Woodward, *I.c.*). Thus, it cannot be determined positively whether the Spartans ever had published on stone anything like a full list of any of their eponymous magistrates, although the statement of Thucydides (2.2) seems to suggest that a list of ephors had been published and was generally available to men like himself. The many lists of ephors on stone during the Roman period are not eponymous.

**TENOS.** There is a remarkable series of inscriptions from the island of Tenos (*IG* XII 5, 880-888) that seem to date from the first century BC. The material is arranged by groups, each group headed by the name of the eponymous archon and then followed by the names of the city officials, such as the secretary of the boule, the prytaneis, strategoi, gymnasiarch, etc. Thus, what we have appears to be an organized listing of all the officials in chronological sequence year by year. Nos. 895-909 (with Suppl. 312 and 314-15) push the list ahead to the imperial period. See also *SEG* XIV 553, with similar chronological groups of the second to the first century BC.

**CHIOS.** A number of different texts are given in *SEG* XVII 381 showing many fragments of what is almost certainly a list of the eponymous magistrates of Chios. The eponymous magistrate is a prytanis to whom the title stephanephoros was later given in the Hellenistic period. Although the title of the magistrate does not appear in the list as we have it, the appearance in the list of King Rhoemetalkas and Antiochus of Commagene strongly suggests that it is indeed a list of eponyms.

**ANTHEDON IN BOEOTIA.** *IG* VII 4173, as re-published by P. Roesch in *ZPE* 24 (1977) 179-85 (*SEG* XXVII 52), is a list of the eponymous archons of Anthedon, beginning about AD 170 and continuing to AD 224. Several different engravers had participated in the updating of the list.

**DIONYSOPOLIS.** *I. Bulg.* I² 22 of the second century BC is a list of the eponymous priests of Dionysos, preceded by a heading: [Oíde iérhyn]tau Διονύσου μετά τούς ιερησαμένους διά βίου.18

**ODESSOS.** *I. Bulg.* I² 46 is a catalogue of priests between 44-43 BC and AD 2-3, with a heading: Oíde iérhntai τῷ θεών μετά τήν κάθηδραν. The name of the god is not given, but see Gočeva in *Klio* 62 (1980) 49-53. L. Robert in *Revue de Philologie* 33 (1959) 192ff. thinks it is a list of eponymous priests.

---

16 *ABSA* 26 (1923-24, 1924-25) 227 no. 20, c.
ASTYPALAEA. W. Peek in *Inschriften von den dorischen Inseln, Abh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 60, 1 (Leipzig 1969) no. 100 has published an inscription containing 14 lines of a list of names who appear to be the eponymous magistrates (damioergoi) of the city, to judge from the appearance of the god Asklepios many times in that list.\(^{19}\) The date is the Roman imperial period.

HERAKLEIA-BY-LATMOS. *OGIS* 459 is a list of the eponymous (strategoi) of the city, among whom are Caesar Augustus for the third time, and again for the fourth time, and Gaius Caesar twice.

AMYZON. J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie*, Paris 1983, nos. 51-54, have published fragments of a list of stephanephori from this Carian city, in which the god Apollo appears as eponym. The heading indicates that it is a list of stephanephori from the time when the Carians had been liberated, i.e. from Rhodian control in 166 BC.

ANTANDROS IN ASIA MINOR. There is a list of eponymous officials, without title, in Ch. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, (Brussels 1900) no. 668, in which the god Apollo appears frequently, having held the office 14 times. The date is the first century BC.

LAGINA IN CARIA. *I. Stratonikeia II*, 1, nos. 601-741, consist of many fragments from the walls of the temple of Hekate in Lagina listing the eponymous priests. However, only no. 609 can be placed in chronological sequence, from 38/7 to 28/7 BC. Later, about the middle of the second century after Christ an interesting change takes place in the list: each priest was then given the opportunity of having his name engraved separately as a memorial, in all probability still in chronological sequence.

ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT. *P. Hibeh* 199 contains brief entries in sequence of the eponymous priests of the dynastic cult of the years 273/2 to 271/0 BC.\(^{20}\) Since the entries include information about events that took place under the priesthoods, it is possible that the list may have been based on or even be part of the list compiled by Charon of Naukratis.\(^{21}\)

These examples will be sufficient to show that the Greek cities everywhere in the Greek world kept chronological records of their eponymous officials and regularly engraved them upon public buildings or on stelai. In addition, there were papyrus copies of such lists available, as we have always surmised, to historians and others.

Although details concerning the structure and inner workings of Greek eponymity will be discussed after the evidence itself from the various cities has been presented, there is one aspect

---


\(^{20}\) The identification of these years depends on the date when Ptolemy Philadelphos changed the beginning of the count of his regnal years from 282 to 285. R.A. Hazzard has made a good case that, in official Greek documents, this happened in Sept. 282, long before the dates of *P. Hib. II* 199 (*Phoenix* 41 [1987] 140-158). My thanks to L. Koenen for this reference.

\(^{21}\) See the discussion by Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I 215 with his notes.
of the institution that belongs here, and that is the true eponym as against the false eponym. The true eponym is the official, annually elected or chosen, whose name is used to date all the official documents of the city throughout the current year. He is the state or national eponym. The name or names of other officials may appear beside his in such documents, as in decrees, but they are used largely to authenticate a document or because their actions had been involved in the procedure that produced the document. For example, the appearance of an agonothete’s name at the head of a list of victors in the games is a false eponym. Also false is the use of a gymnasiarch’s name in the heading of a list of young men’s names. Particularly difficult in this regard is the appearance of names on coins. The formula of ἔπι with the genitive case or the bare name of a person on a coin does not always signify the eponymous official, for he may be simply the man in charge of the mint or the local liturgist contributing his funds to the project. Another example of a false eponym would be the tamias who appears in connection with a collection or transference of money, as in manumissions, for he receives the required Freilassungssteuer. Sometimes, in cases where there are only a few examples from a city, it can be very difficult to distinguish between the two. And some cities indeed had more than one eponymous official. Some cities made changes in their eponymous officials or magistrates down through the years, and there are other pitfalls. Nevertheless, once the evidence is full enough, the true eponym will usually emerge.

(B) The Register

Part I: Mainland Greece and the Adjacent Islands.

1. ACARNANIA

The Acarnanians were influenced, perhaps as early as the seventh century, by the Corinthians who founded the colonies of Thyrrheum, Leukas, Sollium, and Anactorium along the coast, a development that introduced the civilization of the southern Greeks to this relatively backward country. The Acarnanians first come to our attention in the middle of the fifth century when Thucydides characterizes them as semi-civilized (1.5.3) and narrates here and there the part they played in the rise to power of Athens. This involvement resulted in the unification of the Acarnanians during the second half of the fifth century and the emergence of a true federal government with the city of Stratos at its head. This Acarnanian Confederacy remained loyal to Athens and joined the Second Athenian League in the next century. It had a college of seven strategoi as its highest officials, who were also eponymous. In the third century this confederacy came under attack by the Aetolians and others, which resulted in a division of the land between the Aetolians and the Epirotes. It was refounded about 230 BC in a reduced form.

23 Cf. L. Robert in Hellenica 1.9 n. 3; idem in Gnomon 35 (1963) 67-68; J. Pouilloux, Recherches … Thasos I 400; P. Roesch, Thespies et la Confédération bético-ne (Paris 1965) 160-161.
with Stratos under Aetolian control. After that date its chief official was a single strategos (IG IX² 583).²⁴

Actium

Actium was never a city. It was a promontory at the entrance to the Ambracian Gulf within the territory of Anactorium and was the location of the sanctuary of Apollo Aktios. This sanctuary was administered by priests called ἱεραπόλοι, as seen in a decree of the Acarnanian Confederacy from the second century BC found on the site: IG IX² 209b begins with ἐπὶ ἱεραπόλου τῶν Ἀπόλλωνοι τοῦ Ἀκτίοι Γάιστρου τοῦ Ἀνδρόνος Θησάρα, the common formula of eponymity. This eponymous priest of Apollo is also mentioned in IG IX² 208 of the second century, and Larsen (Federal States 269) believes that after the Confederacy took over control of the sanctuary these priests were used on occasion to date its documents, although not to the total exclusion of its strategos. A decree of the Confederacy, from the second century but found at Sparta, confirms the practice: IG IX² 588 (SIG³ 669) begins with ἐπὶ ἱεραπόλου τῶν Ἀπόλλωνοι τῷ Ἀκτίοι Θεσσάρου τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀνακτορίου, followed by the secretary, a promnomon, three sympromnomonoi, and the name of the month.

Anactorium

A fragment of a decree from the fourth-third century (IG IX² 212) begins with ἀγαθῷ τῷ ἤχαι. ἐπὶ πρυτάνιος Πλ[... ἄρχου τοῦ Φιλίνου. The only other place in Acarnania where a prytanis appears is in Thyrrheum, although not in a context concerned with eponymity. Two catalogues from there list the personnel in state sacrifices,²⁵ and the prytanis appears at the head of each one.²⁶ At Anactorium, at least, he was eponymous, and this is not surprising since Corinth, mother-city of Anactorium and Thyrrheum, had prytaneis from very early times: see s.v. Corinth. Accordingly, the possibility exists that the prytanis was also eponymous at Thyrrheum.

2. ACHAEA

From a grouping of villages the process of synoikismos produced twelve cities in Achaea: Pellene, Bura, Aigira, Aigai, Helike, Aigium, Patrai, Rhypes, Pharai, Olenos, Tritaea, and Dyme. Helike disappeared as a result of an earthquake, while Olenos, Aigai, and Rhypes gave way to Keryneia and Leontium so that in the third century they numbered ten. After the dissolution of this early confederacy in the third century it was refounded in 280 BC, at which time the leadership consisted of a college of damiourgoi, two strategoi, and a secretary. In 245 BC the two generals were reduced to one, with a hipparchos as his assistant. The single general

²⁵ IG IX² 247 and E. Mastrokostas in Athen. Mitt. 80 (1965) 157ff., no. 13.
²⁶ Cf. Gschnitzer in RE Suppl. 13 s.v. Prytanis 748.
and the college of ten damiourgoi formed a synarchia, sometimes called simply the Achaioi or the Archontes, with the general in a position of superiority. The importance of the secretary can be seen in the fact that he is sometimes used along with the general as eponym in official documents of the Confederacy: IG IV² 60 of 191 BC (cf Polybius 21.9) begins with [ἐπὶ] γραμματέως τοίς Ἀχαίοις ---, στραταξιοῦ δὲ Διοφάνειος μην[ν] --- etc. Cf. SIG³ 531. Of course the general also appears alone as eponym: IG IV² 71 (SIG³ 471) and IG V 2, 293. The damiourgoi also appear as eponyms (SIG³ 519). In 146 BC the Confederacy was crushed by the Romans at the Isthmus of Corinth, but it was allowed a modified rebirth sometime before 90 BC without political power.²⁷

**Dyme**

A late third or early second century decision on the death penalty for the falsification of coins begins (SIG³ 530) with [ἐπὶ θεοκόλ]όων Φιλοκλέως, [γραμ][]ματιστὰ Δαμοκρί[του, βουλάρχου etc., then the sentence of death for the men, followed by [ἐπὶ Εὐ]φάνεος βουλάρχου. [Ἀσκλαπί]πιδας Δρόμα. [ἐπὶ βουλάρχου [Φιλέα] [---]ις Ὀλυμπίου. Dated to 219 BC is a grant of citizenship to foreign solders: ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Ἀριστολάίδα, βουλάρχου Τιμοκράτεος, προστάτα Κύλωνος, γραμματιστὰ δαμασιοφυλάκων Μενάνδρου, then the formula for the grant followed by the names (SIG³ 529). And the letter of Q. Fabius Maximus to Dyme (SIG³ 684; RDGE 43), probably of 115 BC, begins with ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος. There is no question about the eponymity of the priest called the theokolos, for he appears at the head of all three documents in the classic formula. Gnaedinger (p. 21) rejects all the others, however, on the grounds that their appearance depends merely on their involvement in the proceedings. In a sense the other officials serve to date the documents, but their real purpose is to authenticate them, to stamp with their approval the proceedings and the final outcome. The real state or national eponymous official is the theokolos. The distinction is essential. In some Greek cities there are more than a single eponym. Here, however, I see only the one, while the others appear to be false. H. Swoboda (Klio 12 [1912] 48) believes the secretary is eponymous and says nothing about the theokolos.²⁸

**Tritaea**

In a decree of Tritaea from the third century and concerned with new citizens lines 9ff. are restored by A. Wilhelm (Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde I, [Wien 1910] 37ff. no. 7): [ἀ]ποδόντω τὸ ἄργυριον κα[θότι γέγραπται τὸ μέρος τὸ] ἐπιβάλλον κατ’ ἐνιαυτό[[ν, τὸ μὲν μέρος ἀρξάμενοι ὑπὸ] τοῦ μετὰ Δεξιλαίου ἐνιαυτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ δαμασιοφυλακὸς τοῖς μετὰ Δεξιλάου [πρὶν ἔξειναι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν]. Chrissoula, Damiurgen


²⁸ Cf. Schulthess in RE s.v. Grammateis 1757.
63, correctly points out that the phrase [ἀπὸ] τοῦ μετὰ Δεξιᾶλον ἑνὶ[ντοῦ] leaves no doubt that the president or chief, Dexilaos, of the college of damiorgoi is the eponym of the year and objects to Wilhelm’s inclusion of ἐπὶ in the next phrase: τὸ δὲ ἀργόριον ἐπὶ δαμι[ι]όργοις τοῖς μετὰ Δεξιᾶλαου, since that would seem to make the whole college of damiorgoi eponymous, creating a contradiction. Removal of the preposition in that one phrase seems a necessity, thus making the damiorgoi the indirect object of the verb at the beginning.

3. AETOLIA

The Aetolian tribal state of the fifth century developed into an Aetolian Confederacy based on city membership by 367 BC, when it was already known as a koinon (Tod II 137). It had a federal assembly consisting of citizen members as a whole who could vote directly at its two annual meetings. To handle the main business and to organize the material to be discussed at those meetings there was a council called boule and synhedrion, its members chosen for one year. In 167 BC there were more then 550 such bouleutai (Livy 45.28.7), a number far too large for efficient operation. Accordingly, a committee of more than 30 members was elected, called apokletoi. The whole Confederacy, thus, resembled the government structure of most democratic Greek city-states. Among the officials the strategos was the leader, and like his counterpart in the other confederacies he was eponymous, his name appearing regularly on all state documents either alone or accompanied by other officials. Second in importance was the hipparchos, and then the secretary (two of them in the second century), all three officials appearing in that order in IG IX2 4 (SIG³ 554), a decree of the Confederacy from Thermus, probably of 208/7 BC. In the treaty between the Aetolian and Acarmanian Confederacies of 263-262 BC (IG IX² 3) the date is given by the eponymous strategoi of them both (lines 16-25). The Aetolian strategos was also named eponymously in some documents of member states: e.g. at Naupactus (IG IX² 613 and 616, manumissions) and at Calydon (IG IX² 137a-f, manumissions). In addition to the eponymous strategos, hipparchos, and secretary of the Confederacy there were others used often enough to qualify also as eponymous: a boularchos and an agonothetes. Apparently all Aetolia was divided into districts and each district had its own council headed by a boularchos (see Larsen, Federal States 197). Thus, naturally, within his own district each boularchos had his name used to date the official documents of his district: e.g. at Thermus in IG IX² 8 a proxenia decree of the third century is dated by the boularchos Lykeas, the hipparchos Drakon, and the secretary Ageas. The complex nature of the Aetolian Confederacy’s organizational structure necessarily required more than a single network of magistrates on a single level. Thus, a multiplicity of eponyms. How the agonothete fitted into this structure and at what level is unknown, but there is no denying his importance. G. Klaffenbach (Sb. Berlin 27 [1936] 373-4) has listed six inscriptions which mention him in an eponymous context within Aetolia or Aetolian controlled territory: IG IX² 36 (Thermus); 96b (Phistyum); 110b (Phistyum); Athen. Mitt. 32 (1907) 29 no. 21 (IG IX² 639 no. 8, near Naupaktus in W. Locris); BCH 22 (1898) 356 no. 2 (IG IX² 681, Physcus); Klaffenbach, op.cit., 370ff.
This agonothete is, of course, a magistrate of the Confederacy and not of the cities in which documents mention him. Why an agonothete, usually associated with games and festivals, was such an important federal official and how he functioned in the Aetolian organization are unknown. For conflicting views on this subject see Klaffenbach, op.cit., 374-40, and Lerat, Les Locriens 117-19. It may be significant that the Straton named as agonothete in IG IX² 36 was also the strategos of the Confederacy in 159/8 BC. Did he hold both offices at the same time or did the one lead to the other?  

Calydon

Calydon was one of the first Aetolian communities to emerge from the old tribal organizations and become a city. Situated on the coast in the southwest it came under Achaean domination sometime before 390 BC (Xenophon, Hell. 4.6.1) until at least 367 BC, when Epaminondas liberated it (Diodorus 15.75.2). Then, or perhaps somewhat later, it was absorbed into the Aetolian Confederacy. Henceforth with few exceptions its inscriptions generally reflect the existence of this Confederacy. A series of manumissions from Calydon (IG IX² 137a-f of the second century BC) are all dated by the strategoi of the Confederacy, and only one document permits a glimpse of the inner workings of the city itself. This document is a decision by foreign judges from Thraestus in Elis of a legal dispute from about 300 BC. At the end of the short decision (lines 11ff.) is the entry: ἀ δὲ δίκαι ἐ δικασθεὶ ἐπὶ Ἀνοχίδα καὶ Κεφάλῳ δαμιοργέοντος, Ταμαχρίδα καὶ Ἐριφύλ(ω) δαμονομέοντος. Two pairs of eponyms are listed, one from Calydon and the other from Thraestus. A peculiarity is the use of the singular participle with a double subject in both pairs. More important is the ambiguity about which eponymous title refers to Calydon. That of Thraestus is unknown. Poulsen identifies the Eriphyllos of line 14 with a similarly named judge from Thraestus in line 2, which makes the damiorgoi the eponymous officials of Calydon. Chrissoula, Damiurgen 64-5, agrees, pointing to the earlier Achaean domination over Calydon as support, since the damiorgoi are well known in Achaea.

Phistyum

As is the case among all members of a Greek confederacy, Phistyum dates its documents in two ways, and for Phistyum this means by the eponymous officials of the Aetolian Confederacy and by its own eponymous college of archons. In its many manumission documents this can be seen, e.g., in IG IX² 95 where the dating first is given by the strategos of the Confederacy and then, at the end by ἄρχότον [---]ου, [--- Ἐριφύλ, ἄρχότον δὲ Φαλάκρου,  

---

29 For a list of the Aetolian strategoi see Klaffenbach in IG IX² pp. XLIX-LII, from 322/1 to 129/8 BC. See also Busolt-Swoboda II 1507-31; M. Sordi in Fr. Gschnitzer (ed.), Zur griechischen Staatskunde, Darmstadt 1969, 343-74; Larsen, Federal States 78-80 and 195-215.


31 IG IX² 138, republished by F. Poulsen in BCH 54 (1930) 42ff.
The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities

The strategos is dated by Klaffenbach to 204/3 BC. Here the Aetolian strategos and the local college of archons are eponymous, while the two priesthoods are mentioned only because of their involvement in the manumission process. In Phistyum manumission takes the form of a sale to a deity, in this case to Aphrodite, and that explains the presence of the hiarophylakes and the theokolos in the document. All the manumission documents (IG IX² 95-110) from Phistyum range from the end of the third century to about the middle of the second century.

Potidonia

G. Klaffenbach has published (Sb. Berlin 27 [1936] 371) two inscriptions on a stone slab which preserve two manumission texts from Potidania in Aetolia dating from the middle of the second century. The first (a) begins with the name of the eponymous strategos Lamios son of Algesandros, whom Klaffenbach would put in office in 159/8 BC as head of the Aetolian Confederacy. The second (b) begins with the phrase ἡγονοτῶν ἘΑντίοχου ἘΑρσινοῦ, ἔν δὲ Ποτίδαναι ἔχωντων, followed by three names, then ἔτοιμων ἔννοτων, μηνὸς Ἀλγαδέου τετράδι etc. Thus, it was an eponymous college of three archons that was at the head of the city government of Potidania. The agonothete here mentioned was an official of the Aetolian Confederacy: See above, s.v. AETOLIA.

Thermus

Polybius (5.8.4-9) describes the houses at Thermus as being full of grain and their furnishings as superior to those of all others in Aetolia, and he adds that the Aetolians hold their markets and festivals there every year and that they elect their (federal) magistrates there as well. And Strabo (10.3.2) remarks that a statue of Aetolus, the founder, had been erected at Thermus. The large number of documents of the Aetolian Confederacy set up on stone at Thermus also attests to its great importance in the third and second centuries. However, Thermus never developed into a city-state with its own government, and accordingly the proxenia decrees found there (IG IX² 13-50) are dated by the eponymous magistrates of the Confederacy. Thus, there is no local eponymous official for Thermus itself.

4. ARCADIA

Beginning in the fifth century and reaching a high point in the fourth the process of synoikismos produced in Arcadia a series of independent city-states that finally united into a Confederacy as a result of Sparta’s defeat at Leuctra in 371 BC. Under the guiding spirit of Epaminondas the new city of Megalopolis became the center of the Arcadian Confederacy and it drew into itself, by synoikismos, many of the surrounding communities. The new Confederacy had a primary assembly composed of all citizens from the separate cities called The Ten Thousand. There was also a boule to handle the day-to-day business, consisting of representatives from the separate cities. Whether the members of this boule were the 50 damiorgoi men-
tioned in a decree of the Confederacy (*IG* V 2,1 = Tod II 132) is not clear, for they may have been a college of magistrates directing basic policy under the leadership of the *strategos*. With the fall of Epaminondas the Arcadian Confederacy remained only a weak and divided organization that never recovered fully from the events of the previous decade. In the third century, in 235 BC, under the tyrant Lydiades of Megalopolis that city and then others fell under the power of the Achaeian Confederacy.\(^3\)

**Lousoi**

Located within the territory of Cletor in northern Arcadia, Lousoi had its own city administration and a number of its decrees has survived, one of which (*IG* V 2, 388) is a grant of *proxenia* belonging to the third or perhaps even the fourth century. At its end is the phrase ἐπὶ δαμιοργῷ ἢ τοῦ ἑπέδεικνυμά, which dates the document and guarantees its privileges. And *IG* V 2, 389 of the same general period is another *proxenia* decree ending (lines 13-16) as follows: ἔδωκεν ἐπὶ δαμιοργῶν ἱερέως Δεινόλα, Σακρέτεος, Βούμα, οἰκονόμου Ἀνθέσιλάτου Στυμφαλίου. Chrissoula, *Damirgen 67*, is struck by the fact that the college of *damiorgoi* includes men who held other offices in the city at the same time, a situation without parallel in that particular college. She further puts a comma after the second last word to make a total of five in the college. That number has a weak support in the mutilated decree *IG* V 2, 395 where the dating by the eponymous college of *damiorgoi* seems to contain not four but five men. By the end of the third century this eponymous college apparently has given way to a college of *hieromnemones*, as we find in *IG* V 2, 393, its formula indicating that there was a president of the group: ἐπὶ ἰερομνήμοις τοῖς περὶ Δαμ[---], the restoration confirmed by no. 394. The change may have been one of the results of the extension of the power of the Achaeian Confederacy over Arcadia.

**Mantinea**

After subjection to both Achaeian and Aetolian control\(^3\) Mantinea was given a new name after Antigonus Doson captured it in 223 BC. As Antigoneia it became a member of the Achaeian Confederacy: *IG* V 2, 293 begins with ἐπὶ στραταγόου τῶν Ἀχαιῶν Φιλοποίμενος τὸ τέταρτον (201/0 BC), followed by a list of the Cretan and Mantinean mercenaries who had fought under Philopoemen against King Nabis of Sparta. For the date of this document, also printed in *SIG* 600, see Errington, *op. cit.*, (n. 33) 253. As expected in such situations, Mantinea at this time used the eponymous *strategos* of the Confederacy to date that document. In four manumission texts, however, Mantinea uses its own city eponymous priest. In all of these texts, from the Hellenistic or Roman periods, the formula is ἐπὶ ἱερέως τοῦ Ποσειδώ-

\(^3\) See Busolt-Swoboda II 1395-1409 and Larsen, *Federal States* 180-95. I have not been able to consult S. Dusanić, *The Arcadian League of the IVth Century* (in Serbo-Croatian, with summary in English), Belgrade 1970.

voς followed by the priest’s name.\textsuperscript{34} Pausanias (8.10.2) describes the temple of Poseidon Hippios on the nearby Mt. Alesios.

\textbf{Megalopolis}

In his description of this city Pausanias tells us (8.27) that when Epaminondas founded it as the center of the Arcadian Confederacy in 371 BC as a bulwark against the Spartans, the inhabitants of some forty towns and cities in the surrounding area were forced to leave their homes and move to the newly founded city. After the battle of Mantinea (362 BC) some of these people tried to leave Megalopolis and return to their former cities (cf. Diodorus 15.94). Lycosura was one of those cities whose inhabitants resisted the initial change of residence (Pausanias 8.27.4) or else later left Megalopolis and refused to return. In any event, Lycosura later appears as a city but still within the territory of Megalopolis. There is a fairly consistent use of an eponymous priesthood in Lycosura in the Roman period, the priesthood of Despoina whose sanctuary lay nearby: \textit{IG V 2, 516 begins ἐπὶ ιερεός τῶς Δεσποίνας τῷ Β’ Νικασίππου τοῦ Φιλίππου καὶ ἐπιμελητὰν Δαμιύλλου τοῦ Ζευξία, Δαμιοκράτεος τοῦ Κλίτορος, ἔτους λ’ καὶ β’ κατὰ τὸν Σεβαστὸν (AD 42); IG V 2, 524 (OGIS 407, cf. Magie, \textit{Roman Rule} 1434 n. 19) records a gift to Despoina by a king of Commagene and dated ἐπὶ ιερεός Σωτηρίχου (here, of course, not strictly eponymous): in \textit{IG V 2, 541 A, from the temple of Despoina, a certain C. Iulius Cratinus is honored by the city of Megalopolis and dated [ἐ]πὶ ιερεός Δαμιύλλου; IG V 2, 543 begins ἀγαθὴ τύχῃ. ἐπὶ ιερεός Πομπηίου Ἀ-ρ[ι]στοκράτους οἱ μυούμενοι τῇ τῶν ιερῶν [---]. Admittedly, only the first of these shows a true eponym, but dating by priesthoods also appears in another city, Lycaenum, belonging to Megalopolis: \textit{IG V 2, 549 I, III, V, and VI (fourth century). In the city of Megalopolis itself two inscriptions are significant: IG V 2, 244 (131 BC), ἐπὶ γραμματ[είς τοῖς συνεδροῖς τῷ Β’ Νικηφήρου, ἔτους ἐ[βεδόμου καὶ δεκάτου] etc.; IG V 2, 443 A, [ἐ]πὶ γραμματέος τοῖς συνεδροῖς [---] etc. (cf. 444 C). In \textit{IG V 2, 443 B the [ἐ]πὶ of [ἐ]πὶ δαμιο[ργ]ῶν [---] is rejected by Chrissoula, \textit{Damiurgen} 74, rightly I think. Thus, on the local level, we have an eponymous priesthood (of Despoina) in Lycosura and perhaps elsewhere in the \textit{ager Megalopolitanus} while in Megalopolis itself the secretary of the \textit{synedron} is eponymous.\textsuperscript{35} The word \textit{synedron} may be the equivalent of \textit{boule}: see Aymard, \textit{Confédération Achaienne} 65, who believes it possible that the local \textit{bouleuterion} in Megalopolis also served as the seat of the Achaean federal \textit{synodos} when it was in session. It must be remembered that in 235 BC Megalopolis was brought into the Achaean Confederacy.

\footnotesize\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} \textit{IG V 2, 275; the other inscriptions are nos. 274, 277 and 342a.}
\end{itemize}
Orchomenos

The earliest reference to eponymity in Orchomenos appears in the *synoikia* between that city and Euamemon in the years between 360 and 350 BC: lines 9-10 of *IG V* 2, 343 mention τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ [Χ]αιριάδι, which would seem to mean ‘of the (colonists) in the year of Chairadas.’

A century later we learn from a series of proxneia decrees that the eponymous office is a college of *thearoi* headed by their president. No. 1 (p. 451) is dated at the end by ἐπὶ Σύμμο[i] σὺν θεαροῖς, προστάτας --- τᾶς Ἀλλαίας Νικασίλαος, γραμματέας --- τοῖς. The Athenians mentioned in this decree are known to have lived in the early third century. No. 2 (p. 454), proxenia for four Aetolians, is dated δαμιόργωι (?) --- θεαρῶι ἕ[--], and belongs to the years 243-229 BC, i.e. to the general period when both the Aetolian and Achaean Confederacies were becoming involved in the internal affairs of Arcadia. No. 4 (p. 459) is dated by a single *thearos* in the typical phrase of eponymity and is itself followed by the mention of the *prostata* in the nominative. No. 5 (p. 461) is dated ἐπὶ Ἀρχιφάει ςὺν ἄρχουσιν, προστάτας Ἀλλαίας Θρασωνίδας, ἄρσηκτος Μίναξμος, γραμματέας Σθενόλαος. Here I take archousin to mean ‘magistrates’, i.e. *thearoi*. Similar are the formulae in nos. 6, 8, and 10. In no. 11 (p. 470) the document begins with the eponymous dating ἐπὶ Εὐλύτωι σὺν θεαροῖς, μηνὸς Λαπάτω and concludes with mention of the secretary in the nominative. All of these decrees belong to the same general period, the third century, and in them the *thearos* is eponymous, while the *prostata* and the other magistrates are mentioned merely because of their involvement in the proceedings. However, no. 9 (pp. 466-67) is different: (lines 8-9) ἐπὶ δαμιόργωι ἕ[--]τόσω. προστάτας βουλῶ. The substitution of *boules* for *haliaias* seems to indicate a change of some sort in the administration, although E. Meyer in *RE* s.v. Orchomenos 902 follows Plassart and Blum in the view that both are identical in meaning. Be that as it may, a *damiorgos* has clearly replaced the older *thearos* as the eponymous official of Orchomenos. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 66, thinks that this happened under the influence of the Achaean Confederacy.

Pheneus

A statue base (SEG XIX 328) here begins with ἐπὶ ἱερῶς τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ Θεριλάου τοῦ Ὑρώιδα κατεσκευάθη τῷ ἀγάλματα, and ends with the artist’s signature. A coin from Pheneus is inscribed ἐπὶ ἱερῶς Ἐρμαζίου (Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 56). Both of these together give support to the priest of Asklepios as the eponymous official, but further evidence is needed.

---

36 See S. Dušanić in *BCH* 102 (1978) 341-42.
37 A. Plassart and G. Blum in *BCH* 38 (1914) 447-78.
Tegea

With the weakening and final decay of the Arcadian Confederacy Tegea remained independent and played no significant role in the larger developments of the Hellenistic age after the death of Alexander. Then, in 222 BC at Sellasia, the Achaeans and Macedonians defeated Sparta, which produced a new alignment of power in the Peloponnese. The Achaean Confederacy became the dominant power, with Tegea and the other cities falling under its control.

The earliest evidence for the eponymous official in Tegea falls in the second half of the third century: IG V 2, 10 begins with θεός. ἐπὶ Σωστράτων ἱερεῖ ἔδωξε τῶι δήμωι τῶν Τεγεατῶν, while at the very end we find ἐπὶ στραταγοῖς τοῖς περὶ Χρέμωνα. Gnaedinger (loc. cit. [see p. 249] 20) rightly says that the first phrase shows the eponymous official and the second merely authenticates the document. The eponymous priesthood is that of Athena Alea, whose temple is well known by the description of Pausanias (8.45) where we also learn that the famous Skopas had been the architect. In the building regulations that have been preserved (IG V 2, 6) the eponymous priests are mentioned several times. These regulations also give us a clue to the interpretation of the final phrase in IG V 2, 10, because they frequently mention city officials of Tegea called strategoi. It is significant in these regulations that only the priests are eponymous, while the strategoi with their chief are not used for the purpose of dating. In the Roman period the eponymous priest is named immediately after the dating by the emperor: e.g. IG V 2, 50 (Hadrian). IG V 2, 51 is different, however, for it is dated first by the name of Antoninus Pius, then by the 181st year of the naval battle at Actium, then by the 27th year after the first visit of Hadrian to Greece, and finally by the eponymous priesthood.

5. THE ARGOLID

Argos

In the seventh century the warrior kings of Argos extended their power over the outlying communities, but already in that century the nature of the kingship had been changed by Pheidon, who ruled as a tyrant. In the sixth century everything was different. The king’s position had been replaced by an oligarchy of nobles who ruled as the Nine Damiorgoi. This can be seen in the inscription (IG IV 614) re-discovered by W. Vollgraff and correctly published in Mnemosyne 59 (1932) 369ff.: SEG XI 336 (Jefferey, LSAG 156ff., no. 7). Its date is about the second quarter of the sixth century (Jeffery) rather than the seventh century (Vollgraff) and is apparently the oldest document to mention damiorgoi. Although the form in which they are mentioned is not that of eponymity, Veligianni-Terzi Chrissoula39 thinks that the Nine Damiorgoi here function as if they were eponymous, but the text gives us no hint of such a situation. Previously the king had been eponymous, and here the executive power seems lodged

in the Nine. I am sceptical as is also M. Wörle\textsuperscript{40}. What is evident is that the Argive king was not abolished with the emergence of aristocratic power. He was simply weakened politically, as happened elsewhere. That he lived on in some sort of political office is clear in a treaty between Knossos and Tylissos about the middle of the fifth century in which Argos played a part: \textit{SIG\textsuperscript{3} 56}; \textit{I. Cret. I, VIII 4\punct{}*}; Meiggs-Lewis, \textit{GHI} 42. At the end we find (43ff.) ἡ αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ Μελάντα βασιλέως. Here the ‘king’ must be an eponymous magistrate, since the democratic institutions expressed in the lines that follow really exclude the existence at that time of the old-style kingship. Thus, apparently, the old basileus continued in a reduced political capacity after the Nine Damiorgoi acquired power. He alone was the eponymous magistrate. The middle of the fifth century is the very period in which the student of Thucydides would be led to believe that the priestess of Hera was the usual eponym at Argos, since the historian uses her among others to date the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (2.2). However, that is not the case, as both Jacoby (\textit{FGrHist} 323a III b, [Supplement] Vol. 2, p. 4 n. 41.) and Wörle (op. cit. [see n. 40] 84-85) have pointed out. Thucydides used the priestess only because he had in front of him a copy of the \textit{Priestesses of Hera in Argos}, which was a universal chronicle compiled by Hellanikos of Lesbos. In the Hellenistic age eponymity seems to have been granted to a pair of secretaries, one for the boule and a second for the strategoi, as seen in Schwyrzer, \textit{GDE} 90 a decree which begins with Ἀλεξάνδρου Σικυωνίου. ἐπὶ γροφέας τοῦ βουλαζόν Θεοδέκτα, τοῖς δὲ στραταγοῖς Δαμέα, ἀλλαὶ ἐξοδεῖ τελείασε followed by the day of the month. On the other hand, no. 93 begins with ἐπὶ γραμματεῖα τῶν συνεδρῶν and the name, then followed by a priest, two promanties, and two gropheis. There is room for scepticism as far as the two gropheis are concerned. Wörle (op. cit., see n. 40, 81 n. 18) calls them false eponyms, but in no. 90 they are clearly eponyms.

**Calauria**

Two inscriptions, \textit{IG IV} 839 (\textit{SIG\textsuperscript{3} 259}) of the fourth century and 841 (\textit{SIG\textsuperscript{3} 993}) of the third century, make it probable that Calauria had an eponymous \textit{tamias} in the early Hellenistic Age. The first begins as follows: Σιφνίων ἀπέλειψε ἕν Καλαυρέας κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. ἐπὶ θεοφίλους ταιμία ἐδοξὲ ταῖς πολίς Καλαυρεατᾶν etc. If this immunity granted to the Siphnians is immunity from port-dues, then the mention of the treasurer might find an alternative explanation to that of eponymity, since as treasurer he would be the responsible magistrate to implement such a grant. The second inscription begins with (line 11): ἐπὶ ταιμίας Σωφάντου τοῦ Πολι[---, μη]νος Γερασιστίου, ἐδοξὲ τοῖς πολίταις περὶ τοῦ ἄργουρίου καὶ τοῦ χωρίου οὗ ἄνεθηκαν etc. Here, again, the context concerns money, making the presence of the treasurer in the prescript understandable. Nevertheless, the formula and its location—followed by the month and the formula of decree—point unmistakably to eponymity. Supported by the first inscription, we must accept an eponymous treasurer in Calauria.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos im 5. Jahrhundert vor Christus} (Diss., Erlangen-Nürnberg 1964) 80-89.
Corinth

According to tradition, represented largely by Diodorus (7.9.6) and Pausanias (2.4.4) with additions by Herodotus (5.92) and Nikolaos of Damascus (FGrHist 90 F 57), Corinth was ruled by a relatively small group of aristocrats called the Bacchiads down to the middle of the seventh century. They ruled jointly, but chose annually one of their members to serve as prytanis in place of the king they had overthrown. Their oligarchy was in turn overthrown by the tyrant Cypselus about 655 BC. With the abolition of the old monarchy we would naturally expect the new prytanis replacing the king to become the new eponymous magistrate, but no evidence in support of that has ever been found. After the death of Cypselus his son Periander ruled, and a poem preserved by Diogenes Laertius (1.97) calls him a prytanis. Periander’s nephew Psammetichus ruled next, and with his death Corinthian tyranny came to an end, replaced by a democratic constitution. Some support for an eponymous prytanis in this early period may be found in the fact that in some of the Corinthian colonies, such as Corcyra, Appolonia, and Anactorium, eponymous prytaneis are on record. However, it is not until the Hellenistic Age that we find in Corinth itself any evidence of an eponymous official. Corinth VIII no. 7 is badly mutilated, but it begins with [---]ας γραμματεύς?---, ἐπειδῆ ὁ Πιθο[---], and no. 8 has preserved [ἐπὶ] γραμματεύς[---, ἐπειδῇ?] Θυόδο[τος---].

In support of an eponymous secretary at Corinth in the Hellenistic Age is an inscription from Delos conferring proxenia on two Athenians: L. Robert, Hellenica 5, 6, and 11-12, 562-69. Written in Doric, the identification of the city which issued it is unknown. It begins: θεός. [ἐπὶ] γραμματεύς Ἐρεθίς. [Γ]αιμιλίου (μηνός) ἔδοξε τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας[αί], etc. Robert has examined all the evidence for possible candidates in minute detail and favored the city of Phleious in the Argolid, but N.F. Jones in TAPA 110 (1980) 165ff. has made a good case for Corinth, and Salmon (op.cit. 413ff.) agrees with him. Corinth appears to be the city in question. Thus, in Corinth VIII nos. 7-8, the restored parts of the title should be those of γραμματεύς in the appropriate case.

After the Roman destruction of Corinth in 146 BC a Roman colony was settled there under Julius Caesar, at which time Roman duoviri became the eponymous magistrates, with whom we are not concerned.

Epidaurus

There is a consistent record of the use of eponymous priests of Asklepios at Epidaurus from the early fourth century BC to the third century AD. The building accounts of a tholos (IG IV2 103) seem to contain the earliest known example (fourth century BC): line 146 = ἔπε π’ ἱαρέος Ἀρχελάδα, οὐθέν, with other such phrases at lines 151 and 161, followed by sums

---

41 For the chronology see S.I. Oost in Classical Philology 67 (1972) 16, and J.B. Salmon, Wealthy Corinth, Oxford 1984, 186ff.
42 Cf. L. Robert, Hellenica 11-12, 568 n. 3.
of money. And dating from about 300 BC is *IG IV² 114* (cf. *SEG XXV 399*) naming the eponymous priest Damophilos. Later, after the liberation by the Achaean Confederacy of Corinth from Macedonian domination in 243 BC (Plutarch, *Aratus* 24, and Pausanias 2.8.5) Epidaurus joined the Confederacy and its documents then begin to reflect this membership: *IG IV² 71* (*SIG³ 471*) records the arbitration by Megara between Epidaurus and Corinth. It begins with ἐπὶ στρατηγὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν Αἰγιολεὺς, ἐν δὲ Ἐπιδαύρῳ ἐπὶ ιαρεὺς τοῦ Ἀσκλαπιὸν υἱονυσίου, κατὰ τόδε ἔκριναν τοῖς Μεγαρεῖς etc. This arbitration belongs to the period 242/1-238/7 BC. And many examples then illustrate the use of the eponymous priest of Asklepios throughout the Hellenistic Age and into the Roman period: *IG IV² 98* (*SIG³ 1075*) at the end of the third century; *IG IV² 126* (*SIG³ 1170*) in the second century AD. In the imperial period there is a double or even triple dating, such as in *IG IV² 384* (*SIG³ 842*) of AD 133/4, where the date is given first by the third year of the dedication of the temple of Olympian Zeus and of the founding of the Panhellenion, then by the tenth year of Hadrian’s visit (in AD 124), and finally by the priest of Asklepios. The priest continues to be eponymous to the third century AD, e.g. in *IG IV² 127* of AD 224. Nos. 424-425 (AD 297), 428-429 (AD 304), and 438 (AD 355) mention the priest along with the date by the era.

**Mycenae**

Despite the meagre remains of Mycenae in the Classical Age and the gloomy picture presented by Pausanias (2.15-16) of its appearance in his time, it had the normal organization of a Greek polis and did send 80 men to Thermopylae at the time of the Persian invasion, as Pausanias tells us. Argos, however, destroyed it in 468 BC and it remained virtually uninhabited, except perhaps for those involved in the management of the temple of Athena, until the Hellenistic Age. It was then rebuilt and flourished for a time, and then lapsed once again into historical obscurity (Tomlinson, *Argos* 31-32). A bronze plate from the temple area has been found there with an inscription in archaic letters (*IG IV 492* [Schwyzer, *GDE* 97; Jeffery, *LSAG* 171ff., no. 2], ‘c. 500-480?’): Φρονηματίδας Μυκανέαθεν πάρ Ἀθανάίας ἐς πόλις ἴκετας ἔγεντο ἐπὶ Ἀντία καὶ Πυρρία. ἐν δὲ Ἀντίας καὶ Κήθος καὶ Ἰαννίδος. An- tias and Pyrrhias were eponymous magistrates, but their title is unknown. The fact that there are two of them makes it difficult to believe that they could have been priests, since normally only one priest would have been eponymous. A possibility that the two men were damiorgoi finds support, weak as it is in *IG IV 493* (Schwyzer, *GDE* 98), where we learn that a college of damiorgoi existed at Mycenae in the last quarter of the sixth century (Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 8-9, and Jeffery, *LSAG*, p. 171, no. 1). Many centuries later the damiorgoi are still there, with one of them acting as their president or chief: *IG IV 497* (*SIG³ 594*) and *SEG III 312*.

**Phleius**

A mutilated sacred law in archaic script (*SEG XI 275*; Jeffery, *LSAG* 146-47, no. 1) from the sixth century concerns oaths sworn over sacrificial victims. Its final line (7) reads [−]ς
καὶ Λάστρατος ἀρχε[ν ---]. which R.L. Scranton, the first editor (Hesperia 5 [1936] 241), indicates would make Lastratos an archon. Jeffery, however, believes that two officials are named and restores ἀρχε[ταν ?]. On the same block as this archaic inscription is part of another mutilated sacred law (SEG XI 276, probably of the Augustan Age, according to Scranton.) It begins with [ἐπί --- ἄ]ρχοντος ὡστε θύειν τοῖ Απόλλ[ωνι ---]. It appears probable that Phleius had an eponymous archon to the first century AD, but additional evidence is needed to clarify the practice in the archaic period.

6. ATTICA

(a) Kingship and Aristocracy

About 500 BC logographoi like Hekataeus were at work assembling and systematizing the records of Greek history on a regional, city-oriented basis. They used written records of all sorts as well as orally transmitted material. The results became available to men like Hellanikos and Herodotus, and, for this early period, those results included a list of Athenian kings. Legends and myths had been woven into the fabric of that list, and, thus, the earlier generations of those kings are not historical. According to the tradition embedded in the local chronicles, taken up and refined by Atthidographers, the first king of Athens was Kekrops who lived in the sixteenth century (Marmor Parium = IG XII 2, 444 and FGrHist 239, in the heading). In the eleventh century a new dynasty of kings came to power, the Medontidai who were probably historical and who reigned until about the middle of the eighth century. They, however, were forced by the aristocracy to surrender most of their power to the new offices of polemarchos and archon, in that order according to Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 3, who is uncertain about when these new magistrates were created, whether under Medon himself or under his successor Akastos. These two magistrates, like the king himself, were life-long. Then, in the middle of the eighth century all three of them were limited to ten years each. Seventy years later, in 682/1 BC their tenure was reduced to one year. The old basileus had been gradually stripped of his power and is now an ordinary—and quite weak—magistrate. The tradition is unanimous in naming Kreon the first archon in that year. It was somewhat later that the six thesmothetai were created, thus producing the historic nine archontes.43

(b) The Eponymous Archon

With Kreon begins the list of Athenian eponymous archons. Our evidence for placing him in 682/1 BC rests largely on the Marmor Parium (32) which merely records that, as one calcu-

lates backwards from 264/3 BC (the date of the chronicle’s composition), 420 years have elapsed since the (Athenian) archon began to hold his office on an annual basis. It does not give his name, but it can be found in the chronological work of Kastor of Rhodes (\textit{FGrHist} 250 F 4), in Syncellus I p. 400 (Dindorf), and in Velleius Paterculus 1.8.3. Kreon’s exact date can vary from 684/3 to 683/2 to 682/1 BC, depending on a number of factors, but Cadoux (\textit{Athenian Archons} 88-89) is probably right in accepting 682/1 BC. For the next 202 years not all of the approximately 75 known names of archons can be securely placed in precise years. For the next 178 years (from 480/79 to 302 BC) the list is complete because of the record found in Diodorus, but Book 20 of his history ends in 302 BC and the following Books 21-40 are fragmentary. Epigraphic records then become crucial for the Hellenistic Age in filling out the long gaps of the literary sources, but the evidence is sufficient to show the continuity of the use of the Athenian eponymous archon into the fifth century AD. A certain Nikagoras in AD 484 is the last known archon (SHA, \textit{Proclus} 36).44

\textbf{(c) Prior to the Persian War}

Upon examination of the extant epigraphic documents prior to 480/79 BC the use of the archon’s name to date those documents is extremely limited. I know of only one: \textit{IG I^3} no. 4, the so-called Hekatompedon inscription (A-B) of 485/4 BC. Lines 14-15 of A record: τ[αυτα δὲ ἔδωκαν τοῖς δῆμοι] ἐπὶ Φ[ιλοκράτω ἔρχοντο, and in lines 26-27 of B we find ταὐτόν’

---

44 The fundamental modern list of Athenian eponymous archons from 682/1 to 403/2 BC is that by Hiller von Gaertringen in \textit{IG I^2} pp. 267-301, which includes rather full citation of the evidence. T.J. Cadoux, ‘The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypschichides’ in \textit{HIS} 68 (1949) 70-123, has re-examined the evidence and provided his own list. For the period 403/2 to 30/29 BC J. Kirchner has assembled a list in \textit{IG II^2} Pars Quarta (Berlin 1918). However, for the period after 302 BC one must consult W.B. Dinsmoor, \textit{The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age} (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) as well as his \textit{The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries} (New York 1939) and then B.D. Meritt and W.K. Pritchett, \textit{The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens} (Cambridge, Mass., 1940). Further details have been added by others, but notably by Meritt himself in \textit{Historia} 25 (1977) 161ff. and by Chr. Habicht, \textit{Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit}, Hypomnemata 75 (Göttingen 1982), 159-177. For the Roman period after 30/29 BC the basic research and organization was done by P. Graindor and published in a series of books: \textit{Chronologie des archontes athéniens} (Brussels 1922); \textit{Athènes sous Auguste} (Cairo 1927); \textit{Athènes de Tibère à Trajan} (Cairo 1931). The results of his work were then incorporated by J. Kirchner in the list he prepared for inclusion in \textit{IG II^2}, Pars Altera, Fasc. Post. (1931), but with some additions and changes. Within a few years this list began to require further changes because of the vast new material emerging from the American excavations in the Athenian Agora. J.H. Oliver republished Kirchner’s list with those necessary changes and additions in \textit{Hesperia} 11 (1942) 81-89. More recently Simone Follet has attempted a full scale investigation of the chronological and prosopographical problems that have arisen in connection with the archons of the imperial age in her comprehensive book \textit{Athènes au IVe et au IIIe Siècle} (Paris 1976). After discussing the problems and the vast number of sources she presents in Annex III a list of the archons from AD 92/3 to the latter part of the third century, while in Annex IV she presents a list of the Athenian hoplite generals. Still more recently there has appeared an article by E. Kapetanopoulos on the period AD 170/1 to 179/80 in \textit{Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica} 112 (1984) 177-91. The latest list incorporating all the known archons from 682/1 BC to the fifth century AD is that of A.E. Samuel, \textit{Greek and Roman Chronology} (München 1972) 195-237, with some notes and bibliography. For the period 159/8 to 141/0 BC see Chr. Habicht in \textit{Hesperia} 57 (1988) 237-47.
The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities

From literary sources, of course, we possess references to decrees of this early period. Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 14.1) mentions the passing of a decree on the proposal of Aristion Ἐπί Κομιέου ἅρχοντος that Pisistratus was given a bodyguard. It is unlikely that Aristotle could have had direct knowledge of such a decree from either a stone or a papyrus, although oral transmission might have preserved it. Such notices in Greek literature should not be accepted at face value. Scepticism is justified.45

(d) After the Persian War of 480/79 BC

When we turn to the period after the Persian War, our epigraphic copies of public documents are not much better in this respect until we reach the middle of the century. It is approximately then that IG I3 11 has been dated, an Athenian treaty with Egesta (458/7 BC?): after the heading appears the prescript in mutilated form, including the enactment formula, the prytanising tribe, the secretary (restored), and then [---] ἅρχε, followed by the name of the proposer. The old style ἅρχε is much more common than the ἐπι formula for the rest of the century. The eponymous archon thereafter appears in the following decrees, all dates BC and all from the publication IG I3: No. 17 of 451/0; 21 of 450/49; 53 of 433/2; 54 of 433/2; 71 of 425/4 (reassessment of tribute, lines 56 and 59); 80 of 421/0; 82 of 421/0; 84 of 418/7; 86 of 417/6; 95 of 415/4; 97 of 410/9; 101-103 of 410/9; 104 of 409/8; 110-112 of 408/7; 114-115 and 117 of 407/6 (but then no. 119 omits the archon while the prytanising tribe and the secretary appear as usual); 125-127 of 405/4. The heading or superscript is important in this regard: in no. 82 the secretary’s name appears first in superscript, while the archon’s is second in the new style (ἐπί); in no. 86 the secretary’s name is in superscript, while the archon’s is relegated to the prescript; in no. 91 the secretary’s name appears as part of the superscript, while the archon’s appears neither in superscript nor in the prescript; in 102 for the first time the eponymous archon in the new style takes precedence over the secretary in the superscript, but then in 104 of the very next year the secretary’s name is entered first in the superscript followed by that of the archon in old style, and similar to 104 are 111, 114-115; in 126 in superscript stands Ἀλεξ[ιας ἅρχεν] with the secretary relegated to the prescript, but then in 127 of the same year the secretary’s name is in the superscript, while that of the archon is in the prescript. The superiority of the secretary is very visible in no. 31, where his name appears twice, first in the superscript and then a second time in the prescript, while the archon is not mentioned at all.

For most of the fifth century one gains the impression from this survey that the eponymous archon had a serious rival in the privilege of having his name used to date official docu-

45 Cadoux, op. cit. (see n. 44), discusses those that refer to archons prior to the Persian War. Of course, the literary references to archons and decrees after the Persian War gradually begin to gain more credibility. Outside of Attica the Athenian archon list was recognized as a useful tool in world chronology: e.g. it was used by Diodorus in general world history, by the compiler of the Oxyrhynchus Chronicle in P. Oxy. 12 (FGrHist 255) to supplement dates by Olympiads, by the compiler of the Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239), and by Arrian in this Anabasis.
ments. Both the secretary and the prytanising tribe are the regular features of superscript and/or prescript in this century and later, while the archon seems to struggle until quite late in the century. Even then another generation and more are required before he ousts the secretary from prominence. His victory has been linked with the need to give a clear indication of the year, clearer than that provided by mention of the prytanising tribe and the secretary.46

(e) The Athenian Archon List

Turning to the reliability of the archon list for the early period, the lists extant on stone and assembled in *IG I²* 1706-1736 are of no value, for they date form the Hellenistic and Roman periods. More recent discoveries, however, have given us much valuable information, notably the stone fragment published by B.D. Meritt in *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 59ff. (*SEG X* 352) and three more from the same monument published by D.W. Bradeen in *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 187-208—all four are in Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 6. All were found in the Athenian Agora and originally formed part of a single official list on Pentelic marble. Meritt has dated the lettering about 425 BC. His fragment contains the names in mutilated form of six archons 527/6 to 522/1 BC, while those of Bradeen give the archons for 597/6 to 595/4, 551/0 to 546/5, and 490/89 to 489/8 BC. Thus, we may be assured that about 425 BC the Athenian archon list was already an accepted fact, available by its official publication to all historians, scholars, and interested persons. It may have begun with Kreon, as Bradeen has argued, although there is no conclusive evidence on that point.47

(f) Dating by Demarch

The Kleisthenic deme was dual in nature, both a self-contained local government and a vital part of the central government in Athens. It has been called a ‘polis in microcosm’, a particularly happy expression, with the *demarchos*, the head of each deme, being the ‘main pivot between the two’.48 Athenian citizenship, politics, and government were thus intimately bound

---


47 The value of the archon list has been well stated by Jacoby, *Atthis* 197: ‘The fundamental importance of that list for Aththodigraphy consists in its being an authentic document, probably starting from 683/2 BC, and in its having been used from that year onward unchanged and without variants, as a framework for Attic history, by all Aththodigraphers from Hellanikos down to Philochoros. The list contained, as far as we can judge, no historical annotations.’ See also Cadoux, *op. cit.* (see n 44), 109-12, and R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City States, ca 700-338 BC* (Berkeley 1976) 135-137 for the historical importance of Meritt’s fragment.

48 D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7-ca. 250 BC* (Princeton 1986) pp. XVIII and XXXVI. His remarks on dating by the *demarchos* are on pp. 60-61 n. 90, where he notes that the demes also (but rarely) dated their documents by priest (*SEG XXI* 519 and *IG I²* 2496) or by priestess (*SEG XXII* 116). One should add to his remarks the material in L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 294-95. It is also appropriate to add here the fact that tribal decrees also used the Athenian archon for dating (*IG I²* 1140-41, 1155-56 [*SIG* 3 957], 1157, 1163, and *SEG XXIII* 78), and similarly the phratries (*IG I²* 1237 [*SIG* 3 921]). Outside of Attica the institution of demes was, of course, also known, and one of them, a deme of Cos, Haleis, used the *demarchos* to date a document (*IGRR* IV 1087, at end): see below, s.v. Cos.
up in the 139 demes of Attica. When the demes issued decrees they regularly dated them by
reference to the Athenian eponymous archon, but occasionally they did so by reference to their
own demarchoi, using the formula of eponymity. However, it would be wrong to speak of the
demarchos as eponymous, for the use of his name served primarily to lend the needed authority
to the document as well as to date it. Such a dating refers only to a small part of the Athenian
state and not to the whole people. The only national or state eponymous magistrate was the
Athenian archon, whose name and title date the deme documents year after year. He appears
alone to date them—in IG II² 1174, 1181, 1184, 1198, 1200, 1202-3, 1217—or in conjunc-
tion with the demarchos (IG II² 1191). These are all decrees of the demes, but also in deme
documents of a different nature the Athenian archon appears with the demarchos: IG II² 2394
and 2498. The demarchos appears alone only in IG I³ 248 and SEG XXIV 151.

(g) The Athenian Klerouchiai

From the end of the sixth century to the peace of 404 BC Athenian settlers (klerouchoi) were
sent out to conquered territories, where they received allotments of land. They differed
from the ordinary colonist in that they retained their Athenian citizenship and were controlled
from Athens. Because of their physical separation, however, from Athens they had a local
governmental structure to conduct their business. Such settlements had existed at Chalchis in
Euboea, Histiaia, Aegina, Lesbos, Melos, Naxos, Andros, Salamis, Imbros, and Lemnos. After
the Athenian defeat in the Peloponnesian War she was forced to abandon these settlements,
except for Salamis (Xenophon, Mem. 2.8.1) but then after the Peace of Antalkidas and the
emergence of her Second Empire she sent out settlements once more, to Samos, the Cherson-
ese, Potidaia, etc. Even in the second century she sent klerouchoi to Delos (after 166 BC).
In publishing their documents abroad, these settlers used the eponymous archon of Athens to
date them, sometimes adding the name of their own local magistrate, e.g.: IG XII 8, 645
(Peparethos); IG II² 1227 (SIG³ 691, Salamis); I. Delos 1497 (SIG³ 662), 1498 (Durrbach,
Choix 79), and 1499-1507, all from Delos; IG XII 8, 18-19 (Lemnos); IG XII 8, 48 (Imbros,
also nos. 51 and 63); IG XII Supplement 248-249 (Andros, also IG XII 5, 715).

(h) The Hoplite General

The college of ten strategoi, so important in Periclean Athens, continued to function down
to the first century BC. However, by the middle of the fourth century about half of them were
regularly assigned specific areas of competence in military security. One of them, the ho-

49 Cf. L. Robert, Opera Minora 1.567 n. 1. Likewise, a dating by phratriarchos should not be
labeled ‘eponymous’ dating.

50 The formulae of the decrees of Athenian klerouchiai have been discussed in the old but still

51 The specific military areas of competence are spelled out by Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 61.1, who
says that one of the generals is in charge of the hoplites if they go out of Attica. Cf. the com-
plite general, was in charge of the hoplites if they went outside of Attica, and in the period when the Athenian administration was being restructured by Sulla the name of the hoplite general stood next to that of the eponymous archon in prestige: *IG II²* 1039 is a decree of 83-73 BC honoring the ephebes and it begins with [ἐπὶ ---]οῦν ἄρχοντος στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοῦς ὀπλίτας Μνας[έου τοῦ] Μνας[έου Βερφ][νικίδου]. Little more than a generation later we hear the last of the other *strategoi* (*IG II²* 1040-1042, the last one of 41/0 BC). Only the hoplite general survived. In the first and second century AD he rivals the eponymous archon in prestige, his name often appearing in official documents in the genitive and giving the impression of eponymy. Some modern scholars have suggested that he was indeed eponymous, but Oliver and Geagan have rightly rejected such a view. The hoplite general is another example of a false eponym, and *IG II²* 3593 is significant in this regard. It is an inscription honoring Titus Flavius Alkibiades, who was archon in AD 139/40: [ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου θουλή καὶ ἡ θουλή τῶν φ’ κοὶ ὁ δήμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλίτων στρατηγοῦντος καὶ γυμνοστάρχου καὶ ἀρχαῖων τῆς ἐπώνυμον ἡμείς καὶ Περέα Νίκης τῆς ἐπὶ ἐπὶ ἑράκει [λ]εως, followed by his name and patronymic. Instead of calling him simply ‘archon’, the redactor of the text calls him ‘the one who held the eponymous magistracy’ and, thus, clearly making a distinction between the office of eponymous archon and the hoplite general. For our purpose it makes little difference in what order all his offices were held. Also significant is a passage in Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 2.20, in which Apollonius of Athens is described as having been granted two offices in the liturgies, namely τὴν ἐπώνυμον καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλίων, i.e. eponymous archon and hoplite general. Here again a distinction is made concerning eponymy. Geagan (*op. cit.* [see n. 52] 7-8) has analyzed the use of the word *eponymos* in these late Athenian inscriptions and concluded that it was used to distinguish the eponymous archon from the other eight archons. However, one should add that it also asserted the archon’s supremacy in the matter of eponymy and emphasized that there was only one such office, that of the eponymous archon.*
(i) Notable Foreigners as Athenian Archons

In times of financial crisis in the Hellenistic Age, when not enough wealthy citizens could be found to fill the offices, Greek cities everywhere usually made the local god the eponymous magistrate and then used the temple funds to defray the expenses involved in that magistracy. This never seems to have been done at Athens, although, of course, there are big gaps in our list of Hellenistic archons. And through the centuries down to the Roman period Athens permitted only her own (native?) citizens to hold the office of eponymous archon. Other Greek cities, with the rise of the Hellenistic kingdoms, had started the practice of allowing some of these kings to become their eponymous magistrates, but Athens resisted that idea as well, at least until the first century BC. Then, in 88/7 BC apparently a change took place. Chr. Habicht believes that the Pontic King Mithridates VI was the eponymous archon that year, basing his belief in IG II² 1715 (SIG³ 733) which is a list of Athenian archons during the first century BC and has the entry anarchia for the year 88/7 BC. Building on a theory expressed by E. Badian that an archon had been chosen for that year but that after Sulla’s capture of Athens in 86 BC his name had been suppressed, Habicht was certain that the archon was Mithridates. He may be right. More solid evidence of foreigners becoming archons appears about the end of the century.

In the reign of Augustus, or in the very early Empire, a decree was passed (IG II² 1070) ἐπὶ Κότυνος ἄρχοντος to honor Theages son of Apollonios. This Kotys, clearly a member of the Thracian royal family, appears to be the son of Rhoimetalkes, the Kotys celebrated in the pages of Tacitus (Ann. 2.64-66, and 3.38) who was killed in 19 BC or a little earlier. There appears to have been a close relationship between the Thracian royal family and Athens. About a generation later another Thracian king, Rhoimetalkes III, became archon at Athens: IG II² 1967 begins with οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ῥοιμητάλακα νεοτέρου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶν. His archonship has been put in AD 36/7 because of the erasure of

been involved somehow in the proceedings, and Kirchoff in SIG³ has suggested that the document was on deposit in a temple.

55 Cf. L. Robert, Hellenica 2.51-64.
57 There were, of course, other years in which the Athenians reported the lack of an archon. Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 13.1 lists two of them, the first in 590/89 BC and the next in 586/5 BC; see the commentary by Rhodes, op. cit. (see n. 51), pp. 180ff. Another is recorded for 404/3 BC by Diodorus 14.3.1 Cf. Xenophon, Hell. 2.3. Under the Empire anarchia in Athens occurred six times: J. Day, An Economic History of Athens under Roman Dominations (New York 1942) 240.
58 See E. Badian in AJAH 1 (1976) 103-28. In note 41 Badian says that he finds Habicht’s view about Mithridates holding the archonship in 88/7 BC ‘historically unacceptable’ although ‘technically unimpeachable’.
59 Graindor, Athènes sous Auguste (see n. 44) pp. 88-89, summarizing the results obtained in his Chronologie des archontes athéniens (Brussels 1922) 52-54, concluded that it was this particular Kotys who became archon at Athens: cf. PIR² C 1554 and R.D. Sullivan in ANRW 7.1. 200-204.
60 See J. Crowfoot in JHS 17 (1897) 321-26, and J.H. Oliver in GRBS 6 (1965) 51-55.
Caligula’s name in *IG II²* 2292, a badly mutilated catalogue in which Rhoimetalkes again figures as the eponymous archon. With the annexation of Thrace as a Roman province in AD 46 Thracians no longer enjoyed such distinction, and Romans take their places. The first of them is a certain C. Carrinas Secundus (*PIR²* C 450), known from Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.45) to have been one of Nero’s agents sent out to Greece in AD 64, where he and a companion called Acratus confiscated some of Greece’s greatest art treasures. It is, thus, strange to learn that the Athenians had made him archon, but *IG II²* 4188 is very precise: Γάιον Καρρέιναν Γαζίο[υ νιόν Σεκούνδο φιλο]καίσαρα τόν ἐπώνυμον άρχοντα καὶ ιερέα Δρούσου [μπάτου] etc. And among the acts of foreign cities published in the Asklepieion in Epidaurus is a series of decrees (*IG IV²* 83 and 84 [*SIG³* 796]) carrying the date ἐπὶ Σεκούνδου ἀρχοντος καὶ ιερέως Δρούσου ἡπάτου followed by the month and the formula of decree. Another Roman singled out for such distinction is Q. Vibius Crispus toward the end of the first century. His name in a context of eponymity appears on a triangular base found at Athens not long ago:63 [ἐπὶ Κο. Βεβίβου Κρίσσου Μαί[ρεθονίου ἀρχοντος], etc. The date of his archonship is unknown, but a new fragment of the *Fasti Ostienses* (*AE* 1968, 6) places him as consul [II] in AD 74. since the inscription on the Athenian base speaks of him as having held a third consulship, his archonship at Athens ought to fall sometime in the reign of Domitian. Also in the reign of Domitian another Roman was honored by the Athenian archonship, Q. Trebellius Rufus from Tolosa in Narbonese Gaul. The evidence is found on two bases with identical inscriptions (*IG II²* 4193), in which we are informed that he had been the high priest of the province of Narbonensis, the chief priest of a college of priests in the town of Caenina in Italy, and eponymous archon in Athens. A third base was published by J.H. Oliver in *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 72-75, which adds the information that his wife had been priestess of the goddess Roma in Tolosa.64 His archonship has been placed in the period AD 85/6-94/5 by Graindor (*Tibère à Trajan* 144).

Somewhat different from these is the figure of C. Iulius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, a Syrian prince whose grandfather was the last king of Commagene. The young prince was made eponymous archon at Athens sometime between AD 75/6 and 87/8: *IG II²* 3112 is a choregic monument honoring him as archon and agonothete. He was also suffect consul at Rome for part of the year AD 109. Part of his mausoleum still stands in Athens on the Hill of the Muses.65 Other notable figures who became Athenian archons but who were not origi-

---

61 Cf. Graindor, *Chronologie* 69-70, and *Tibère à Trajan* 48-49. For his family see also R.D. Sullivan in *ANRW* 7.1.209-11.

62 For seculation about the Athenian motivation in making him archon see Day, *op.cit.* (see n. 57), 179-80, and Graindor, *Tibère à Trajan* 14-16.


64 Cf. L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1944, no. 82.

65 See *PIR²* I 151. For the date of his archonship see Graindor, *Chronologie* 95-100, and *idem*, *Tibère à Trajan* 51-52 (with the photograph of *IG II²* 3112) and 166 (with a photograph of
nally Athenians include the historian Flavius Arrianus, whose archonship can be put in AD 145/6, especially by *IG* II² 2055 and also a number of others assembled by Follet (*op. cit.*, 209-12); Q. Alleios Epiktetos of Epidaurus, sometime under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius on the basis of *IG* IV² 691 (Follet, *op. cit.*, 126); and Tiberius Claudius Attalos of Synnada in Phrygia, in AD 140/1 (*IG* II² 1105).⁶⁶

Quite a different and unusual individual, who perhaps was an Athenian by origin, is Tiberius Claudius, son of Kallikratides, Trikorisius, whose career is given in the inscription on a base of marble found at Eleusis, dating from the age of Nero and the Flavians: *IG* II² 3546. The deme of Trikorynthos is relatively small, in the plain of Marathon. J.H. Oliver has identified him with the person mentioned in another inscription (A. Wilhelm in *Wiener Anzeiger* 72 [1935] 83-90) which gives his personal name as Oinophilos and his Roman tribe as Quirina. At what point in his life he went to Rome is unknown, but he seems to have adopted a daughter there by the name of Calpurnia Arria, who was the daughter of the imperial governor of Galatia, L. Nonius Calpurius Asprenas Torquatus, consul ca. AD 71. While in Rome he pursued an equestrian career, as *IG* II² 3546 informs us, beginning with praefectus fabrum (in this age meaning an aide to some higher authority) and then advancing to praefectus cohortis Hispanto rum II. Presumably it was after reaching this level of the equestrian career that he returned to Athens and then held a number of important posts, including those of envoy to foreign courts, strategos, gymnasiarch, agonothete, epimelete of the city, herald of the boule and demos, herald of the Areiopagos, and finally eponymous archon.⁶⁷ He was one of those Greeks who sought fame and fortune in the imperial service of Rome, like so many others, but then returned to his native city and reached the local pinnacle of prestige.

In the matter of holding the Athenian eponymous archonship the Roman emperors stand on a higher level than these others, different form them because of political reality. Not many of them, however, seem to have been interested: Domitian, Hadrian, Commodus, and Gallienus.⁶⁸

---

⁶⁶ Republished by D.J. Geagan in TAPA 103 (1972) 153-55, with new fragments.


⁶⁸ Domitian: Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 8.16; *IG* II² 1759 who apparently died in office and was then replaced by an equally unknown person called Laelianus. See Graindor, *Chronologie* 95-98, who places him in office between AD 90 and 100. For an account with two photographs of the monument see J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York 1971) 462-65.

---
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(j) The Tetrapolis in Attica

In the old tribal period, before the political changes of Solon and Kleisthenes and even before the unification of Attica under the leadership of Athens, i.e. ca. 900-700 BC, there were independent states other than Athens in the countryside. One of them would have been Eleusis and another almost certainly the Tetrapolis. Strabo (8.7.1) informs us that four old cities or towns of the Marathonian plain called Oinoe, Probailinthos, Trikorynthos, and Marathon were founded by the legendary Xouthos as a collective unit called the Tetrapolis. The unity apparently was only religious and not political, and they shared a common worship under the leadership of a single official called an archon. Remains of their common religious calendar has survived. Their religious unity continued on into much later times and in certain activities of a religious nature their age-old common life was granted certain privileges. Their unity in the fourth century can be seen in an inscription found in the Marathonian plain, IG II² 2933 (SIG³ 930): Τετραπολέες τοις Διονύσωι ἄνέθεσαν. Λυσανίας Καλλίων Τρικορύσιος ἤρξεν. ἱεροποιοί, followed by four names, one from each of the four townships. It is dated to the fourth century by one of the hieropoioi whose identity is known. Lysanias is the archon of the Tetrapolis. He officiated at the joint sacrifices and was assisted by the hieropoioi. The antiquity of the Tetrapolis makes it very probable that its archon had been its chief official in the pre-Kleisthenic period. There is even a possibility, nothing more, that the townships themselves in that period also had heads or chiefs called archons. This is suggested by the fact that after Kleisthenes made the demes an integral part of the new government and made the demarchs the chief official in each of them, they continued for several generations to use the term archon instead of demarch. IG I³ 248 (Meiggs-Lewis, GHI 53) contains the finan-

---

69 Greek tradition ascribed the unification of Attica under Athenian leadership to King Theseus in the thirteenth century: Thucydides 2.15.2; Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239 A 20); Plutarch, Theseus 24.1-4; Diodorus 4.61.8. Modern scholarship has put the date long after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilization: Hignett, op.cit. (see n. 43), 34-38 (800-700 BC), and A. Andrewes in CAH III² 3.360-63 (ca. 900 BC). For the population of Attica and the demes before Kleisthenes see D. Whitehead, The Demes of Attica, (Princeton 1986) 3-10. His conclusion about these demes before Kleisthenes is important (pp. 10-11): ‘No more space need be expended upon proving that many of what became the Kleisthenic demes were in existence long before him. Evidence carries us most of the way in this, common sense the rest. However, the belief that they possessed any official standing then, as units of either central or local government, is neither necessitated nor justified’. Others, however, have found it impossible to believe that some sort of local government did not exist, and Whitehead (p. 15) outlines their objections.

70 Cf. Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Tetrapolis, and see W. Wrede in RE s.v. Tetrapolis, cols. 1086-88.

71 IG II² 1358, discussed in detail by Whitehead, Demes 190-93.

72 The scholiast on Sophocles, Oedipus at Colonus 1047 (Philochoros, FGrHist 328 F 75) mentions that when a theoria was sent from the Tetrapolis to Delphi sacrifices were made at the Python in Oinoe, but when it was sent to Delos the sacrifices were made at the Delion in Marathon. This sounds as if it were all done independently of Athens: cf. Wrede in RE s.v. Tetrapolis cols. 1087-88. M.P. Nilsson, Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Athens (New York 1972) 40, says this does not prove the independence of the Tetrapolis but ‘at most it may be said to be likely’.
cial accounts for the temple of Nemesis in the deme of Rhamnous in the period 450-440 BC. In listing those accounts over a period of five years it dates them by the use of demarchs only twice, while the archons are used three times. Townspeople do not quickly change their habits and, thus, the Kleisthenic reform for them, or some of them, meant a gradual phasing-out of the title archon to designate their chief official, leaving that title alone in the new government to denote the eponymous magistrate of the Athenian state.

7. BOEOTIA

Already by 525-519 BC the city of Thebes was creating a Boeotian Confederacy under its leadership. The first major obstacle to unity arose in 519 when Plataea refused to join and turned to Athens for help (Thucydides 3.68.5 for date). With her Athenian allies Plataea defeated the Boeotian forces. Thus, Boeotian unity failed in the south and Theban hostility toward Athens began. The Confederacy, however, continued to function reasonably well until the Persian War. It remained neutral in 490, but after the Greek defeat at Thermopylae in 480 it aided the Persians. At Plataea in 479 it fought side by side with the Persians against the combined forces of the Athenians, Plataeans, and Megarians. The allied Greek victory at Plataea then destroyed Theban domination of the Confederacy, for its leaders were executed without a trial. The Confederacy, however, was apparently not disbanded but in its weakened condition could do nothing against the later Spartan and Athenian domination. Some twenty years after Plataea the Athenians forced the Spartans out of Boeotia and made themselves its master after the Battle of Tanagra in 457. Ten years later Orchomenos liberated Boeotia from Athenian domination. The Confederacy thereafter experienced four stages in its history: the first from 447 to 387, the second from 378 to 338, the third from 338 to 146, and the fourth under Roman domination.

The first stage is very well known to us because of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. In this stage Boeotia was divided into eleven districts, each district furnishing the federal organization with 1,000 hoplites, 100 cavalrymen, and a military commander called Boeotarch. Each dis-

---


74. Buck, op. cit. (see n. 73), 141 seems convinced that the Confederacy was not dissolved but that it continued under a different city’s hegemony. He believes (p. 142) that ‘an uneasy hegemony’ was exercised sporadically ‘by Tanagra, with Thebes attempting to get it back from time to time, but not being quite strong enough to do so.’

75. Thucydides 1.113.3. Cf. Larsen in *Classical Philology* 55 (1960) 9-18, and Buck, op. cit. (see n. 73), 150-53.

strict also sent 60 councillors called Bouleutai to the federal assembly. In 447 Thebes, Plataea, Orchomenos, and Thespiae each controlled two districts, while Tanagra controlled one. Hal-iatrus, Lebadea, and Coronea together comprised a single district, and likewise Akraiphia, Kopai, and Chaeroneia. This division, however, did not remain constant. Thebes eventually became the headquarters of the whole Confederacy, and political power resided with the board of Boeotarchs. The Peace of Antalkidas in 386 dissolved the Confederacy and each city became independent, except that Sparta occupied Thebes, Thespiae, Plataea, and Tanagra. In this period there is no evidence of the existence of a federal eponymous archon.

The foundation for the rebirth of the Confederacy in 378 began the previous year when Thebes, under the leadership of Pelopidas, freed itself from Spartan occupation. By 374 Thebes had liberated most of Boeotia, except for Plataea, Thespiae, and Orchomenos. Expansion was then rapid under Pelopidas and Epaminondas, but short-lived. At Chaeronea in 338 it was crushed by the Macedonians under Philip II and the young Alexander. Thebes was then plundered and destroyed, its territory distributed among the allies (Arrian, *Anab.* 1.9.9). The other Boeotian cities were spared and recovered their autonomy. It is in this second phase that evidence first appears of a federal eponymous archon as the nominal head of the whole Confederacy: *IG* VII 2407 (*SIG* 3 179), a decree of 362 or 361 mentioning the archon Dioteles. The real political power, of course, still lay with Boeotarchs.

The third phase begins immediately after Chaeronea and especially with the reconstruction of the city of Thebes permitted by Cassander in 316 (Diodorus 19.54.1 and Pausanias 9.7.1-2). In this Hellenistic period the new headquarters of the Confederacy are in Onchestos, as so many of the inscriptions testify by the use of the phrase ἄρχων ἐν Ὑπάτης. With the victory of Rome and the annexation of Achaea as a province the Greek Confederacies were disbanded in 146, but a rebirth was permitted just a few years later (Pausanias 7.16.10).

On the basis of *IG* VII 2871, found at Coronea and dated to the period after 146 BC, H. Swoboda assumed that in this Roman period the headquarters of the Confederacy had been moved to Akraiphia. The inscription is an agonistic catalogue that begins with ἄρχων ἐν Ἀκραίφαιας Ἰππόνικου. He thought, of course, that the archon was that of the Confederacy and that therefore the eponymous archon had been reactivated after 146 BC. However, M. Feyel has shown that the archon in this text was the local archon of Akraiphia. There is, in

---

77 On this proxenia decree see Roesch, *Thespies* 75-77. The first two letters of his name are restored, but [Di]oteles seems to be preferred over [Thi]oteles. There is a list of the federal eponymous archons in Roesch, *Thespies* 87-94, from Dioteles to 146 BC. On the archon’s position see Roesch, *Études* 282ff. who accurately records (p. 286): ‘Ainsi le rôle de l’archonte fédéral est-il uniquement celui de magistrat éponyme de la Confédération. Aucun document connu ne lui attribue d’autres compétences. Il paraît ne jamais intervenir ni dans les questions politiques, ni dans les affaires économiques de la Béotie.’

78 Swoboda in *Busolt-Swoboda* (see n. 23) II 1446. His view is rejected by Feyel in *Contribution à l’épigraphie béotienne* (Le Puy 1942) 58-63, and by Roesch, *Thespies* 93-94. Roesch (p. 94) comments on the disappearance of the federal eponymous archon: ‘Peut-être, au moment du
fact, no indication as yet that the federal eponymous archon of Boeotia survived the general
dissolution of the Greek confederacies in 146 BC.

It should be noted that whenever non-Boeotian cities, for whatever reason, became part of
the Boeotian Confederacy they had to give up their former eponymous magistrate as well as
their old political officials and henceforth use the Boeotian system of archon and polemarchs.
For example, Megara used to have an eponymous basileus as eponymous magistrate ever since
the fifth century, but when in the Hellenistic Age it was for a time a member of the Boeotian
Confederacy its eponymous magistrate was the archon and its principal officials the pole-
marchs (IG VII 27-28). Other non-Boeotian cities that were for a time members of the Boeo-
tian Confederacy were Chalkis and Eretria in Euboea, Aigosthena in the Megarid, and Halai in
Locris.79

Akraiphia

When the federal eponymous archon of the Confederacy is named in public documents of
Akraiphia his name and title come first, those of the local archon second: IG VII 2716 of
τῶ and is followed immediately by the names of the three Akraiphian polemarchs and the
secretary. The polemarchs and secretary, of course, are false eponyms. Similar to 2716 is
2719. The federal archons are not always named: 2715 begins with the local archon and is
followed by the three local polemarchs and the secretary. Cf. 2718 and 2720. The earliest
eponymous archons of Akraiphia belong to the very end of the sixth century: Jeffery, LSAG
60, no. 13, is a dedication on a column in the sanctuary of the hero Ptoios, a column which
once supported a tripod. About the same date is SEG XXII 430 (Jeffery, LSAG 92, no. 4, and
95, no. 10). The archon is still eponymous in the first century AD when a decree from the pe-
riod of Claudius begins with ἀγαθὴ τύχη. ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀκρησίοις Διὸς Σωτῆρος τοῦ μετὰ
Ἀφροδίσιον τὸ γ’. Thus, as L. Robert points out in the editio princeps (BCH 59 [1935] 441
[Opera Minora 1.282]), the city was in miserable economic condition and Zeus had to be made
the eponym in order to use the funds in his treasury to carry out the duties and meet he ex-
penses of the position.

Anthedon

Throughout its history prior to the dissolution of Greek confederacies by the Romans in
146 BC the Boeotian Confederacy had a national army to which its member cities contributed
infantry and cavalrymen. Thus, military catalogues are fairly common in Boeotian inscrip-
tions. P. Roesch (Études 340-43) has compiled a list of them based on the epigraphic formu-
lae employed. IG VII 4172 from Anthedon is such a catalogue and has been placed by Roesch

79 For these cities see below s.v. Euboea, Megarid, and Locris. Cf. Roesch, Thespies 161.
in the period after 245 BC. It is short, its heading as follows: Κτεισίσω ἀρχοντὸς Βοιωτοῖς, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλις Ἐσχριών, πελτοφόρη ἀπεράντων, followed by eight names before breaking off. Ktesias is the federal eponymous archon, while Eschrion is the eponymous archon of Anthedon. Somewhat later is the honorary decree of a religious association of Anthedon published by M.H. Jameson in the Archäologischer Anzeiger 1968, 99-102, no. 3 (SEG XXV 564), but subsequently republished by Roesch (Études 91-104 = SEG XXXII 453) in a more complete form. He places it in the second century. Unfortunately it is not possible to decide whether Nikagoros, the archon used to date the text, is the eponymous archon of Anthedon or of the association, although very often associations simply employ the eponym of the host city. Anthedon’s archon, however, is still eponymous under the Empire in the reign of Marcus Aurelius and right on through into the reign of Severus Alexander, as we know from a list of its archons preserved on a stele: IG VII 4173, which has been re-examined and re-published by Roesch in ZPE 24 (1977) 179-85 (SEG XXVII 52). Its heading reads as follows: Ἀγαθὴ τύχη. ἀρχόντων στεφάνων ἑτέρων ἀναγραφῇ δευτέρᾳ. The names that follow are arranged in three columns (lines 5-45), and Roesch has been able to date them accurately, the list beginning about AD 165-170 and ending in AD 224. Among the archons the name of Zeus appears five times, indicating times of economic difficulty and perhaps connected to the campaigns of Marcus Aurelius along the Danube, as suggested by Roesch.

Chaeronea

A very large number of manumission texts are dated by the eponymous archon of Chaeronea in the course of the second century: IG VII 3301-3406. One of them, IG VII 3376 (SIG3 1207), is very specific: ἀρχόντος ἐγι Χαιρωνείαι Ἀρίστωνος, μηνὸς Ἀργυρίου πεντεκαδεκάτης, etc. More recently discovered Chaeronean manumission texts have been published by J.M. Fossey and P. Roesch in ZPE 29 (1978) 123-37 (SEG XXVIII 444-52). The archon of Chaeronea is still used eponymously in the first century AD: see the mutilated list of ephebes in IG VII 3296, which begins with ἀρχοντος Ελπίδος Ζώιλου and is followed by the three polemarchs and the secretary, the typical series of Boeotian city magistrates.

Chorsiai

All the known examples of the eponymous archons of Chorsiai belong to the Hellenistic Age. IG VII 2390 is a mutilated military catalogue which begins with the naming of the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy and is followed by the name of the eponymous archon of Chorsiai. IG VII 2383 is a decree of the city honoring Kapon of Thisbe. It begins with the date of the archon of Chorsiai and belongs to the beginning of the second century: reprinted by Moretti, ISE I no. 66. Other examples of the same general date are IG VII 2385, 2387-90.
Copai

The earliest inscriptions mentioning the eponymous archon of Copai belong to the middle of the third century or a little earlier. *IG VII 2781* is a military catalogue that begins with [θ]εός. Μελαντίχον άρχοντος τοι άπειραναντο εν ὁπλίτας, πολεμαρχιόνων, followed three names, one of them designated as the λοχαγός, then the secretary, all of these being the typical Boeotian magistrates in the cities. A little later in the third century are 2782-2789, all of them military catalogues using the eponymous archon of Copai. Two other military catalogues of *ca.* 260-250 have been published by G.-J.-M.-J. Te Riele in *BCH* 99 (1975) 77-87 with similar headings, and cf. S. Lauffer in *Chiron* 6 (1976) 12-13, no. 3 (*SEG XXVI 550) of 250-230 BC. Another is *SEG XXII 432* dated to the beginning of the second century. I know of no later examples of the eponymous magistrate of Copai.

Coronea

A proxenia decree of the period after 245 BC (*IG VII 2858*) is dated by the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy, and several others, some badly mutilated, are similar: *IG VII 2859-69*. The manumission texts, however, regularly use the eponymous archon of Coronea for the dates. The largest number of them, all of pre-Roman date, have been published by N.G. Pappadakis in *Archaiologikon Deltion* 2 (1916) 217-35 and 269. Each one is dated by the archon, eight of them in all. There is one in the corpus, *IG VII 2872*, and another has been published by J.M. Fossey and P. Roesch in *ZPE* 29 (1978) 138-41 (*SEG XXVIII 455*), from the second half of the third century. Thus, all the known examples belong to the Hellenistic Age.

Haliartus

The eponymous archon of Haliartus is attested in several inscriptions of the third and early second century. *IG VII 2849* is a proxenia decree of the period before the Roman war against Perseus. Another decree (*IG VII 2848*) is very mutilated, but it too seems to have been dated by the city’s archon and belongs to the same period as 2849. A more recently discovered decree, first published by C. Vatin in *BCH* 92 (1968) 616ff. (*SEG XXV 556*) and then republished with additions and corrections by P. Roesch in his *Études*, 203-10 (*SEG XXXII 456*), has been dated to 235-220 BC. It begins with ἀρχ[ο]ντος [Ἐμπεδίωνδος], and gives the names and titles of many of the city’s magistrates. In the war against Perseus Haliartus chose to oppose Rome (Polybius 27.5), and for that decision the city was destroyed by the Romans and its land given to Athens (Polybius 30.20; Strabo 9.2.30; Livy 42.46.7, 56.3 and 63.3). Thereafter the Athenians retained control of the area in Boeotia through an epimelete, and public documents of Haliartus used the Athenian archon for the purpose of dating. An example has been preserved in *IG VII 2850*, a decree republished by Roesch in his *Études*, 168ff., no.
23, and it begins ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Νικοδήμου, ἐπιμε[λη]τοῦ δ’ ἐν Ἀλιάρτ(ω) Ἀ[νταγό-
ρου τ]οῦ Ἀντ(α)γόρου Ἄτ[ρου]. etc. Nikodemos was archon in Athens in 122/1 BC.

Hyettus

The military catalogues from Hyettus (IG VII 2809-2832) conform to a type and are intro-
duced by a regular formula, e.g. no. 2811: Θιῶς. Φιλοξένω ἀρχοντος Βοιωτοίς, ἐπὶ πόλιος
dὲ Ἀριστογίτονος, πολεμαρχίόντων, followed by three names, then the name of the secre-
tary and then τοι ἀπεγράψανθο ἐμ πελτοφόρας followed by the names of the men. Thus, in
these catalogues we find the dating first by the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy
and then by the eponymous archon of Hyettus. The extant examples in the corpus are dated
between 230 and 172 BC. Slightly older is SEG XXVI 498, of 250-245 BC, while nos. 499-
500 belong to 210-200 and ca. 200 BC respectively. The eponymous magistrate of Hyettus is
still the archon in the period after AD 212, as recorded in IG VII 2808 (SIG3 1112), the text
republished by J.H. Oliver (The Sacred Gerusia, Hesperia Supplement 6 [1941] 143-46, no.
33) and by Roesch (Études 153ff. no. 21) with commentaries.

Lebadea

The usual combination of dating by the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy
and by the local eponymous archon is found in Lebadea, e.g. in IG VII 3068, a military cata-
logue of twenty-year-old men: Χαροπίνω ἀρχοντος Βοιωτοίς, Λέβαδαιε[νίς] δὲ Κά[ρυ]ο-
tος, εἰκαστικέτεις ἀπεγράψαντο, followed by names. The same type of double eponymous
dating is found in a manumission from the end of the third century in IG VII 3083 (Schwyzer,
DGE 509), while a local decree of Lebadea from the Roman Republican period uses only
the city eponym (IG VII 3059). The city’s archon was still eponymous in the period after the
reign of M. Aurelius (IG VII 3106), at a time when the city felt it necessary to spell out the ti-
tle in full: ὁ ἐπόνυμος ἀρχων καὶ ἀγονοθέτης τῶν Σεβαστῶν Λύρηλιος [Φιλ.]οκράτης
etc. A false eponym is found in IG VII 3088, in which a military list from the third century
BC is dated by the city’s Boeotarch.

Onchestus

In the Hellenistic Age, from 338 BC to the beginning of the second century, Onchestus
was the headquarters of the Boeotian Confederacy. Then, from 197 to 172 BC, the headquarters
was back in Thebes. See the resume of these events in Roesch, Études 281. Thus, one must
distinguish between the local eponym of the city and the eponym of the Boeotian Confederacy
in the inscriptions from that city. A distinction is made in SEG XXV 504, a military cata-
logue of the third to the second century (220-210 BC?) from Thespiae: Χαροπίνω ἀρχοντος
ἐν Ὄθοιοι, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλιος Ἐπιμαχάνω etc. For the formula see Roesch, Études 268ff.
and cf. J. and L. Robert, Bulletin 1956, 226. Decrees of the Confederacy, of course, use only
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the eponym of the Confederacy: T.G. Spyropoulos in *Teiresias* 3 (1973) 384 (*SEG* XXVII 60), dated a little after 338 BC.

**Orchomenus**

The usual double dating by the eponymous archons of the city and of the Boeotian Confederacy is found in a large number of inscriptions, e.g. *IG VII* 3175, a catalogue of the period after 245 BC: *Φυλοκόμω αρχόντος Βοιωτοῖς, Ἕρχομε[ν]ίοις δὲ Θωγνατίδαο, followed by the names of the three polemarchs, the name of the secretary to the polemarchs, and the names of soldiers (lines 6-49). Similar double dating: *IG VII* 3172 VII (223-216 BC), 3178 (230?-213 BC), 3179 (223-216 BC), 3180 (223-216 BC), 3184, *SEG* III 371-374, and R. Étienne and P. Roesch in *BCH* 102 (1978) 360 of ca. 287-280 BC. Decrees of the city itself are dated by its own eponymous archon, e.g. *IG VII* 3169 (*SIG* 3 994): *Δαμοσ[θ]ίδαο άρχοντος, ἱερεῖ-άδδοντος Ἀντιχαρίδαο Ἀ[θ]αναδόρῳ, ἀ πόλις Δι[α] Μειλί[χο], followed by the decree proper (late third century). Other examples of dating by the eponym of the city: *IG VII* 3166-3168, 3171 A-C (Schwyzer *DGE* 526), 3173, 3176 (all these from the third century), 3181, 3195 (first century), 3199-3204 (second century manumissions), 3210-3211, 3220, 3224 (first century). No. 3176 is dated by the archon for the fourth time. Military catalogues, reflecting the military demands of the Confederacy, regularly use double dating, as in *IG VII* 3175, 3178-3180, *SEG* III 371-372, and *SEG* XXX 447 and 449. I have found no examples of the eponymous archon of Orchomenus in the Roman imperial period, which may not be used as evidence that its archon ceased to function in that capacity.

**Oropus**

Oropus was in the border zone between northern Attica and Boeotia on the coast opposite Euboea in a position of strategic importance. It enjoyed a wide reputation because of the presence of the nearby sanctuary of Amphiaras, which was the seat of an oracle as well as a sanatorium. The city and its territory were a constant bone of contention between Boeotia and Athens throughout all of the classical period. Soon after the Peace of Antalkidas in 386 BC it was subject to Athens for a short period and then reverted to Boeotia, only to be returned to Athens by Philip II after Chaeronea. From 313-304 and from 287 to 146 BC it was part of the Boeotian Confederacy again, with Athens alternating in its control. In the second century after Christ it belonged to Athens (Pausanias 1.34.1). A large number of inscriptions mention the eponymous archon of Oropus, but several peculiarities of the dating of documents found in the city or its territory complicate the picture. In the Hellenistic Age to the first century BC the variations of eponymity in the proxenia decrees will illuminate the fact.

1. Federal archon and priest of Amphiaras, e.g. *IG VII* 237: *ἄρχοντος ἐν κοινῷ Εὐέργου, ἱερεῶς δὲ τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου Φανοστράτου, Πολύνικος Πανδάρου εἶπεν, etc. Cf. nos.

2. Federal archon and archon of Oropus and priest of Amphiaraus, e.g. IG VII 246: ἄρχοντος ἐγ Κοινὸς Βοιωτῶν Ἀπολλοδόρου, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλεως Παυσανίου, ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου Γλαύκονος, etc. Cf. nos. 252, 254, 255, 261, 273, 278 (Leonardos p. 23 no. 138), 295, 296, 298, 299, 310, 312, 392.

3. Federal archon alone, e.g. IG VII 280: Ἀντίγωνος ἄρχοντος, Λύσσανδρος Μειλίχω 'Νάπ[ίος ἔλεξεν· ἐπειδὴ] Θεομνηστός εὐνοῦς ἐών διατε[λ]ῇ τῷ κοινῷ etc. Cf. nos. 290, 303, and SEG XV 282, where the federal archon is followed by the names of Boeotarchs and then the secretary (cf. Roesch, Thespies 83 and 106-107).


For a new corpus of inscriptions from Oropus and the Amphiaereion see B. Petrakos, Epigraphika tou Oropou, Athens 1980, which adds nothing significant to the present material.

In agonistic texts with lists of victors the eponymous archon of Oropus is used along with the priest of Amphiaraus: IG VII 419-420. A similar heading is used for a list of sacred objects of ca. 200 BC in IG VII 3498. In an examination of the formulæ used in the proxenia texts Roesch justly remarks (Études 283): “Il semble qu’on ait répugné à mentionner l’archonte de la cité qui apparaît plus rarement que l’archonte de la Confédération et surtout que le prêtre d’Amphiaraos.” Nevertheless, the archon alone at Oropus was eponymous. The priest of Amphiaraus is a false eponym, named because of his interest in the proceedings (proxenia, e.g.), while the eponymous archon of the Confederation represents a different administrative and political entity.

Tanagra

There are very many proxenia decrees from Tanagra and they regularly use the city’s eponymous archon for dating them, e.g. IG VII 505 (Schwyzer, DGE 459 no. 1) from the period after the middle of the third century: Εἰρίαο ἄρχοντος, μεινὸς Δαματρίῳ νιομεινή, ἐπε- εψάριδε Γιονώπαστος Ἀμινίονος, Ἐπιχαρίδας Φύλλιος ἔλεξε· δεδόχθη τοῦ δάμοι, πρό- ξενον εἰμὲν καὶ εὐρέγεταν τὰς πόλιος Ταναγρήην etc. Cf. Roesch, Thespies 170-71 for the formula. Other proxenia decrees of similar date with the city’s eponymous archon: IG VII 504 and 506-524. For a special, honorary decree granting proxenia from ca. 171-146 BC, using the city’s eponymous archon, see SEG II 184. Th. Reinach in REG 12 (1899) 53ff. (Schwy- zer, DGE 462) published a decree which promulgated a sacred law of the period 230-220
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BC. It is dated by a man who was archon for the third time: Καφίσιαο ἄρχοντος τῷ τρίτῳ. Cf. Roesch, Études 386-88.

Thebes

An inscription on a bronze phiale dedicated by lektō Yhba-oí at the end of the seventh or early in the sixth century was first published by Stavropoulos in the Ephemeris Archaiologike for 1896, 243, and subsequently reprinted by Schwizer (DGE 440 no. 11) and Jeffery (LSAG p. 92 no. 7, Plate 8): ἡμῖν τῷ Καρυκέριον Φλόγακος ἄρχοντος λεκτοί[ς] Θεβαίοι[ς] ἀνέβειαν. Phloax is the eponymous archon. All other examples of the eponymous archon of Thebes are much later, e.g. IG VII 2420, a list of third century dedications over three years to the Kabiroi in their sanctuary west of the city: Μνασιλάω ἄρχοντος, ἱσχεπαθδύτων Σάμμειο Ἰσμενικέταο. Φοξίνω 'Αθηνοδώρῳ, Καβιριαρχίοντων, followed by three names, and then γραμματιδύτων Καφισοδώρῳ Ἀκαστίδαο, ἐπάνθητα etc. (lines 1-9). Similar formula is used for the next two years (lines 10-39), each year dated by the archon of Thebes. Of course, this inscription was set up by the sanctuary officials, not by the city government.

About the middle of the third century is another list (IG VII 2421) dated by the archon of the city. A financial document of ca. 170 BC (IG VII 2426) begins with a heading: Μίκκου ἄρχοντος ἀπολογία ἱππάρχου Πομπιδ[ου]. Mikkos is the eponymous archon of Thebes, and the hipparch is a Theban officer (Roesch, Thespies 177 n. 1). An agonistic inscription of the early first century (IG VII 2447) is dated by the local eponymous archon. As leader of the Confederacy from its origins down to 338 BC, Thebes figured prominently in its history, and the earliest mention of the Confederacy’s eponymous archon occurs in IG VII 2407 (SIG3 179) from 362 to 361 BC: [Θ]εός. τύχα. [Δι]οτέ[λι]ος ἄρχοντος ἐδοξέ τοῦ δάμοι πρόξενον ἐϊ- μεν Βοιωτῶν etc. As usual, care must be taken to distinguish the archons of the Confederacy from those of Thebes, as, e.g., in IG VII 2418 (SIG3 201, Tod II 160) which mentions the Confederacy’s archons over a period of three years (354-352 BC). It is a list of contributions to the Sacred War against the Phocians.

Thespiae

The earliest example of the eponymous archon of Thespiae is found in a list of sacred offerings from early in the fourth century (probably 386 BC when the Peace of Antalkidas dissolved the Boeotian Confederacy), first published by M. Feyel and N. Platon in BCH 62 (1938) 149-66 (SEG XXIV 361). It begins with a short heading: θεός. τύχα. ἱερὰ χρέματα Θεσπιέων Διοπειθέως ἄρχοντος ἐν ἱεραίωι, followed by a long list of the objects. At that time, as Roesch mentions (Thespies 55), the three ports of Chorsiae, Siphae, and Kreusis were freed from the control of Thespiae, and the Thespians accordingly conducted an inventory of the sacred objects in the Heraion of Chorsiae and in the temples of the other two ports. Thus, Dio-peithes is the eponymous archon of Thespiae. Numerous proxenia decrees of the third century are also dated by the eponymous archon of Thespiae: IG VII 1721-1732, N.G. Pappadakis in
A decree of ca. 155-130 BC (SEG I 132) honors three judges sent out to Delphi and is dated by the eponymous archon of Thespiae. Military catalogues from Thespiae follow the usual formula of dating first by the federal archon and then by the local archon of the city: SEG XXV 504 of the third-second century; IG VII 1747-1750 of the third century, generally after 245 BC. An important inscription listing the magistrates elected by Thespiae for two consecutive years was published by A. Keramopoullos in Archaiologikon Deltion for 1931-32, pp. 12-40, and re-edited by Roesch, Thespiae 3-11. The list has been dated not before 220-215 BC and not after 210-208 BC. At least one (1.61) of the years is dated by the eponymous archon. In another inscription (IG VII 1725 from the middle of the second century) the eponymous archon is reported to have held that office for the fifth time. In the first and second century AD (IG VII 1776-1777) the archon was still eponymous, by which time apparently he was given his full title (IG VII 1864), τὸν ἐπόνομον ἄρχοντα Φλ(αοιον) Ἀρχέλ[αον ---], as the occasion warranted.

Thisbe

Three inscriptions (IG VII 2223-2224 and 2228), of indeterminate date in the Hellenistic period, are dated by the eponymous archon. Thisbe was one of the few Boeotian cities which had supported Perseus in his war against Rome, and when it surrendered in 171 BC it suffered severe penalties: see RDGE 2. Presumably it continued to use its eponymous archon after a senatorial decree had laid down the lines of its future administration.

(to be continued)