

ROBERT K. SHERK

THE EPONYMOUS OFFICIALS OF GREEK CITIES: I

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 249–288

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

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.¹ 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.² 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.³ 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 *li-i-mu* (or *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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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 *Prytaneis of the Lacedaemonians* (*FGrHist* 262 T 1). Well known is the collection of Athenian archons by Demetrius of Phaleron (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.22 [Thales]), and Plutarch (*Aristeides* 5.9-10). A certain Ktesikleides also seems to have listed the Athenian archons (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 2.56 [Xenophon]). Philochoros may have done the same or at least wrote about them in the fourth century (*FGrHist* 328 F 72). Phainias of Eresos wrote at least two books on the *Prytaneis of Eresos* (Athenaeus 333a). Hermogenes son of Charidemus, a physician of Smyrna whose writings, listed in *IGRR* IV 1445, include πύνα(κα) Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ζμυναίων διαδοχῆ(ν) κατὰ χρόνους. Charon of Naukratis compiled a list

² I quote the entry in the Sumerian text from M.B. Rowton in *CAH*² 1.1.220 n. 3.

³ See A. Ungnad in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* II s.v. Eponymen, 412 and his lists pp. 164ff. For a convenient example see J.B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, Princeton 1969, p. 271. no. 2.

⁴ For the lists of Assyrian eponymous *li-i-mu* see the basic article of Ungnad, *op. cit.*, 413-457. The great canon of these eponyms begins in 911 and reaches to 648 BC. For further observations see Rowton in *CAH*² 1.1.193ff. and Falkner in *Arch. f. Orient f.* 17 (1954) 100-120. A convenient example is in Pritchard, *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 *Abh. der preuss. Ak. der Wiss.* (Berlin 1902). There is a photograph in *CAH*², Plates to Vol. 1, no. 25.

of eponymous priests in Alexandria (*FGrHist* 612).⁶ 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 (*SIG³* 723) contains some regulations for the compulsory up-dating of the list of eponymous priests.⁷ 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).⁸ 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 490/89 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.⁹ 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) 140-90.¹⁰

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 Antigonos,

⁶ Cf. P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria II* (Oxford 1972) 364 with n. 204.

⁷ See the revised reading of the stone by Hiller von Gaertringen in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 (1929) 349 ff.

⁸ Cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 364 n. 64; revised reading reported in *SEG XV* 518.

⁹ See S. Dow in *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 144 ff., Chr. Habicht in *Chiron* 6 (1976) 127-35, and E. Badian in *AJAH* 1 (1976) 111-12.

¹⁰ Cf. M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca II* (Rome 1969) 328 ff.

agreed to turn over to him all his soldiers, and declared that he 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: Οἶδε μολπῶν ἠισύμνησαν· Ἰππόμαχος θήρωνος : ἐπὶ τούτου 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 from 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 from 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.

¹² Cf. Jacoby, *Atthis* 180ff. and Guarducci, *Epigrafia* II 393ff.

¹³ See Chr. Dunant and J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* II (Paris 1958) 104-16, nos. 199-223, and J. Pouilloux, *ibid.* I (Paris 1954) 263ff., nos. 28-34. Pouilloux and F. Salviat have announced in the *Praktika* of the 8th International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (published in Athens 1984) pp. 233-58 their project of reconstructing the catalogue of the Thasian archons.

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: Ἄλίο ἰαρήζ τοίδε.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: Στρατηγοὶ διὰ πέντε ἐτέων. This is followed by Ἐπὶ Ἰστυείου 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 (*Epigrafi* 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: Ζεὺς 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, *Epigrafi* II 345.

followed by the name of a secretary.¹⁶ 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, *l.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.¹⁷

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 up-dating 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: [Ὅϊδε ἱέρην]ται Διονύσου μετὰ τοὺς ἱερησαμένους διὰ βίου.¹⁸

ODESSOS. *I. Bulg. I² 46* is a catalogue of priests between 44-43 BC and AD 2-3, with a heading: Ὅϊδε ἱέρηνται τῷ θεῷ μετὰ τὴν κάθηδον. 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.

¹⁷ L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris 1938, 135, supports that view, but P.M. Fraser in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens I* (Leiden 1978) 363ff. disagrees.

¹⁸ Cf. L. Robert in *Revue de Philologie 33* (1959) 203.

ASTYPALAEA. W. Peek in *Inschriften von den dorischen Inseln, Abh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 60, I (Leipzig 1969) no. 100 has published an inscription containing 14 lines of a list of names who appear to be the eponymous magistrates (damiourgoi) 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'Amyzon en Carie*, Paris 1983, nos. 51-54, have published fragments of a list of stephanephoroi from this Carian city, in which the god Apollo appears as eponym. The heading indicates that it is a list of stephanephoroi 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

¹⁹ Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1971 no. 486.

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 agonothe'te'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 ἐπί 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.²² 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.²³

(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,

²² See K.W. Harl, *Civic Coins and Civic Politics* (Berkeley 1987) 26-30.

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, *Thespiens et la Confédération béotienne* (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 τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Ἀκτίωι Γάστρου τοῦ Ἄνδρωνος Οἰνιάδα*, 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 τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Ἀκτίωι Θευδότου τοῦ Σώτωνος Ἀνακτοριέως*, followed by the secretary, a *promnamon*, three *sympromnamonoi*, and the name of the month.

Anactorium

A fragment of a decree from the fourth-third century (*IG IX² 212*) begins with *ἀγαθῶν τύχαι. ἐπὶ πρυτάνιος Πλ[]άρχου 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

²⁴ See Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde II* (München 1926) 1461-1470, and J.A.O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*, Oxford 1968, 89ff.

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 *Achaiοi* 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 IV*² 60 of 191 BC (cf Polybius 21.9) begins with [ἐπ]ὶ γραμματέος τοῖς Ἀχ[αίοις ---, στρατα]γοῦ δὲ Διοφάνειος μη[νὶ --- etc. Cf. *SIG*³ 531. Of course the general also appears alone as eponym: *IG IV*² 71 (*SIG*³ 471) and *IG V* 2, 293. The *damiourgoi* also appear as eponyms (*SIG*³ 519). 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 (*SIG*³ 530) with [ἐπὶ θεο]κόλου Φιλοκλέος, [γραμ]ματιστᾶ Δαμοκρί[του, βουλ]άρχου etc., then the sentence of death for the men, followed by [ἐπὶ Εὐ]φάνεος βουλάρχου· [Ἄσκλη]πιάδας Δρόμα. [ἐπὶ βο]υλάρχου [Φ]ιλέα· [---]ίας Ὀλυμπίχου. Dated to 219 BC is a grant of citizenship to foreign soldiers: ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Ἀριστολαίδα, βουλάρχου Τιμοκράτεος, προστάτα Κύλωνος, γραμματιστᾶ δαμασιοφυλάκων Μενάνδρου, then the formula for the grant followed by the names (*SIG*³ 529). And the letter of Q. Fabius Maximus to Dyme (*SIG*³ 684; *RDGE* 43), probably of 115 BC, begins with ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος. There is no question about the eponymy 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 ἀργύριον κα[θότι γέγραπται τὸ μέρος τὸ] ἐπιβάλλον κατ' ἐνιαυτό[ν, τὸ μὲν μέρος ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ] τοῦ μετὰ Δεξίλαον ἐνια[υτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ δαμι]οργοῖς τοῖς μετὰ Δεξιλάου [πρὶν ἐξίεναι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν]. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen*

²⁷ See Pausanias 7.16.10 and Polybius 2.41ff., and cf. Busolt-Swoboda 1531-75; Larsen, *Federal States* 81ff. and 215ff.; Veligianni-Terzi Chrissoula, *Damiurgen. Zur Entwicklung einer Magistratur*, Diss. Heidelberg 1977, 103-107.

²⁸ Cf. Schulthess in *RE* s.v. Grammateis 1757.

63, correctly points out that the phrase [ἀπὸ] τοῦ μετὰ Δεξιλάου ἐνια[υτοῦ] 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 ἐπί in the next phrase: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ δαμι]οργοῖς τοῖς μετὰ Δεξιλάου, 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 than 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 Acarnanian Confederacies of 263-262 BC (*IG IX² 3*) the date is given by the eponymous *stratego*i of them both (lines 16-25). The Aetolian *strategos* was also named eponymously in some documents of member states: e.g. at Naupaktus (*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*, Phycus); Klaffenbach, *op.cit.*, 370ff.

(Potidania in Aetolia). This agonotheite is, of course, a magistrate of the Confederacy and not of the cities in which documents mention him. Why an agonotheite, 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 agonotheite 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?²⁹

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,³⁰ 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 *stratego*i of the Confederacy, and only one document permits a glimpse of the inner workings of the city itself. This document³¹ 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: ἁ δὲ δίκαι ἐδικάσθη 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 Eriphylos 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 ἀρχόντων [--]ου, [. . . . Φ]ιστύων, ἰ[αροφυλ]άκων δὲ Φαλάκρου,

²⁹ For a list of the Aetolian *stratego*i 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.

³⁰ See J.A.O. Larsen in *Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson* II, (St. Louis 1953) 807-808 (= Fr. Gschnitzer [ed.], *Zur griechischen Staatskunde* [Darmstadt 1969] 312-313).

³¹ *IG IX² 138*, republished by F. Poulsen in *BCH* 54 (1930) 42ff.

Ἀγησάνδρου [Φ]ιστύ[ων], θευκολε[ού]σας δὲ [Κα]λλιμάχ[ας Φιστυίδος]. μάρτυροι etc. 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 ἀγωνοθετέοντος Ἀντιόχου Ἀρσινοέος, ἐν δὲ Π[ο]τιδανίαι ἀ(ρ)χόντων, followed by three names, then ἔτο(υ)ς ἐνάτου, μηνὸς Ἀλγυέου 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 Achaean Confederacy.³²

Lousoi

Located within the territory of Cleitor 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 δαμιοργοῦ --- τοῦ Νικοδάμο[υ], 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: ἐ[δ]οξε [δ]ὲ ἐπὶ δαμιοργῶν ἱερέος Δεινόλα, Σακρέτεος, Βούμα, οἰκονόμου Ἀνθεσιλά[α]ου Στυμφαλίου. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 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 *hieromnemes*, as we find in *IG V 2, 393*, its formula indicating that there was a president of the group: ἐπὶ ἱε[ρομνάμοσι το]ῖς 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 Achaean Confederacy over Arcadia.

Mantineia

After subjection to both Achaean and Aetolian control³³ Mantineia was given a new name after Antigonos Doson captured it in 223 BC. As Antigoneia it became a member of the Achaean Confederacy: *IG V 2, 293* begins with ἐπὶ στραταγοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν Φιλοποίμενος τὸ τέτα[ρ]τον (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 *SIG³ 600*, see Errington, *op. cit.*, (n. 33) 253. As expected in such situations, Mantineia at this time used the eponymous *strategos* of the Confederacy to date that document. In four manumission texts, however, Mantineia uses its own city eponymous priest. In all of these texts, from the Hellenistic or Roman periods, the formula is ἐπὶ ἱερέως τοῦ Ποσειδῶ-

³² 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.

³³ See R.M. Errington, *Philopoemen* (Oxford 1969) 10.

voς followed by the priest's name.³⁴ Pausanias (8.10.2) describes the temple of Poseidon Hippios on the nearby Mt. Alesios.

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: *IG V 2*, 516 begins ἐπὶ ἱερέος τᾶς Δεσποίνας τὸ β' Νικασίππου τοῦ Φιλίππου καὶ ἐπιμελητᾶν Δαμύλλου τοῦ Ζευξία, Δαμοκράτεος τοῦ Κλίτορος, ἔτους λ' καὶ β' κατὰ τὸν Σεβαστόν (AD 42); *IG V 2*, 524 (*OGIS* 407, cf. Magie, *Roman Rule* 1434 n. 19) records a gift to Despoina by a king of Commagene and dated ἐπὶ ἱερέος Σωτηρίχου (here, of course, not strictly eponymous): in *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 ἱερέος Δαμύλλου; *IG V 2*, 543 begins ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. ἐπὶ ἱερέως Πομπηίου Ἀρ[ι]στοκράτους οἱ μνούμενοι τῆι τῶν ἱερῶν [---]. Admittedly, only the first of these shows a true eponym, but dating by priesthoods also appears in another city, Lycaeum, belonging to Megalopolis: *IG V 2*, 549 I, III, V, and VI (fourth century). In the city of Megalopolis itself two inscriptions are significant: *IG V 2*, 441 (131 BC), ἐπὶ γραμματ[έος] τοῖς συνέδροις τὸ β' Νικηράτου, ἔτους ἐ[βδόμου καὶ δεκάτου] etc.; *IG V 2*, 443 A, [ἐπὶ] γραμματέος τοῖς σ[υνέδροις ---] etc. (cf. 444 C). In *IG V 2*, 443 B the [ἐπὶ] of [ἐπὶ] δαμιο[ργ]ῶν [---] is rejected by Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 74, rightly I think. Thus, on the local level, we have an eponymous priesthood (of Despoina) in Lycosura and perhaps elsewhere in the *ager Megalopolitanus* while in Megalopolis itself the secretary of the *synedrion* is eponymous.³⁵ The word *synedrion* may be the equivalent of *boule*: see Aymard, *Confédération Achaienne* 65, who believes it possible that the local *bouleuterion* in Megalopolis also served as the seat of the Achaean federal *synodos* when it was in session. It must be remembered that in 235 BC Megalopolis was brought into the Achaean Confederacy.

³⁴ *IG V 2*, 275; the other inscriptions are nos. 274, 277 and 342a.

³⁵ Cf. Swoboda in *Klio* 12 (1912) 48-49, Schulthess in *RE* s.v. Grammateis 1757, and L. Robert, *Hellenica* 5, p. 6.

Orchomenos

The earliest reference to eponymity in Orchomenos appears in the *synoikia* between that city and Euaemon in the years between 360 and 350 BC: lines 9-10 of *IG V 2*, 343 mention τῶν δε ἐπὶ [X]αιριάδι, which would seem to mean ‘of the (colonists) in the year of Chairadas.’³⁶ A century later we learn from a series of proxenia decrees that the eponymous office is a college of *thearoi* headed by their president.³⁷ No. 1 (p. 451) is dated at the end by ἐπὶ Σίμο[ι] σὺν θεαροῖς. προ[σ]τάτας --- τᾶς] ἀλιαίας Νικασίλαος. γρα[μ]ματεὺς ---]τος. 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 δαμ[ιο]ργῶι (?) ---] θεαρῶι ’Ε[---], 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.³⁸ 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 *prostatas* in the nominative. No. 5 (p. 461) is dated ἐπ’ Ἀρχιφάει σὺν ἄρχουσιν. προστάτας ἀλιαίας Θρασωνίδας. χερσκόπος Μίναιχμος. γραμματεὺς 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 Εὐλύτοι σὺν θεαροῖς, μὴνὸς 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 *prostatas* 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 δαμιοργῶι ’Ε[---]τόσωι. προστάτας βουλᾶς. The substitution of *boulas* 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 ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ Θηριλάου τοῦ Ἡρώιδα κατεσκευάθη τὰ ἀγάλματα, and ends with the artist’s signature. A coin from Pheneus is inscribed ἐπὶ ἱερέος Ἑρμαξίου (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. Duašanić in *BCH* 102 (1978) 341-42.

³⁷ A. Plassart and G. Blum in *BCH* 38 (1914) 447-78.

³⁸ Cf. R. Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes* (Paris 1937) 240.

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 Σωστράτῳ ἱερεὶ ἔδοξε τῷ δάμῳ 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* (Jeffery, *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

³⁹ *Damiurgen, Zur Entwicklung einer Magistratur* (Diss. Heidelberg 1977) 5.

in the Nine. I am sceptical as is also M. Wörle⁴⁰. 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 Tyliisos about the middle of the fifth century in which Argos played a part: *SIG*³ 56; *I. Cret.* I, VIII 4*; Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 42. At the end we find (43ff.) *ἡ στάλα ἔσστα ἐπὶ Μελάντα βασιλέος*. 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 (*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 *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 Schwyzer, *GDE* 90 a decree which begins with Ἀλεξάνδρου Σικυωνίου. ἐπὶ γροφέος τῆι βουλῆι Θιοδέκτα, τοῖς δὲ στραταγοῖς Δαμέα, ἀλιαῖαι ἔ[δοξε] τελείαι followed by the day of the month. On the other hand, no. 93 begins with ἐπὶ γραμματέος τῶν συνέδρων 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, *IG* IV 839 (*SIG*³ 259) of the fourth century and 841 (*SIG*³ 993) of the third century, make it probable that Calauria had an eponymous *tamias* in the early Hellenistic Age. The first begins as follows: Σιφνίοις ἀτέλεια ἐγ Καλαυρέαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. ἐπὶ Θεοφείδεος ταμία ἔδοξε τῆι πόλι τῆι Καλαυρεατῶν 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 ταμία Σωφάνεος τοῦ Πολι[---, μη]νὸς Γεραιστίου, ἔδοξε τοῖς πολί[ταις περὶ τ]οῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ τοῦ χωρίου οὗ ἀνέθη[καν 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.

⁴⁰ *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.⁴¹ 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 γρα[μματεὺς?---, ἐπειδ]ῆ ὁ Πυθο[--], and no. 8 has preserved [ἐπὶ γρ]αμμα[τέος --, ἐπειδῆ?] Θιόδο[τος --].⁴²

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. [ἐπ]ὶ γραμματιστῶ Εὐθέα· [Γ]αμιλίου (μηνός)· ἔδοξε τῶι ἐκκλησί[α]ι, 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 γραμματιστάς 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 = ἐπ' ἰαρέος Ἀρχελάιδα, 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 στραταγ[οῦ τῶν] Ἀχαιῶν Αἰγιαλεῦς, ἐν δ' Ἐπιδαύρῳ ἐπ' ἰαρεῦς τοῦ Ἀσκληπιο[ῦ Δι]ονυσίου, κατὰ τάδε ἔκριναν τοὶ 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?'): Φραηιαρίδας Μυκανέαθεν παρ Ἀθαναίας ἐς πόλιος ἰκέτας ἔγεντο ἐπ' Ἀντία καὶ Πυρφία. εἶεν δὲ Ἀντίας καὶ Κίθιος καΐσχροῶν. Antias 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, *Damiorgen* 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 ἄρχε[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[των ?]. 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 [ἐπὶ --- ἄ]ρχοντος ὅστε θύειν τῶι Ἀπόλλ[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-

⁴³ Important accounts and criticism of this ancient tradition are those of G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia* II (Gotha² 1895) 124ff. with the citation of the sources; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* II (Berlin 1893) 124-44, and in *Hermes* 33 (1899) 119-29; A. Ledl, *Studien zur älteren athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1914) 107-272; C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 33-46. An excellent survey is that of F. Jacoby in *Klio* 2 (1902) 406-39. The fundamental work on the Atthidographers is that of F. Jacoby, *Atthis, The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford 1949).

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 (*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 (*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, *Proclus* 36).⁴⁴

(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: *IG I³* no. 4, the so-called Hekatompedon inscription (A-B) of 485/4 BC. Lines 14-15 of A record: τ[αῦτα δὲ ἔδοχσεν τῷ δέμο]ι ἐπὶ Φ[ιλοκρ]ά[τ]ος ἄρχ[οντ]ος, and in lines 26-27 of B we find ταῦτ'

⁴⁴ The fundamental modern list of Athenian eponymous archons from 682/1 to 403/2 BC is that by Hiller von Gaertringen in *IG I²* pp. 267-301, which includes rather full citation of the evidence. T.J. Cadoux, 'The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hysichides' in *JHS* 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 *IG II²* Pars Quarta (Berlin 1918). However, for the period after 302 BC one must consult W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) as well as his *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York 1939) and then B.D. Meritt and W.K. Pritchett, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940). Further details have been added by others, but notably by Meritt himself in *Historia* 25 (1977) 161ff. and by Chr. Habicht, *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: *Chronologie des archontes athéniens* (Brussels 1922); *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo 1927); *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 *IG II²*, 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 *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 *Athènes au II^e et au III^e 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 *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, *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 *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 237-47.

ἔδοχσεν τῷ δέ[μοι ἐ]πὶ Φ[ιλοκράτος ἄρχοντ]ος. 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 ἐπὶ Κωμέου ἄρχοντος 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 Eggesta (458/7 BC ?): after the heading appears the prescript in mutilated form, including the enactment formula, the prytanising tribe, the secretary (restored), and then [---]οῦ ἔρχε, followed by the name of the proposer. The old style ἔρχε is much more common than the ἐπί 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 412/1; 99 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 Ἀλεξίῳς ἠρχεν] 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 II² 1706-1736* are of no value, for they date from 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

⁴⁶ A.S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Leiden 1977) 23, and cf. his article in *Chiron* 9 (1979) 23-30 on ‘Archon-dating in Fifth Century Attic Decrees: the 421 Rule’.

⁴⁷ The value of the archon list has been well stated by Jacoby, *Atthis* 197: ‘The fundamental importance of that list for Atthidography 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 Atthidographers 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 II² 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 II² 1140-41, 1155-56 [SIG³ 957], 1157, 1163, and SEG XXIII 78*), and similarly the phratries (*IG II² 1237 [SIG³ 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.⁴⁹ 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 conjunction 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 Chalcis 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 Chersonese, 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).⁵⁰

(h) The Hoplite General

The college of ten *strategoï*, 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.⁵¹ 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 useful book of H. Swoboda, *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse* (Leipzig 1890) 39ff.

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 ---]ου ἄρχοντος· στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλίτας Μνασ[έου τοῦ] Μνασ[έου Βερε]νικίδου. Little more than a generation later we hear the last of the other *strategoí* (*IG II² 1040-1042*, the last one of 41/0 BC).⁵² 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 eponymity. Some modern scholars have suggested that he was indeed eponymous, but Oliver and Geagan have rightly rejected such a view.⁵³ 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 βουλή καὶ ἡ βουλή τῶν φ' κ]αὶ ὁ δῆμος [ὁ] Ἀθηναίων τὸν [ἐ]πὶ [τ]οὺς ὀπλίτας στρατη[γ]ὸν καὶ γυμνασίαρχον κ[αὶ] ἄρξαντα τὴν ἐπώνυμον [ἀ]ρχὴν καὶ ἱερέα Νίκη[ς] τῆ[ς] ἐξ ἀ]κροπό[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 τε ἐπώνυμον καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλῶν, i.e. eponymous archon and hoplite general. Here again a distinction is made concerning eponymity. 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 eponymity and emphasized that there was only *one* such office, that of the eponymous archon.⁵⁴

ments and reference of P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 678-79.

⁵² Cf. D.J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla* (Princeton 1967) 20.

⁵³ See Geagan, *op. cit.* (see n. 52), 24. Geagan then proceeds to give excellent reasons why the name of the hoplite general appears so prominently in state documents without being eponymous, reasons that lay at the very heart of distinguishing false from state eponyms. As he puts it, prior to his full discussion of the point: 'It is much more probable that such a citation of magistrate's or official's name in the heading of a decree or in a dedication indicates an interest in the institution either by which or for which the decree was passed or the monument erected, or it may indicate a general interest in the setting up of dedicatory monuments'.

⁵⁴ *IG II² 3173* is a case in point: [ὁ] δῆμος θεᾶι Ῥώμη καὶ Σεβασ[τ]ῶι Καίσαρι στρα[τηγ]οῦντος ἐπὶ τ[οὺς] ὀπλίτας Παμμένους τοῦ Ζήνωνος Μαραθωνίου ἱερέως θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Σεβαστοῦ Σωτήρος ἐπ' ἀκροπόλει, ἐπὶ ἱερείας Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος Μεγίστης τῆς Ἀσκληπίδου Ἀλαιέως θυγατρὸς. ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀρήου τοῦ Δωρίωνος Παιανιέως. Here only the archon is the state eponymous magistrate. The others are false. For the priestess of Athena Polias in this regard see L. Robert in *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 67-68 on false eponyms. A rather striking case of a false eponym is found in *IG II² 2496* (*SIG³ 1216*), a rental document of the fourth century BC. It begins: ἀγαθεῖ τύχει ἐπὶ Φιλίππιδου ἱερέως. Obviously the priest had

(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.⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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 Κότυος 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.⁵⁹ There appears to have been a close relationship between the Thracian royal family and Athens.⁶⁰ About a generation later another Thracian king, Rhoimetalkes III, became archon at Athens: *IG II² 1967* begins with οἱ ἐφηβεύσαντες ἐν τῷ ἐπ[ὶ] βασιλέως Ῥοιμητάλακα νε(ωτέρου) ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶι. 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.

⁵⁶ Cf. Chr. Habicht in *Chiron* 6 (1976) 127-135.

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.⁶¹ 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 (*PIR*² 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 Καρρεΐναν Γάιο[υ υἱὸν Σεκοῦνδον φιλο]καΐσαρα τὸν ἐπώνυμ[ον ἄρχοντα καὶ ἱερέα] Δρούσου [ὑπάτου] etc. And among the acts of foreign cities published in the Asklepieion in Epidaurus is a series of decrees (*IG* IV² 83 and 84 [*SIG*³ 796]) carrying the date ἐπὶ Σεκούνδου ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου followed by the month and the formula of decree.⁶² 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 [ἐ]πὶ Κο. Βειβίου Κρίσπου Μα[ραθωνίου ἄρχοντος], 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 speculation about the Athenian motivation in making him archon see Day, *op.cit.* (see n. 57), 179-80, and Graindor, *Tibère à Trajan* 14-16.

⁶³ The base from Athens was originally published by S.N. Koumanoudis in *Ἀρχαιολογικὰ Ἀνάλεκτα ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν* 3 (1970) 403-406, with comments by E.A. Kapetanopoulos in the same journal (6 [1973] 137-38). For the career of Vibius Crispus see A.B. Bosworth in *Athenaeum* 51 (1973) 74-78, and W. Eck in *RE* Suppl. 14, col. 852, no. 28.

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

⁶⁵ See *PIR*² 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 Epidauros, 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 Calpurnius 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 Hispanorum 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 from them because of political reality. Not many of them, however, seem to have been interested: Domitian, Hadrian, Commodus, and Gallienus.⁶⁸

the funeral monument). Quite a different archon is the individual called simply Philopappus in *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.

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

⁶⁷ For Oliver's view about his adoption of Calpurnia Arria see *AJA* 55 (1951) 347-49, and, for the tribe and personal name, *GRBS* 14 (1973) 393-95. Cf. H. Devijver, *Prosopographia Militarium Equestrum quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*, Pars Prima (Louvain 1976) 274, C 189.

⁶⁸ Domitian: Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 8.16; *IG II² 1996*; *F. Delphes* III 2.65. Hadrian: *CIL* III 550 (*ILS* 308) is his *cursus honorum* before becoming emperor, with the addition in Greek at the end honoring Hadrian as their archon; SHA, *Hadrian* 19; Dio 69.16.1; Phlegon of Tralles (*FGrHist* 257 F 36 [XXV]). For the date of his archonship (AD 112/13) see Follet, *op. cit.* (see n. 44), 28-29. Commodus: A.E. Raubitschek in *Hesperia*, Supplement 8 (1949) 282, combines a number of fragments to produce a new text and he places the Athenian archonship in AD 188/9. Gallienus: SHA, *Gallienus* 11. The date is almost certainly AD 264/5, as argued by A. von Domaszewski in *Philologus* 65 (1906) 352, and Graindor, *Chronologie* 267-68, no. 184.

(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.⁶⁹ 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, Probalinthos, Trikorynthos, and Marathon were founded by the legendary Xouthos as a collective unit called the Tetrapolis.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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.⁷² Their unity in the fourth century can be seen in an inscription found in the Marathonian plain, *IG II² 2933 (SIG³ 930)*: Τετραπολέες τῶι Διονύσῳι ἀνέθεσαν. Λυσανίας Καλλίου Τρικορύσιος ἦρχεν. 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 Pythion 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.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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*.⁷⁶ In this stage Boeotia was divided into eleven districts, each district furnishing the federal organization with 1,000 hoplites, 100 cavalymen, and a military commander called Boeotarch. Each dis-

⁷³ The fullest modern account of the early Confederacy is by R.J. Buck, *A History of Boeotia* (Alberta 1979) 107-20. He carries it down only to 431 BC. An account with very full discussion of the institutions within the Confederacy is the one by P. Roesch, *Thespiens et la confédération béotienne* (Paris 1965). Always useful and careful is Larsen, *Federal States*, 26-40 and 175-80. For a mass of details, the *Études béotiennes* of P. Roesch (Paris 1982) should be consulted.

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.

⁷⁶ Best edition is by V. Bartoletti, Teubner ed., Leipzig 1959, with *An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynchia,'* by I.A.F. Bruce, Cambridge 1967; for an additional fragment see L. Koenen, *Studia Papyrologica* 15 (1976) 69-79, cf. 55-66.

trict also sent 60 councillors called Bouleutai to the federal assembly. In 447 Thebes, Plataea, Orchomenos, and Thespiiai each controlled two districts, while Tanagra controlled one. Haliartus, 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, Thespiiai, 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, Thespiiai, 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* (*SIG³ 179*), a decree of 362 or 361 mentioning the archon Dioteles.⁷⁷ 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 Ὀγχηστῶνι. With the victory of Rome and the annexation of Achaëa 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 ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀκραίφωις Ἰππονίκου. 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.⁷⁸ There is, in

⁷⁷ On this proxenia decree see Roesch, *Thespias* 75-77. The first two letters of his name are restored, but [Di]ote[l]es seems to be preferred over [Thi]ote[l]es. There is a list of the federal eponymous archons in Roesch, *Thespias* 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, *Thespias* 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 polemarchs (*IG VII 27-28*). Other non-Boeotian cities that were for a time members of the Boeotian 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 about 250-245 BC begins with Δορκύλω ἄρχ[οντος] Βοιωτοῖς, ἐ[πὶ δε πόλι]ος Νι[κ]αρέ[τ]ω 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 period of Claudius begins with ἀγαθῆ τύχη. ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀκρηφίοις Διὸς Σωτήρος 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 the expenses 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 inscriptions. P. Roesch (*Études* 340-43) has compiled a list of them based on the epigraphic formulae employed. *IG VII 4172* from Anthedon is such a catalogue and has been placed by Roesch

rétablissement du Koinon vers 140, a-t-on estimé qu'il faisait double emploi avec les béotarques dans la nouvelle Confédération. Dans ces conditions, il n'y avait aucune raison de la rétablir.'

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: Κτεισίαο ἄρχοντος Βοιωτοῖς, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλι[ος Ἑσχ]ρίωνος, πελτοφόρη ἀπε[γ]ράψαν[θο], 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 στεφαν[ηφόρων] ἀναγραφὴ δευτέρα. 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 (*SIG*³ 1207), is very specific: ἄρχοντος ἐγ Χαίρωνεῖαι Ἀρίστωνος, μηνὸς Ἀγριωνίου πεντεκαίδεκάτη, 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 [ἄρχοντ]ος Ἑλπί[νου τοῦ] Ζωίλου 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. Μελαντίχῳ ἄρχοντος τοὶ ἀπεγράψαντο ἐν ὀπίτασ, πολεμαρχιόντων, 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 ἄρχ[ο]ντος [Ἐμ]πεδιώνδα[ο], 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 ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Νικοδήμου, ἐπιμε[λη]τοῦ δ' ἐν Ἀλιάρτ(ωι) Ἀ[νταγόρου] τοῦ Ἀντ(α)γόρο(υ) Ὅτ[ρ]υνέ[ως], 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 introduced by a regular formula, e.g. no. 2811: Θιός. Φιλοξένω ἄρχοντος Βοιωτοῖς, ἐπὶ πόλιος δὲ Ἀριστογίτονος, πολεμαρχιόντων, followed by three names, then the name of the secretary and then τυὶ 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 (*SIG*³ 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 catalogue of twenty-year-old men: Χαροπίνω ἄρχοντος Βοιωτοῖς, Λεβαδει[ή]οις δὲ Κα[φισ]ότιος, Φικατιφέτιες 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 title in full: ὁ ἐπώνυμος ἄρχων καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης τῶν Σεβαστῶν Αὐρήλιος [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 catalogue of the third to the second century (220-210 BC?) from Thespieae: Χαροπίνω ἄρχοντος ἐν Ὀγγειστοῖ, 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

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: Φιλοκώμω ἄρχοντος Βοιωτοῖς, Ἐρχομε[νί]οις δὲ Θιογενειτίδαο, 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 (*SIG³* 994): Δαμοτ[θ]ίδαο ἄρχοντος, ἰαρεῖ-ἀδδοντος Ἀντιχαρίδαο Ἀ[θ]ανοδώρω, ἃ πόλις Διὶ Μειλί[χ]υ, 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 Amphiaraus, 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.⁸⁰ 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 eponymy in the proxenia decrees will illuminate the fact.

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

⁸⁰ See J. Wiesner in *RE* s.v. Oropos, cols. 1171-74; L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11-12, 195ff.; Roesch, *Thespies* 174-75.

239, 240, 245, 247, 251, 253, 256, 276, 289, 291-293, 300, 302, 304, 308, 378, 388⁸¹, *SEG* XXIV 344.

2. Federal archon and archon of Oropus and priest of Amphiaraus, e.g. *IG* VII 246: ἄρχοντος ἐγ κοινῷ Βοιωτῶν Ἀπολλοδώρου, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλεως Παυσανίου, ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου Γλαύκωνος, 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, Λύσανδρος Μειλίχου Ὠρώπ[ιος ἔλεξεν· ἐπειδεῖ] Θεόμναστος εὐνοος ἐὼν διατε[λ]ῆ τοῖ 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).

4. Priest of Amphiaraus alone, e.g. *IG* 263: ἱερέως Ἀσώπωνος, (μηνός) Ἀλαλκομενείου, Σώφιλος Δημητρίου εἶπεν, etc. Cf. nos. 265, 266, 269, 270, 274, 275, 316, 318, 333, 335, 340, 341, 355, 356, 358, 359, 362, 363, 366-367 (era of Sulla).

For a new corpus of inscriptions from Oropus and the Amphiaeion 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 formulae 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'Amphiaros.” 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: Εἰρίαιο ἄρχοντος, μεινός Δαματρίω νιομεινίη, ἐπὶ ἐψάφιδδε Γυνόπαστος Ἀμινίωνος, Ἐπιχαρίδας Φύλλιος ἔλεξε· δεδόχθη τοῖ δάμοι, πρόξενον εἶμεν καὶ εὐεργέταν τᾶς πόλιος Ταναγρῆων 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. (Schwyzer, *DGE* 462) published a decree which promulgated a sacred law of the period 230-220

⁸¹ B. Leonardos in *Archaiologike Ephemeris* for 1925-1926, p. 19 no. 133.

BC. It is dated by a man who was archon for the third time: Καφισίαο ἄρχοντος τῷ τρίτῳ. Cf. Roesch, *Études* 386-88.

Thebes

An inscription on a bronze phiale dedicated by lekto< Yhba>oi 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 Schwyzer (*DGE* 440 no. 11) and Jeffery (*LSAG* p. 92 no. 7, Plate 8): *ἡιαρὸν τῷ Καρυκεῖφιου Φλόφακος ἀπάρχοντος λεκτοῖς} Θεβαῖοις} ἀνέθεαν*. 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, ἱαρείαδδόντων Σαμίαο Ἴσμενικέταο, Φοξίνω Ἄθανοδώρω, Καβιριαρχιόντων*, followed by three names, and then *γραμματίδδοντος Καφισοδώρω Ἄκαστίδαο, ἐπάνθετα* 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 ἰπάρχου Πομπίδ[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 ἔδοξε τοῖ δάμοι πρόξενον εἶμεν 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.

Thespieae

The earliest example of the eponymous archon of Thespieae 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. Feyerl and N. Platon in *BCH* 62 (1938) 149-66 (*SEG XXIV 361*). It begins with a short heading: *θεός. τύχα. ἡιερά χρέματα Θεσπιέων Διοπειθέος ἄρχοντος ἐν ἡεραίῳι*, 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 Thespieae, 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, Diopeithes is the eponymous archon of Thespieae. Numerous proxenia decrees of the third century are also dated by the eponymous archon of Thespieae: *IG VII 1721-1732*, N.G. Pappadakis in

Archaiologikon Deltion 8 (1932) 204ff. nos. 1-8 (*SEG* III 343-350), and Roesch, *Études* 307-8 (*SEG* XXXII 496). 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 Thespieae. Military catalogues from Thespieae 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 Thespieae for two consecutive years was published by A. Keramopoulos in *Archaiologikon Deltion* for 1931-32, pp. 12-40, and re-edited by Roesch, *Thespieae* 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 ἐπώ[νυμον ἄρχοντα] Φλ(άουιον) Ἀρχέλα[ρον ---], 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)

State University of New York
at Buffalo

Robert K. Sherk