

J. B. SCHOLTEN

THE DATE OF THE DELPHIC ARCHON EUDOCUS II

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 289–291

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

The Date of the Delphic Archon Eudocus II

Magisterial chronologies have long been a source of debate among students of third century B.C. Greek history, and none more so than the list of the eponymous Delphic archons. The correct ordering of these magistrates is crucial to the proper interpretation of the information contained in contemporary Amphictyonic documents, particularly with regard to the chronology of the Aetolian League's expansion in central Greece.¹ Unfortunately, no unambiguous evidence (such as an ancient literary or epigraphic catalogue) exists to assist such an ordering. Consequently, a series of more indirect criteria must be employed.

The sequence obtained by these methods seems the most secure for the mid-to-late 270s (R. Flacelière, *BCH* 52 [1928] 184f.), but even for these years there remains some room for doubt. Most scholars assign the archon Eudocus II to the year 272/1.² This placement, however, is based upon two assumptions: first, that Eudocus' direct successor in office was Straton; and second, that Straton was archon in the pre-Pythian year 271/0.³ Since neither of these assumptions can be verified, the allocation of Eudocus II to 272/1 remains a conjecture. Further information from the Delphic epigraphic corpus, however, suggests that this conjecture is a good one.

Among the more important documents used in the current placement of Eudocus are a decree of the Amphictyonic council dating from his year honoring the Cnidian Socrates son of Telesias and the Elean Alexeinedes son of Philonidus for services rendered, and separate decrees of the Delphic δῆμος dating from the archonship of Straton, adding the city's honors to those of the Amphictyonic council.⁴ These inscriptions are usually cited simply for the chronologi-

¹ For the importance of documents of the Delphic Amphictyony in charting the course of the expansion of the Aetolian League in central Greece during the third century B.C., see K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (Berlin² 1925-1927), IV 2,385-388; R. Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes* (Paris 1937) 125-226.

² This date was established by K.J. Beloch, *Klio* 2 (1902) 208-210 (revised version in *Gr. G.²* IV 2, 389-394); accepted by E. Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) 483; Flacelière, *loc. cit.*, 185 and *Aitoliens*, 367 and 389.

³ During Straton's fall term a certain Eudoxus of Argos pledged to provide ten ceremonial shields for the Pythia (*Syll.*³ 419, lines 5-10). Beloch, *Klio* 2 (1902) 209, argues on this basis that Straton belongs in a pre-Pythian year, since if he were from a Pythian year his fall session would be designated Πυθίοις rather than the *πυλαίαις ὀπωρινῆς* found in *Syll.*³ 419, line 1. The succession Archiadas-Eudocus-Straton is then presented and dated 273/2-272/1-271/0. Beloch's placement of Archiadas in 273/2 is accepted as proven by Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) 483. It should be noted, however, that *FD* 3.1.298 also honors an individual for a pledge to the Pythia, yet dates from the archonship of Eudocus. Is he, too, to be dated to a pre-Pythian year as a consequence?

⁴ Amphictyonic honors for Socrates and Alexeinedes: *FD* 3.3.185 (*Syll.*³ 418A). Delphi honors Socrates: *FD* 3.3.186 (*Syll.*³ 418B); Alexeinedes: *FD* 3.3.187 (*Syll.*³ 418C). Socrates and Alexeinedes were honored for reporting a Solian who was in possession of temple property.

cal evidence contained in their respective dating pre-and-postscripts. Information contained in the actual decrees themselves, however, may be equally important.

The Amphictyonic decree refers to Alexeinedes as Ἡλεῖος ἐν Αἰτωλίας οἰκῶν (*FD* 3.3.185, line 5), but the Delphians describe him as simply Ἡλεῖος (*FD* 3.3.187, line 2). How is one to explain this difference in nomenclature? The initial editor of the Amphictyonic decree noted Alexeinedes' unusual designation and attributed it to a simple change in domicile.⁵ But what caused Alexeinedes to move to Aetolia, and why had he (apparently) returned to residence in Elis by the time of the Delphic decree in the archonship of Straton? The answer to this enigma may well be found in political developments in Elis in the late 270s.

Plutarch, Justin and Pausanias all record the establishment of a tyranny at Elis in the wake of the death of Pyrrhus of Epirus in late summer or early autumn 272.⁶ Their reports indicate that a certain Aristotimus, with the support of the Macedonian monarch Antigonos II Gonatas, held power for a period of five or six months. These sources further note that during his brief reign Aristotimus sent a large number of his political opponents into exile and that, significantly, a great many of these exiles found refuge in Aetolia until the tyrant's assassination early in 271.⁷

This historical situation explains quite well the change in nomenclature for the Elean Alexeinedes found on the documents at Delphi. The Amphictyonic decree referring to Alexeinedes as an Elean living in Aetolia is from an autumnal session of the council, as historical developments would require. Moreover, the description ἐν Αἰτωλίας οἰκῶν is very similar to the designation κατοικῶν | πολιτεύων ἐν Αἰτωλίας which was used by the Aetolian league to denote an exile living in Aetolia with special political status and influence.⁸ Alexeinedes' possession of such a status, and the care taken by the Amphictyonic council to record that status, would be in keeping with the interest the Aetolians showed in supporting Aristotimus' opponents and hastening his downfall.⁹

⁵ P. Foucart, *BCH* 7 (1883) 410: "(Alexeinedes) avait quitte sa patrie pour se fixer en Etolie."

⁶ Plutarch *Mor.* 250F-253E (*De mul. vir.*); Justin 26.1.1-10; Pausanias 5.5.1 and 6.14.11. For the date of the death of Pyrrhus see Beloch, *Gr.G.*² IV 1, 577, and P. Lévêque, *Pyrrhos* (Paris 1957) 632f.

⁷ Plutarch *Mor.* 251C-D (*De mul. vir.*), who puts the number of Elean exiles in Aetolia at 800 men and 600 women. See also Justin 26.1.5-7.

⁸ For the designation οἱ κατοικέοντες | πολιτεύοντες ἐν Αἰτωλίας in official Aetolian documents, see *I.G.* ix.1², 1.4, line 18; 135 line 3; 169A line 2 and B line 3; 179 line 19; 189 line 3; 190 line 2; 192 line 10 and 12. For the technical meaning of this phrase, the special legal status, privileges and influence of its possessors, especially political exiles, see P. Funke, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur des Aitolischen Bundes* (Habilit. diss. Köln 1985) 60-62.

⁹ For the Aetolian support of the exiled opponents of Aristotimus, see Plutarch *Mor.* 251C-D (*De mul. vir.*); Justin 26.1.5-6. Note also the statue of Cylon, assassin of Aristotimus, dedicated by the Aetolian league: Pausanias 6.14.11. Flacelière, *Aitoliens* (n.1), 194 and n.2, suggests a possible connection between events in Elis and the Delphic decree for Alexeinedes in Straton's year, but fails to note the change in Alexeinedes' nomenclature and its possible chronological implications.

If these inferences with regard to Alexeinedes are accepted, then the Delphic archon Eudocus II does indeed belong in 272/1. For the Amphictyonic decree containing the unusual designation ἐν Αἰτωλίαι οἰκῶν dates from the autumn session of Eudocus' year of office, and the only autumn during which Aristotimus' opponents were in exile was that of 272. Given the Aetolian concern for the situation, one could easily imagine the league passing a grant of special status for the Elean exiles at its regular autumn electoral assembly in 272.¹⁰

Admittedly, this approach to assigning a date to Eudocus II also requires some assumptions, in particular the notion that the change in Alexeinedes' nomenclature has any significance at all. However, the rarity of such specific terminology in the other third-century Delphic and Amphictyonic honorary decrees¹¹ suggests that Alexeinedes' situation was indeed unusual, just as were the circumstances attending the rise and fall of Aristotimus. Moreover, the fact that this argument concerning the date of Eudocus II, based (primarily) on literary sources, reaches the same conclusions as earlier studies which used different, epigraphic criteria, seems the strongest possible indication (short of explicit ancient testimony) that the date traditionally proposed for Eudocus II is correct.

This corroboration of the date of Eudocus II has further ramifications. Internal evidence from other Delphic inscriptions shows that Eudocus' direct predecessors in office were Heracleidas and Archiadas.¹² Accordingly, the new argument concerning Eudocus also gives added security to the traditional placement of these two other archons in the years 274/3 and 273/2. This in turn allows further confidence in assigning a date to at least one of the Aetolian league's third-century territorial additions. For Amphictyonic documents suggest that it was between the autumn and spring sessions of Archiadas' year of office that the Aetolians gained control over the region of Aenis.¹³ This event almost certainly occurred in winter or spring 273/2 B.C.

Portland State University

J.B. Scholten

¹⁰ The Aetolians held their federal electoral assembly during the Παναϊτωλικά, their national religious festival, celebrated annually about the time of the autumnal equinox (Polybius 4.27.1 and 5.8.5; see J.A.O. Larsen, *TAPhA* 83 [1952] 1-33).

¹¹ No parallel examples are to be found among the collection of honorary decrees of the Amphictyonic council and the Delphic δῆμος from the era of Aetolian domination assembled by Flacelière, *Aitoliens* (n.1), 385-548.

¹² For the succession of the Delphic archons Heracleidas-Archiadas-Eudocus, see Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) 481-487.

¹³ This conclusion is based upon the disappearance of the two-member Aenianian delegation from Amphictyonic records between the autumnal and vernal sessions of the Amphictyonic council in Archiadas' year, and the concurrent growth of the Aetolian delegation from three to five members (compare *FD* 3.2.205 to 3.3.203). See also Beloch, *Gr. G.*² IV 2, 392-393.