

ROBERT K. SHERK

THE EONYMOUS OFFICIALS OF GREEK CITIES. MAINLAND GREECE AND THE
ADJACENT ISLANDS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 84 (1990) 231–295

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities*

Mainland Greece and the Adjacent Islands

8. CHALCIDIC PENINSULA

Geographically separated from the Greek states to the south by the kingdom of Macedonia, this peninsula was a very early area of colonization by Chalcis, Corinth, Eretria, and Andros. With such an origin and because of the opportunities afforded for communication and trade with the north its historical role before the time of Philip II was played out in the context of Athenian and Spartan events. Its vulnerable position and the consequent need for unity caused its cities to form a Chalcidic Confederacy at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Olynthus became its capital. Unlike most Greek federal states, the Chalcidians were a group of cities that united into a kind of tribal state, rather than the reverse, and then formed a federal state. After an expansion of the Confederacy into Macedonia early in the fourth century it found itself confronted by Sparta in 382 BC. Sparta besieged the city of Olynthus and the Confederacy was disbanded. With the collapse of Spartan power, however, the Confederacy was reformed. Then, in 348 BC, Olynthus fell to Philip II. All semblance of the Confederacy disappeared and its cities lost their freedom. Little is known about the Confederacy's type of government, but it is reasonable to conclude that there was a federal *boule*. No source mentions its executive officer by name and title, although there is a reference to its officials in the treaty with Philip II in 356 BC (Tod, *GHI* 158). See Larsen, *Federal States* 58-78. Coinage of the Confederacy has revealed, however, the names of many of its officials, but again with no titles.

Olynthus

An eponymous priest is used at Olynthus to date a series of deeds recording the sale of houses in the first half of the fourth century BC. The majority of them were published by D.M. Robinson in *TAPA* 59 (1928) 225-32; 62 (1931) 42-53; 65 (1934) 124-37; 69 (1938) 47-50. They have been recently evaluated by D. Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 143-69. Despite some fluctuation in the formula of sale the eponymity is clear. *TAPA* 62 (1931) p. 43 begins in the usual way: θεός· τύχη· ἱερεὺς Ἀντίδοτος Πολυκλέος, μείς Ταργηλιών, etc. In none of the deeds is the name of the divinity given for whom the priest served.

Potidaea (Cassandraia)

Potidaea was a colony founded by Corinth at the beginning of the sixth century. It was a member of the Delian League from which it revolted in 432 BC and was subsequently captured by Athens after a long siege. Athenian cleruchs occupied it for almost thirty years be-

* Continued from *ZPE* 83, 1990, 280ff..

fore it regained its independence. In 364 BC it again fell under Athenian control and two years later Athenian cleruchs were sent out a second time (Tod II 146), but then in 356 BC Philip II captured it and gave it over to the Olynthians. In 316 BC Cassander founded the new city of Cassandreia on its site and it became one of the strongest of Macedonian cities with an extensive territory. Augustus made it a Roman colony.

No evidence for eponymity appears until the end of the fourth century, when *SIG*³ 332 records the grant of land and privileges made by King Cassander to Perdikkas son of Koinos in the period 306-287 BC. It begins with a preamble: ἐφ' ἱερέως Κυδία· βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων δίδωσι Περδίκκᾳ Κοίνου etc. The priest Kydias is eponymous, almost certainly the priest of Cassander: cf. Chr. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte* (München 1970) 37, while John A. Alexander in *Ancient Macedonia I* (Thessaloniki 1970) 128 is unduly cautious. *SIG*³ 380 records honors for Androbolos son of Menis granted by the city of Naupactus in the period of King Lysimachus (286-281 BC). It begins with ἐφ' ἱερέως τοῦ Λυσιμάχου Τιμησίου, Δημητριῶνος etc., where the priest's name Timesios is followed by the name of the month Demetrian. Cf. *SEG XXIX* 600. Habicht, *op. cit.* 40, argues that the cult of Lysimachus could hardly have continued after his death, since Macedonia then fell to Antigonos Gonatas, son of his enemy Demetrius. These two inscriptions represent the only two sources to mention eponymous officials for the city.

Torone

A deed for the sale of a house at Torone attest the use of an eponymous priest, published by Maria Karamanoli-Siganidou in *Archaeologikon Deltion* 21 (1966) 152-57 (*SEG XXIV* 574) and dated by D. Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 154-55 to the middle of the fourth century: τύχη ἀγαθή· ὠνή οἰκίης· μεῖς Ἀρτεμισίων· ἱερεὺς Εὐφραντίδης Ἀριστοτίο, followed by the usual formula of sale found in the Chalcidic Peninsula. Thus, the priest is eponymous, as in all the others.

Vrastina Kalyvia (Stolos?)

Two deeds of sale from this site in the Chalcidic Peninsula also mention eponymous priests, but again without indicating the deity. See Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 155ff.

9. DORIS

This tiny inland district shared its western border with Aetolia and its eastern with Phocis. It appears only briefly on the stage of history—and then only in a minor way—when in the middle of the fifth century (457 BC) the Phocians attacked it and the Lacedaemonians sent 1500 hoplites to the rescue (Thucydides 1.107; cf. Larsen, *Federal States* 122-23). Doris, of course, had been settled by the Dorians in the course of their advance to the Peloponnese and the Lacedaemonians were aware of the relationship. The district could boast of only four cities: Kytinion, Erineos, Boion, and Pindos. As a member of the Delphic Amphictiony it had a small vote, but important enough to be the subject of a controversy resolved by a decision of a tribunal of arbitration in 161-160 BC (*SIG*³ 668 and republished by G. Daux, *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle*, Paris 1936, Appendix IX). The city of Kytinion had an eponymous archon, seen in a manumission of the second century published by J.-P. Michaud in *BCH* 93 (1969)

83 (*SEG XXV 606*): ἄρχοντος Τιμαγόρου μηνὸς Ποκίου, ἱερ[ατε]ύον[τος τῷ Σαράπει Εὐξία, ἐπὶ] τοῖσδε ἀπέδοτο etc. As usual in manumissions, the priest is mentioned only because of his involvement in the ceremony. The eponymous archon is known in other cities of Doris as well, particularly in Erineos: *SGDI 2286* (Delphi) begins with ἄρχοντος ἐμὲν Ἐρινεῶ Κλέωνος τοῦ Σωσάνδρου μηνὸς Λαφρίου, ἐν Δελφοῖς δὲ ἄρχοντος Ξενοκρίτου μηνὸς Θεουξενίου, followed by the terms of manumission. Similar examples of the eponymous archon of Erineos are found in *SGDI 2149,2172*; *F. Delphes III 3,5* and *37*. An interesting alternative is in *SGDI 2030* (Delphi): ἄρχοντος Ἐμμενίδα τοῦ Καλλία μηνὸς Βοαθίου, ἐν δὲ Ἐρινεῶ δωριαρχέοντος Φιλοκράτεος τοῦ Καλλικράτεος μηνὸς Ἀρχοστασίου, ἀπέδοτο, etc. Cf. *F. Delphes III 1,37*. And the eponymous archon is also easily restored in another manumission, this one from Boion, *F. Delphes III 1,320*: [ἄρχοντο]ς ἐμ Βόαις [--] etc. All of these texts belong to the second century.

10. ELIS

The wide, fertile coastal plain of Elis and its favorable climate made it an ideal agricultural country, factors that tended to keep the small communities apart and slow the development of city life. Strabo says (8.3.2) that it was only after the Persian wars that the city of Elis emerged out of the cluster of towns (*demoi*, as he calls them) in the area, although those towns had felt a kind of unity long before that period, Elis, early in the sixth century, had already pushed its control outward from those towns to overwhelm Pisatis in the south and to include the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus by about 570 BC. The city itself developed democratic institutions that were usually in the hands of an oligarchic family of nobles. It controlled its possessions by force of arms and not by the formation of a federal state. There was no Elean Confederacy. At the end of the Peloponnesian War Elis suffered a defeat by Sparta and was forced to become its ally (about 399 BC). After Leuctra she recovered her independence, established a democratic constitution, and joined the opposition to Sparta. Soon afterwards, but at an unknown date, the oligarchic party put pressure on the democrats in power and the result was a revolution that ousted the oligarchs. After a short time, however, the democrats passed a law of reconciliation with the oligarchs which permitted the noble families to return from exile with amnesty. An epigraphic copy of this act has survived in Olympia, first published by E. Szanto in *Jahreshefte 1* (1898) 197ff. and subsequently reprinted in Schwyzer (*DGE 424*) and C.D. Buck, *Greek Dialects*² (no. 65).¹ In lines 6-7 reference is made to events prior to the passage of the law and they are dated as followed: ὅσσα καὶ ὕσταριν γένωνται τῶν περὶ Πύρρωνα δαμιουργῶν, 'as far as concerns those events that took place later than the *damiorgoi* under Pyrrhon'. This is a clear reference to a board of *damiorgoi* under the leadership of Pyrrhon, the eponymous *damiorgos*. See also the proxenia decree of the fourth century published by E. Kunze in the *V. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia 1941/2 und 1952*, 157-60 (*SEG XV 241*): θεοτιμίδην τὸν Εὐδήμο Μενδαῖον πρόξενον ἐπόησαν τοὶ φαλεῖοι, δαμιοργεόντων Καρανο, Φρυνίσκου, προστάται + three names and the remains of more. Here the board consists of two *damiorgoi*, the first of whom

¹ Szanto dated it about 335 BC; Swoboda (in *RE s.v. Elis*, col. 2406) about 350 BC; and S. Dušanac (in *Recueil travaux Fac. Philosophie Belgrade 11* [1970] 49-60) in the period 371-366 BC. Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin 1971 no. 328*, and Chrissoula, *Damiurgen 32 n. 97*.

appears to be the leader or president and, thus, the eponym. One last piece of evidence is a bronze plaque from Olympia about the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century. The text in *I. Olympia* 17 is as follows: ἐνίκασαν ἐπὶ [---]να, δαμιοργῶν [---] etc. Cf. *SGDI* 1170. Jeffery (*LSAG* p. 59) prints and restores differently, without any punctuation or accents: ενικασαν επι [τῶν περι ---]να δαμιοργον[τῶν ---] etc. Chrissoula (31 n. 94) would omit the comma after [---] να in any event, thus making the person into what she calls a true eponym. From Makistos comes a citizenship decree of 399-369 BC which clearly shows a certain Daimachos as the eponymous *damiorgos* (*SEG XXXV* 389, line 8). I have found no examples from the Roman period.

11. EPIRUS

Because of the complex nature of Epirote political evolution as well as the slow development of city institutions in the countryside it seems more appropriate to examine the Epirote eponymous magistrates within the framework of the tribal organizations rather than city by city. Our earliest information about tribal unity can be seen in the description of Thucydides (2.80.1-6) concerning the action of the Ambrakiots and the Chaonians in enlisting the aid of Sparta in 429 BC to attack Acarnania. Thucydides tells us that the Chaonians had no king at that time but were led by two annually elected (or appointed) *prostatai* from the ruling clan, that the Thesprotians also had no king, and that the Molossians were led by the guardian of their king, who was too young to rule by himself. Thus, a political evolution from tribal kings to annual magistrates by the beginning of the Peloponnesian War was well on its way in Epirus. The third great tribal power, the Molossians, still retained their king and will continue to do so until about 232 BC. By the early decades of the fourth century the Molossians had gained great power and importance, so much in fact that a Molossian state existed that conferred citizenship on foreigners and whose officials below the king included a *prostates* and ten *damiorgoi*, one *damiorgos* from each of the ten neighboring tribes that belonged to it. This information is contained in two inscriptions from Dodona, first published by D.E. Evangelides in the *Archaiologike Ephemeris* for 1956, p. 1 (*SEG XV* 384), and reprinted by N.G. L. Hammond, *Epirus*, Oxford 1967, 525-26. They are decrees granting citizenship to two women in the same year, sometime between 370 and 368 BC. The first one (to line 10): ἀγαθᾶ τύχα· βασιλεύοντος Νεοπτολέμου τοῦ Ἀλκέτα Φιλίστα τᾶ Ἀντιμάχου γυναικὶ ἐξ Ἀρρώνου ἐδόθη πολιτεία, αὐτὰ καὶ ἐκγόνοις, ἐπὶ προστάτα Μολοσσῶν Εἰδύμμα Ἀρκτᾶνος, γραμματέος Ἀμφικορίου Ἀρκτᾶνος, δαμιοργῶν followed by the names of ten men with the names of their tribes in almost all cases. The *prostates* of the Molossian state is eponymous, and Hammond believes he was appointed to restrict the power of the king, citing Aristotle (*Politics* 1313a20). Other tribes also used the *prostates* as their eponymous magistrate, e.g. in a manumission of the Thesprotai, middle of the fourth century, *SEG XXVI* 717: ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι· ἐπὶ προ[σ]τάτα θεσπρωτῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἱερέος δὲ Φυσταίου, μηνὸς Γαμιλίου, etc. Also, in a manumission from Buthrotus of the Hellenistic Age, published by L.M. Ugolini, *Albania Antica* III (Rome 1942) 115, and interpreted by J. and L. Robert (*Bulletin* 1948, no. 98): προστατοῦντος Χαόνων Βοίσκου Μεσσανέου, ἱερεύοντος δὲ τοῖ Ἀσκληπιοῖ Νικάδα Καρτωνοῦ, μηνὸς Ἀγριανίου etc. In both of these I believe the priest is a false eponym, his presence due to the procedure of manumission,

although, of course, his name in each of them also serves to date the document. For a *prostates* of the Pergamioi see the decree published by D.E. Evangelides in *Epeirotika Chronika* 1935, 260ff., and republished by L. Robert, *Hellenica* 1.95 (*SEG* XV 411), dated sometime after 264 BC and found in a place near Iannina: προστατέ[οντος Μολο]σσ[ῶν [Λεον ?]τίου Κυεστο[ῦ, Ἀτεράργω]ν δὲ [Ἀναξάν]δρου τοῦ Ἀμύντα . . . λ. αίου [παρα]γενομένων παρὰ τῶν Περγαμί[ων, ἐπὶ] προστατά Νικάνδρου τοῦ Θευ[δότη] followed by the names of the envoys from the Pergamioi. Robert believes Nikandros was one of the envoys, however, and prefers παρὰ Περγαμί[ων τοῦ] προστατά Νικάνδρου etc.

Sometime between 331 and 325 BC a change took place in the Epirote distribution of power: the Molossian state became part of a larger organization which Hammond (p. 537) rightly calls the Epirote Alliance. The new arrangement can be seen in Diodorus (19.36.2-4) in 317 and in an inscription dated between 317 and 297 BC, *SGDI* 1336 (cf. Hammond 559-60 for the date): θεὸς τύχ[α· Κ]λεωμάχῳ Ἀτιντᾶνι οἱ σύμμαχοι τῶν Ἀπειρωτᾶν ἔδωκαν ἐν Ἀπείρῳ ἀτέλειαν ἐπὶ βασιλέος Νεοπολέμου Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπὶ προστα(τα) Δέρκα Μολοσσῶν καὶ ἐντέλειαν. Another inscription (*SGDI* 1339) shows that the Alliance made decisions in its name, a point confirmed by Diodorus (19.36.3). In this period of the Alliance the old ten *damiorgoi* of the Molossian state were replaced by ten *hieromnemes*, and the Molossian *prostates* is still eponymous. Then, with the death of the Molossian king about 232 BC the Alliance was transformed into a new organization, the Epirote Confederacy, in which the individual members had a common citizenship and were known collectively as 'the Epirotes' (Polybius 20.3.1 and in many inscriptions). The Confederacy issued decrees, granted citizenship, and had an eponymous *strategos* as its leader, as we learn from *SGDI* 1338-1339, which date from soon after 232 BC and the years prior to 167 BC respectively (Hammond 648). The new eponymous *strategos* replaces the Molossian king of the past, but the Molossian *prostates* lives on as eponymous. Cf *SGDI* 1350 in which we find double dating by the Confederacy's *strategos* and the Molossian *prostates*: ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι. Στραταγοῦντος Ἀπειρωτᾶν Λυσανία Καρώπου προσστατεύοντος Μολοσσῶν Ἐχελάου Παρόρου etc., in a text of manumission. The Confederacy met in Dodona, Phoenike, and Gitana in rotation. Strongly centralized like the Hellenistic confederacies, the tribal *koina* of the Epirotes sent their representatives to a synhedrion. Hammond (654) emphasizes that the 'tribal *koina* were the living units' which formed the Confederacy. Thus, tribes and not cities were the sinews of its organization. Occasionally, we hear of tribal *strategoï* as distinct from the federal, as in an inscription from Buthrotus and published by Ugolini (*op. cit.* 117, cf Hammond 655 and J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1982, no. 200): ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι. Στραταγοῦντος τῶμ Πρασαίβων Λυκόφρονος Ο. . ατα, προσστατοῦντος δὲ Ἀριστομάχου Αἰξωνίου, etc., a third century manumission.

There is also evidence of an eponymous *prytanis* in Epirus. An inscription has been found at Cassope, in a building that is probably the Prytaneion, *SEG* XV 383, of the second century probably prior to 167 BC: στραταγοὶ οἱ ἐπὶ Ἀνδρομένεος πρυτάνιος, etc. It is a dedication by four stratagoi and their secretary, and clearly the *prytanis* is a local eponymous magistrate. Another *prytanis* is known from *IG* V 1, 28 which mentions the *prytanis* of the city of Byllis along the Aoos River, but not in an eponymous context. A grant of citizenship at Nikaia from about 200 BC is dated by an eponymous *prytanis* who just might be the pryta-

nis of the koinon of the Bylliones (*SEG XXXV 695*), and there is another in the area of the Amantes (J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1973 no. 261).

The second century brought the Romans, and then Pydna produced political changes. In this age the Epirote Confederacy was still a working organization, although a split divided its members in their loyalties about 170 BC. Some, like the Molossians, took the side of Perseus, while others supported the Romans. Apparently the Confederacy survived until 146 BC. A very important treaty survives from this period after Pydna. It was published by P. Cabanes and J. Andréou in *BCH* 109 (1985) 499-544 (*SEG XXXV 665*) and concerns the frontiers between Ambrakia and Charadros about 160 BC. It begins with a heading: [ἐ]πὶ γραμ[ματιστ]ᾶ Διοφάνεος τοῦ Δαιμάχου, ἐν δὲ Χαράδροι πολιταρχοῦντος Μενάν[δρου τ]οῦ Μη[τροφάνεος, μη]νὸς ὡς ἐκάτεροι ἄγοντι Φοινικαίου, etc. Thus, at Ambrakia the secretary was eponymous and at Charadros the politarch. At Buthrotus two manumission records of about 150 BC show that the *strategos* of the koinon of the Prassaioi, the *prostates*, and the priest of Asklepios were eponymous: F. Drini in *Iliria* 1984, 2, 99-100 (*SEG XXXV 666*).

12. EUBOEA

Both Herodotus and Thucydides speak of the Euboeans in the fifth century as if they formed some kind of a political community, as if they spoke with a single voice. And Strabo (10.1.12) says that the Euboean cities for the most part had a harmonious arrangement with each other, even to the extent that they agreed to follow rules of conduct in their wars with each other. They are thought by many modern historians and numismatists to have formed a Euboean Confederacy in or very soon after 411 BC when Euboea revolted from Athens (Thucydides 8.95).²

Thucydides adds that the Peloponnesians persuaded Euboea to revolt and that the Peloponnesians then organized other matters on the island. That remark and the nature of Euboean coinage after 411 BC were sufficient for Wallace and others to postulate the existence of the Confederacy from that point onward. However, there is no literary or epigraphic evidence to support that position until the Hellenistic Age, and Larsen (*Federal States* 97-103) repeatedly stresses the lack of direct evidence for that early period. The numismatic evidence consists of a very large number of coins minted either at Chalcis or Eretria showing a cow or heifer and a legend EVB beginning soon after 411 BC. Larsen (p. 101) feels that does not of necessity mean that those are coins minted by a Euboean federal state, but that they could just as easily indicate a Euboean alliance of cities. He believes a Euboean federal state did not begin until about 341 BC at the earliest. Thus, the Euboean Confederacy is a shadowy creature and solid evidence of its existence appears first in an inscription that seems to date from very early in the third century: *IG XII 9,207*, which outlines a Euboean law about the Dionysiac Artists in the era of Demetrius Poliorcetes—see Picard (n. 2), 261ff., for details. That text contains phrases such as 'according to the Euboic law' in line 20, 'contrary to the laws laid down by the Euboeans about these things' in lines 68-9, and 'according to the decrees passed by the

² Such is the opinion of W.P. Wallace (*The Euboean League and its Coinage* [New York 1956] 1ff.), while O. Picard is more cautious and puts it in the period 371-357 BC (*Chalcis et la Confédération eubéenne* (Paris 1979) 235-37).

Euboeans' in line 72. An actual decree of the Confederacy from the second century has been preserved, *IG XII 9,898*. It was found at Chalcis and in it a certain Ergotimos is made pro-xenos of the Confederacy. The dating is at the end, rather than the beginning: ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνος Ἀμεινοκλέους. This has caused some to conclude that the eponymous magistrate of the Confederacy was a *hegemon*, but other evidence—see s.v. Chalcis—shows that the *hegemon* was the eponymous magistrate of Chalcis. Most have concurred in that view and they are right.³ We have no direct evidence on the eponymous magistrate of the Euboean Confederacy. Could he have been identical with the *hegemon* of Chalcis in the second century?

Carystus

The earliest evidence for the eponymous archon of Carystus dates from the fourth century. *IG XII 9,7* is an account of the city's treasurers necessitated by a loan from Thebes and Histiaea. W.P. Wallace has re-edited the whole inscription in *Phoenix* 16 (1962) 15-28 and dated it about 370 BC or soon thereafter, i.e. soon after the Battle of Leuctra. In line 20 the date is expressed ἄρχοντος Ἀρχεστ[ράτου ---], similarly in lines 25-6, and confidently restored in 11-12. In a catalogue of the second century (*IG XII 9,8 = SIG³ 951*) one will find lists of the local magistrates beginning with ἄρχοντος Εὐαινέτου λιμενοφύλακες + seven names followed by other officials. A similar inscription (*IG XII 9,9*) begins the same way and seems to date from the first century. And *IG XII Suppl. 527 (SEG III 758)*, from the last six or seven years of the reign of Hadrian, proves the use of the Carystian eponymous archon for that age.

A peculiar situation is created by *IG XII 9,11*—formerly attributed to Athens incorrectly [*IG III 1306*]—which begins [θεοῦ Ἀ]δριανοῦ [ἄρξ]αντα τὴν στ[εφ]ανηφόρον ἐπώνυμον ἀρχήν. βουλευεῖν ἔλαχον οἱ ὑπογεγραμμένοι ἄρχ[οντι] Μοιραγένει νε(ωτέρω), followed by a long list of names arranged in small groups with each group introduced by the word *archeproboulos*. Clearly something is lost at the beginning, the word or name to which [ἄρξ]αντα refers. This text seems to show that in the reign of Hadrian there were two eponymous magistrates at Carystus, an archon and a *stephanephoros*, not impossible but very unlikely, especially because no such *stephanephoros* is otherwise known at Carystus. Since there had been doubt about the original origin of this inscription, it would not be out of place to suggest that the stone (of Pentelic marble) had been used as ballast in a merchant ship and that its true origin is unknown.

Chalcis

The earliest inscription showing the eponymous magistrate used in Chalcis belongs to the late fourth century and is a very short list of names, *IG XII 9,912* (lines 5-6): ἄρχοντος ἐν Ὀν[χηστῶι] and then the names. Onchestus, of course, is in Boeotia and consequently the text refers to the years 308-304 BC when Chalcis and Eretria were under the control of the Boeotian Confederacy.⁴ In 304 BC Demetrius Poliorcetes liberated Euboea from the Boeotians. During that brief period of time the Boeotian Confederacy had imposed its own system of city administration on both Chalcis and Eretria. Holleaux has shown, for example, that the

³ Picard (*Chalcis* 298) and P. Ducrey (*BCH* 94 [1970] 133), and cf. D. Knoepfler (*BCH* 96 [1972] 297 n. 42).

⁴ For this Boeotian episode see the brilliant paper by M. Holleaux (*Études* 1.41-73).

Boeotian polemarchs had been used in Eretria in that period. After 304 BC the city of Chalcis had a *hegemon* as its eponymous magistrate, as can be seen in *IG XII 9,900* from the second century. It contains four proxenia decrees, each one dated at the beginning with the formula ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνος + name without patronymic, and each one with clear reference to the city itself as the originator of the decree. The same kind of decree is in *IG XII 9,901* toward the end of the second century. A list of *agoranomoi* from the first century after Christ (*IG XII 9,913*) is dated by a *hegemon* of Chalcis. And a catalogue of gymnasiarchs from the age of Augustus (*IG XII 9,916*) is also dated by a *hegemon*—the phrase τῷ κοινῷ in line 20 does not refer to the Confederacy in my opinion. In the reign of Nero a coin of Chalcis shows on its reverse the phrase στρα(τηγός) Τι(βέριος) Κλαύ(διος) Εὐθυκλί(δης) Χαλ(κιδέων): Picard (*Chalcis* 126 no. 96, and Plate 22). Thus, the coin was minted by the authority of a *strategos* who almost certainly was the chief magistrate of the city at that time. The *hegemon*, however, was still the eponymous magistrate.

Eretria

The earliest example on stone of an eponymous Greek magistrate comes to us from Eretria: *IG XII 9,1273-1274*, re-published by Jeffrey (*LSAG* p. 84, Plate 5, no. 9, and text p. 402), who suggests a date about 550-525 BC. The text concerns a payment of fines and is dated in line 5: ἐπὶ Γόλο ἄρχοντος (Jeffrey) or ἐπὶ Τόλ(λ)ο ἄρχοντος; (Hiller von Gaertringen).

B. Chr. Petrakos has published (*BCH* 87 [1963] 545 = *SEG XXXIV* 898) an inscription on a square base which states that the *Aeinautai*, apparently an association of sailors at Eretria, had erected a herm ἐπὶ τῆς Τιμανδρίδου καὶ Τιμαρχίδου καὶ Σκύθεο ἀρχῆς. From the lettering he dated it to the last years of the fifth century, and A. Ritsonis (*Archaiologika Analekta ex Athenon* 17 [1984] 141-47) believes that a herm stele belongs to this base and he dates it to the last decade of the sixth century. A tentative suggestion by Petrakos that the three magistrates of the inscription might be *polemarchoi* despite the fact that they are known to have been used eponymously only in the period 308-304 BC and no other—see above, s.v. Chalcis—has been rightly rejected by J. and L. Robert (*Bulletin* 1964 no. 406). The three magistrates are almost certainly archons forming a board of three, one of whom would be eponymous. *IG XII 9, 191 A 8* from Eretria in the fourth century makes it clear that Eretria did indeed have a board of archons: [ὁ ἐν]ιαυτὸς ὁ μετὰ τὴν Ἰπποκίδου [κα]ὶ συναρχόντων [ἀρχὴν ---]. And elsewhere in Euboea it was a board of three, as in Histiaea (*SEG XXIX* 817). *Polemarchoi* were used eponymously in Chalcis and Eretria only in 308-304 BC when the Boeotian Confederacy forced them on the cities: *IG XII 9,139* and 240. The Boeotians, finding a board of (three?) archons in Eretria simply substituted their system of three *polemarchoi* for the normal Eretrian archons. After the departure of Boeotians, the normal Eretrian archons were brought back. In *IG XII 9,243* the eponymous archon is used five times in an Eretrian catalogue of various officials and epebes, of Hellenistic date. *IG XII 9,249 B 105* is also dated by an archon in a long list of names in letters of the third century. And *IG XII Suppl. 555*, a list of epebes of the third century, is dated by the archon.

Hestiaea

About 300 BC in Hestiaea the eponymous magistrate was one of the three archons who formed a board. See the inscription published by A. Sampson in *Archaiologikon Deltion* 29 (1973-1974) 489 (*SEG XXIX* 817), line 8: ἐπ' ἀρχόντων τῶν μετὰ Φιλεταίρου Ἀρχί-νου, and two more names. In 232 BC, however, the board of archons numbered six (*IG XII* 9,1187 = *SIG³* 492), and in a decree from between 232 and 220 BC the number is also six (*IG XII* 9,1186). The hierothytai of lists of contributors in *IG XII* 9,1189 and *SEG XXXIV* 909 are apparently false eponyms. One must keep in mind that in the fifth century there were Athenian klerouchoi at Hestiaea: Thucydides 1.114, Diodorus 12.22, and Plutarch, *Pericles* 23.

13. ILLYRICUM

Apollonia

Two inscriptions mention the eponymous prytanis of Apollonia. *SEG II* 361 is only a fragment: [π]ρυτανεύοντος Παρμονίσκου τοῦ Δαμάγεος, τοξάρχῶν Λύσων Ἀγεστράτου Ἀσκλαπιῶτι. The second was found at Magnesia but is a decree of the Apollonians: *I. Magnesia* 45: παρὰ Ἀπολλωνιατῶν πρυ[τ]α[νεύ]οντος Ἀριστομένοσ, Ἄλοτροπίου τρίτῃ etc. Both belong to the Hellenistic Age. It should be mentioned that in 229 BC Apollonia submitted to the protection of Rome in opposition to Queen Teuta. The eponymous prytanis may also be named on Apollonian coinage.⁵

Epidamnus

From an inscription found at Magnesia we learn of the existence of a *prytanis* at Epidamnus (*I. Magn.* 46, line 39), and Gschnitzer in *RE Suppl.* 13, 737 has suggested that he was eponymous.⁶

14. LACONIA

Larsen (*Federal States XIV-XVII*) gives good reasons for the use of the word 'confederacy' to designate only the true federal state, regardless of whether the Greek designation is *koinon*, *ethnos*, or *sympoliteia*. The true federal state is one 'in which there is a local citizenship in the smaller communities as well as a joint or federal citizenship and in which the citizens are under the jurisdiction both of federal and local authorities.' He uses 'league' for the other, looser types of organization often called *symmachia* in Greek. Thus, neither the Lacedaemonians nor the Athenians were ever leaders of a confederacy.

As a result of Spartan success against Messenia and Argos in the sixth century and then against the tyrant Hippias in Athens a series of treaties with the Peloponnesian states made Sparta the dominant power and the head of a Peloponnesian League, technically called 'the Lacedaemonians and their allies'. It existed as a vital force until the domination of Thebes, which set into motion the forces that caused the allies to withdraw their support of Sparta. By

⁵ See H. Ceka in *Studia Albanica* 1 (1964) fasc. 2, 81-94, and also J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1967 no. 348. For the numerous names of Apollonians recorded on the coinage see Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 35-37, where those in the genitive apparently are the prytaneis.

⁶ For the correctness of his view see Ceka (*loc. cit.* n. 5) and J. and L. Robert (*loc. cit.* n. 5).

365 BC the end of the Peloponnesian League was virtually complete. In the course of its history Sparta had exercised the *hegemonia* and there was no separate, standing body of officials to conduct the League's business or carry out its decisions. The administrative structure of Sparta was used. Thus, there was no separate leader of the League apart from the Spartan king and its commanders. Thus, no eponymous magistrate of the League existed.

Then, in the Hellenistic Age, a Lacedaemonian League arose. It is attested by a number of inscriptions which call it a *koinon* of the Lacedaemonians: *IG V* 1,1111 (Geronthrae) and 1226-1227 (Fanum Neptuni Taenarii). From statements by Strabo (8.366) and Pausanias (3.21.6-7) it was concluded by Chrimes (*Sparta* 435-41) that this Lacedaemonian League 'was finally constituted, with the inclusion of Sparta, in 188 BC.' (p. 439). A change was made under Augustus when Sparta was removed from the League and it was re-named the League of the Eleutherolakones, which remained in existence until at least the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In both these periods of its history there was an eponymous *strategos* at its head who is frequently mentioned in the inscriptions of perioikic towns. *IG V* 1,932 is a proxenia decree from Epidaurus Limera, and lines 11-12 mention [οἱ ἔφοροι οἱ εἰς τὸν μετὰ στρατηγὸν Ἀδά[μαντα ἐνιαυτ]ὸν πρὸ μηνὸς Λυκείου. No. 1145 from Gythium is dated about 70 BC and records a proxenia decree which is to be engraved and set up by [οἱ ἔφοροι οἱ] ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦ Βιάδα (lines 44-45). And a marble base from Gythium (no. 1161) reads Αὐτοκ[ράτορα] Νέρουαν Καί[σαρ]α Σεβαστὸν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἐλε[υ]θερολακῶνων στρατηγούντος Ἐπινεικίδα τοῦ Φιλοχαρέινου. Cf. nos. 1110 (Geronthrae), 1111 (Geronthrae), 1208 (Gythium), and *SEG XI* 922 (Gythium). These examples show that the perioikic towns of Laconia used the League's eponymous *strategos* to date their documents from 188 BC into the imperial period.

The question whether these towns also employed local eponymous officials of their own is not so easily answered. In *IG V* 1,1145, a proxenia decree from Gythium, dating is by the League *strategos* and the decree is to be written up by the ephors when a certain Biadas was *strategos*. The same Biadas is mentioned in a different passage of the same decree in a dating context merely as ἐπὶ Βιάδα. Thus, the city of Gythium can instruct the ephors to have its own decree engraved, which should mean that the ephors are those of the city and not of the League. Then, in *IG V* 1,1146 (*SIG³* 748), the famous decree of Gythium honoring the Roman Cloatii brothers about 71 BC, the same *strategos* Biadas appears without his title (lines 14-15) for the purpose of dating: ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Βιάδα δὲ ἐνιαυτῷ. The point here is that in dating its documents Gythium does not always give the title of the eponymous magistrate when it is a question of the League *strategos*, but rather omits it or includes it almost capriciously. And elsewhere in no. 1146 four other eponyms are recorded for dating purposes, but without the title of *strategos*. Surely they are all *strategoι* of the League, as Kolbe has listed them in his Index to *IG V* 1, p. 343. The same Biadas also is used eponymously in no. 965 from Cotyrta—see Chrimes (*Sparta* 436-37 n. 8) for the identification—but again without the title *strategos*.

We also find that in the perioikic towns there is a local chief of a local board of ephors. *IG V* 1,961 from Cotyrta is a proxenia decree of the city which is to be engraved and erected by οἱ ἔφοροι οἱ περὶ Παλαιστέαν, and at the end of the decree the ephors are instructed to

send a copy of it to the ephors of the Lacedaemonians. Here the preposition clearly identifies Palaisteas as the chief of the local board of ephors, and other inscriptions present further examples: nos. 962, 1241, 1294, and 1336. One would look to him as the local eponymous magistrate, but no Laconian text provides direct proof. No. 1174 from Gythium in the second century after Christ is an inscription on a marble base which includes the phrase ἐπὶ ἐφόρων followed by their names. However, the phrase here need not necessarily be a reference to date but rather to the involvement of the ephors in the erection of the monument. I have found no real evidence that the towns of Laconia made any use of local eponymous magistrates after the formation of the Lacedaemonian League in the second century BC. The League's eponymous *strategos* seems to have been sufficient for their needs.

Sparta

Although it is likely that the Spartan ephors existed since the middle of the eighth century, as ancient sources report and modern scholars have generally agreed, and although it has been suggested that it was only in the middle of the sixth century that dating by ephors began in Sparta, there is no direct evidence whatever that such a system of dating began prior to the fifth century.⁷ It may be taken for granted that whenever a system of annual eponymous officials is used by a Greek city some sort of official list would eventually be started locally, for at some point in time the social or historical usefulness of a list would arise. In the case of the Spartan ephors it is not known when a list was started, although by the second half of the fifth century it was in use. It is possible to follow Jacoby in suggesting that it was started in 556/5 BC. The Greeks themselves had pushed the list back to the eighth century. Whatever the truth, the eponymy of the ephors does not seem to have existed before the age of Chilon the ephor in the sixth century.⁸ The first Spartan ephor known by direct evidence to have been eponymous in a specific year is Ainesias, recorded by Thucydides in the famous passage (2.2) in which he fixes as accurately as he can the beginning of the Peloponnesian War: 'For fourteen years the thirty-year truce remained in effect, which took place after the capture of Euboea. Then in the fifteenth year, in the forty-eighth year of the priesthood of Chrysis in Argos and when Ainesias was ephor in Sparta, and when there were still *four* months left of the archonship of Pythodoros at Athens', etc. The date is 432/1 BC. An earlier example is found in *IG V 1*, 1228 (Jeffrey, *LSAG* p. 407 no. 53) but it cannot be fixed to a particular year: ἀν-

⁷ It was F. Jacoby in his *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin 1902) 138-42 who worked out the year 754/3 BC as the traditional year of the first Spartan ephor, and that date has been generally accepted: Busolt-Swoboda II 683; W. den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam 1954) 78-81; F. Kiechle, *Lakonien und Sparta* (München 1963) 220-32 after a painstaking examination of the sources. The date, of course, is traditional and it depends on three widely scattered fragments (Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 7.1; Eusebius, *Olympiad* 5.3; Diogenes Laertius 1.68) which once formed part of Apollodorus of Athens' great *Chronika* (*FGrHist* 244 F 335). The first ephor in this tradition was Elatos. Another dated ephor prior to the fifth century was Chilon, whose date Jacoby concluded (*Apollodors Chronik* 139 and 183-88) must have fallen in the 56th Olympiad (556-563 BC). In his *Atthis* (p. 305 n. 24) Jacoby felt that 'it was only in 556/5 B.C. that the office [of ephor] became so important as to cause dating by ephors instead of kings.' The reformer Chilon, one of the Seven Sages, is said to have increased the political power of the ephors at the expense of the two kings. Cf. V. Ehrenberg in *Neugründer des Staates* (München 1925) 5-54; Chrimes, *Sparta* 402ff.; Kiechle, *op. cit.*, 242-52.

⁸ See note 7. Among the extant Greek historians it is Xenophon in his *Hellenica* who made the greatest use of the list of Spartan eponymous ephors. A good working list of all the known examples will be found in Samuel, *Chronology* 240-41.

ἔθηκε τῷ Ποιοιδᾶ[νι] θεάρης Κλεογένε. ἔφορος Δαίοχος. ἐπάκο Ἄριο(ν), Λύον. Since the ephor Daichos is not among the eponymous ephors recorded by Xenophon in his *Hellenica* year after year from 431/0 BC to 404/3 BC, and since the archaic script suggests a date early in the fifth century, he must have held office before the War. Slightly later but still prior to the War is the stele of Damonon, *IG V 1*, 213 (Jeffrey, *LSAG* p. 407 no. 52), which is a victory-list of the athletic contests won by Damonon and his son. In four places these contests are dated by the eponymous ephors: (line 66) ὑπὸ δὲ Ἐχεμένε ἔφορον. The use of this preposition is unusual and it is repeated in lines 73-4, 81, and 90. Again, none of these four ephors figure in Xenophon's list.

We are reminded by *IG V 1*, 1564 (p. XX) that the Spartan ephorate was a board of five ephors from very early times. No. 1564 (Tod II 99) from about 403 BC is dated internally by the Spartan kings Agis and Pausanias and by the names of the five ephors. One of the five was the state or national eponym of the year, but he is not singled out. The board is also mentioned in the usual fashion by a phrase such as in *IG V 1*, 26, a decree praising ἐφόρους τοὺς περὶ Πασιτέλη.

At some point in the Hellenistic Age the chief of the Spartan ephors ceased to be eponymous. This has sometimes been associated with the constitutional changes known to have taken place under King Cleomenes III. After becoming king in 235 BC he began a series of reforms in 227 BC which seem to have included the abolition of the ephorate. To be sure, the prime source (Plutarch, *Cleom.* 10) merely says that he destroyed the powers of the ephors by abolishing their chairs, except for one which he kept for himself. After his death, the ephors return to some degree of power. However, when Pausanias says (2.9.1) that Cleomenes destroyed the power of the Gerousia and established the *patronomoi* in place of it, at least in name, he may be right in this instance, since perhaps in the second century and certainly early in the first century there is clear evidence that the chief of the board of *patronomoi* was eponymous. And he continued to be eponymous until at least the second century after Christ.⁹

The continued existence of the ephors after Cleomenes is seen in the many catalogues of *patronomoi* and/or ephors in *IG V 1*, 48-77, the majority of them from the middle of the second century BC to the second century after Christ. The earliest mention of eponymous *patronomoi* is in *IG V 1*, 48 of the first century before Christ. Others of similar date are nos. 261 and 266, and perhaps also 260, 263, and 254. Kolbe pushes some back to the second century BC in his Index to *IG V 1*, p. 342. Cf. H. Schaefer in *RE XVIII* 2296. Those so

⁹ See Chrimes, *Sparta* 19ff., whose interpretation of these events has been criticized by den Boer, *op. cit.*, 203ff. Den Boer believes that Cleomenes in fact did abolish the ephorate, while Chrimes does not. H. Michell, *Sparta* (Cambridge 1964) 327ff., believes that after the abolition of the ephorate Cleomenes 'appointed a board of magistrates named *patronomoi*', but that after his death a reaction set in, the ephors regained power, and the *patronomoi* 'had probably been deposed from office'. B. Shimron, *Late Sparta* (Buffalo 1972) 39ff., believes the ephorate was abolished under Cleomenes and that the *patronomoi* were established in their place for the purpose of implementing the reforms as a whole. For him the *patronomoi* continued in office and the ephorate was also restored after the death of Cleomenes. L.J. Piper, *Spartan Twilight* (New York 1986) 54-55, adds nothing new. For a list of the *patronomoi* see Kolbe, Index to *IG V 1*, p. 342, and Chrimes, *Sparta* 463-67 (her dates: AD 60-65 to about AD 180). Also useful is A.S. Bradford, *A Prosopography of Lacedaemonians from the Death of Alexander the Great, 323 BC, to the Sack of Sparta by Alaric, AD 396* (München 1977) 484-90. For a fresh look at these and other problems see P. Cartledge and A. Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta* (London-New York 1989).

dated by Kolbe (nos. 871-873, 875-881, 886-890, 892-893, 895, 910-912) are all Spartan tiles dated by *patronomoi*, many of which had been published by Wace in the *ABSA* for 1906 and 1907. By the letter forms of one group of them Wace suggested a date of the second or first century. Thus, there is only a possibility the *patronomoi* were eponymous in the second century, whereas we can be sure of it by the first century.

The old eponymous ephor had been the chief of a board of five, and now the eponymous *patronomos* is the chief of a board of six *patronomoi*, to which six *σύναρχοι* are added as assistants. This is illustrated nicely by *IG V* 1,48, which lists the names of the six *patronomoi* followed immediately by the names of their six *synarchoi*. The board with the eponymous *patronomos* usually stands together at the head of the lists in *IG V* 1,48-77 in the form οἱ ἔφοροι ἐπί and the name of the *patronomos*. Cf. *SEG XI* 510-518 and 579 (second century after Christ). In other lists the title *patronomos* is sometimes added after the name, but it is usually omitted.

The eponymous *patronomos* is also found in the inscriptions of a religious nature, and an interesting combination of terms occurs in no. 275 of AD 70. It is a dedication that is dated ἐπὶ Σικλείδας, πατρονομοῦντος ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἀρμονεΐκου, which means that Tiberius Claudius Harmoneikos took the place of the *patronomos* Sikleidas, probably because of the death of the latter.

In the second century after Christ there was a resurgence of interest in Lycurgus and he became a god with a special cult in Sparta. As such he was then frequently selected to act as the eponymous *patronomos*.¹⁰ From *IG V* 1,312 (lines 6-8) we learn that the god Lycurgus had been selected for the eleventh time. Cf. also nos. 45, 130, 311, 541-543, and 683. In no. 541 we find that, when Lycurgus the god held the eponymous office, a prominent Spartan acted as ἐπιμελητής in his place to care for the ordinary duties of that office: ἐπιμελητὴν τῆ[ς] θεοῦ Λυκούργου πατρονο[μίας] τὸ δ', (κ)αὶ μόνον καὶ πρῶτον τῆ [ἐαυ]τοῦ πατρονομία συνάψαν[τα] τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς θεοῦ Λυκ[ούργ]ου τὸ δ' π[ατ]ρονο[μίας]. Similar phrases are repeated in no. 542.

Among prominent Romans selected to be *patronomos* was Hadrian: *IG V* 1,32 B, line 13, and no. 1314. Other famous persons included Tiberius Claudius Atticus, father of the more famous Herodes Atticus: no. 32 A, line 13, and nos. 62,287-288. Cf. A.M. Woodward in *ABSA* 43 (1948) 257-59 for others of less prominence.

15. EAST LOCRIIS

The East Locrians—called collectively *Epiknemidioi* and *Hypoknemidioi* and later *Opuntioi*—were separated geographically from the West Locrians on the Gulf of Corinth but preserved a feeling of kinship with them that can be observed in their dispatch of colonists to Naupactus in West Locris. At that event, early in the fifth century, the East Locrians passed a law regulating the legal conditions between themselves and their colonists: *IG IX* 1,334 (*SIG*³ 47 and Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* no. 20). The document also mentions colonists sent to Naupactus from Chaleion in West Locris. It reveals the East Locrians acting as a single state and calling their colonists the Hypoknemidians. The collective terminology and the authority with

¹⁰ See A.M. Woodward in *ABSA* 14 (1907-1908) 112ff.

which the East Locrians spell out the legal conditions for their colonists, without naming the city or cities from which they came, is evidence of the existence of an East Locrian federal government, a Confederacy. Cf. Larsen, *Federal States* 48ff. The same document also mentions a federal assembly of 1000 in Opus, which was certainly the Confederacy's headquarters. There is also mention of an official called ἀρχός, but unfortunately there is doubt about whether he is an official of Naupactus or of the Confederacy. Larsen makes him the chief official of the Confederacy, but Lerat (*Les Locriens* II 120) believes he belongs to Naupactus. There is the additional difficulty that the term itself is merely general and not a specific title at all. Cf. Oldfather in *RE* XIII 1247. No extant document settles the problem.

Three centuries later, about 165 BC, an inscription, naming many cities and *koina* which had honored a certain Cassander, mentions (A 6) a *koinon* of the East Locrians. It must be a new organization formed after Pydna and the organization of Greece by Rome. It is this *koinon* which is meant in the series of proxenia decrees from Opus of the second century published in *IG* IX 1,268-277. No. 271 will serve as an example: θεός. ἄρχοντος Σωτέλεος Ὀπούντιοι καὶ Λοκροὶ οἱ μετὰ Ὀπουντίων ἔδωκαν etc. 'The Opountians and Locrians with Opountians' clearly reveals a state organization with the city of Opus in a commanding position. Oldfather in *RE* XIII 1232, places the creation of this *koinon* after 167 and before 165 C, i.e. after both East and West Locris had been totally freed from the Aetolians. Because prominent position of Opus in this new state I believe the archon mentioned in no. 271 the others is the eponymous archon of Opus. These same proxenia decrees also reveal a *demos* and a *boule* at Opus and thus a more democratic government than that of the older oligarchy of nobles.

Halai

The earliest evidence of eponymity in Halai occurs in the early years of the fifth century according to an inscription (Schwyzer, *DGE* 359) on a base dedicated by its citizens: θεαγένεος κ' Αριστομένεος καὶ Φσανῶ ἀρχόντων Χαλῆες ἀνέθεαν τ' Ἀθάναι. Here the whole board of three archons functions as eponymous. Throughout the fifth and fourth centuries the eastern tip of East Locris included both Halai and Larymna, but in the Hellenistic Age those two cities belonged to Boeotia. East Locrian independence in the fourth century deteriorated after Leuctra, when the influence of Boeotia gradually increased and finally overwhelmed the eastern cities of East Locris. Then in the third century Halai and Larymna became a permanent part of Boeotia, as we can see in a passage of Polybius (20.5) which shows Boeotian cavalry operating freely in the area around Larymna. Cf. Busolt-Swoboda II 1458; Roesch, *Études* 400; Walbank, *Commentary* III p. 70. Writing under Augustus, Strabo (9.2.13 and 9.4.2) makes both cities Boeotian. An important inscription from Halai illustrates the Boeotian connection (H. Goldman in *AJA* 19 [1915] 445-46, no. 3): ἄρχοντος Φίλωνος τῷ κοινῷ Βοιωτῶν ἐπὶ πόλιος δὲ Μικκίνα etc. Philon is the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy in 206-205 BC, and Mikkinas is the local eponymous archon of Halai. Another inscription from Halai of the same period (Goldman, *ibid.* p. 451, no. 4) uses the same formula: [ἄρχ]οντος τῷ κοινῷ Βοιωτῶν [Νί]κωνος [ἐπὶ πόλιος δὲ] Κλευομά[χ]ου etc. Nikon was eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy 208-207 BC.

In the second century after Christ the archon was still eponymous: *SEG* III 421, an ephebic list.

Opus

Although Opus in the fifth century enjoyed a very prominent position in East Locrian history as the headquarters of the East Locrian Confederacy, there is no hard evidence concerning the eponymous official of either Opus or the Confederacy in that century or the next. And in the third century Opus was subjected to the constant pressures of Boeotia, Aetolia, and Macedonia. In the second century Opus was the leader of a new East Locrian *koinon* in which the eponymous official was the archon of Opus: see above, s.v. 15. EAST LOCRIS. Early in the reign of Augustus we learn (*IG* IX 1,282) that an Opuntian named Gnaeus Calpurnius Helix was both priest of Caesar Augustus and archon of his city. The combination suggests special honor and, thus, eponymity. In the reign of either Galba or Otho a coin of Opus is stamped with the formula ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Σεραπί[ωνος] Ὀπουντίων, who is either the eponymous archon or the magistrate responsible for the minting of the coin: *BMC Central Greece* p. 10, and Head, *Historia Nummorum* p. 337.

Scarphea and Thronium.

These two cities in northern East Locris lay only a few miles apart and a border dispute between them ended with a treaty agreement about the location of the border. An epigraphic copy has been found (H. Pomtow in *Klio* 16 [1920] 170 no. 131) and its opening lines contain the dating by eponymous archons: ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι. τῶν μὲν θρονιέων ἄρχοντος Μελ[αντί]χου μηνὸς (Ἄ)φαμίου, [τῶν δ]ὲ Σκαρφέ[ων] ἄρχοντος Ἄριστο[?]ξένου, μηνὸς Ἰτωνίου τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάται, etc. The use of the plural *archontes* in the following lines applied to both cities makes it certain that both of them employed eponymous archons. The document belongs to the second century. In the case of Thronium *IG* IX 1,309 also shows the use of an eponymous archon in the Hellenistic Age.

16. WEST LOCRIS

In 426 BC the West Locrians were Athenian allies and ready to act with a united force on a military venture with the Athenians (Thucydides 3.93.3; cf. 3.101). This gives the impression of political unity among the West Locrians, and inscriptions testify to highly developed governments of a democratic nature in their cities, cities which act independently of each other. Nevertheless, there is no real evidence of any federal government in West Locris in the fifth century. In the middle of the fourth century, however, there is evidence of a West Locrian *koinon* in a decree of Physceis (*IG* IX² 1,665). Indeed, Physceis was the capital of this *koinon*. Nothing else is known of it, and it seems to have been absorbed into the Aetolian Confederacy in 270 BC or a little later, when 'la Locride Occidentale tout entière n'est plus qu' une province de l'Étolie' (Lerat, *Les Locriens* II p. 67, and cf. p. 117). During the period of Aetolian domination the eponymous *strategos* of the Aetolian Confederacy was used to date West Locrian documents, usually alongside the local eponyms of the cities. After Pydna and the Roman reorganization the West Locrian *koinon* was reconstituted, but without Naupactus, Amphissa, and Chaleion. It is only in this Roman period after Pydna that we know the name

of the koinon's eponymous magistrate, an agonothele. See Larsen, *Federal States* 48-58 for the early period and Lerat, *op. cit.* 55ff., 80-83, and 117 for the later. For the agonothele of the second century and later see G. Klaffenbach in *Sitzungsberichte Berlin* 1936, 370-79, and Lerat, *op. cit.* 117-19.

Amphissa

IG IX² 1,750 contains two proxenia decrees from the early part of the second century. The first of them consists only of the last three lines of the decree and is dated by a *boularchos* named Lysiponos, while the second is almost complete and not only mentions the archons of Amphissa (line 5) but also is dated by another *boularchos* named Antigenes (line 33). This is the only inscription from Amphissa that testifies to eponymous *boularchoi*, and since this is the period of West Locrian independence from Aetolia they are not the Aetolian *boularchoi* found in Aetolian districts. Cf. Lerat, *Les Locriens* II 67 and 121-22, and G. Klaffenbach in *Sitzungsberichte Berlin* 27 (1936) 373 n. 1, as well as above, s.v. no. 3 AETOLIA. All other documents from Amphissa are dated by the eponymous archon of the city: *IG IX² 1,752* (lines 1-2) from the second half of the second century, and 755 b (line 1) from the first century after Christ. No. 767 is worthy of mention also, since it is a tombstone dated by the eponymous archon of the city, which is in itself somewhat unusual. It dates from the second century after Christ. Finally, an inscription from Chaleion of the second century before Christ is dated by the archon not only of Chaleion but also by the archon of Amphissa: *IG IX² 1,721 C*.

Bouttos

Mentioned only in our literary sources, Bouttos was closely linked historically to Naupactus and was located in the territory of that city. Adjacent to it was a sanctuary of Asklepios, whose ruins have been discovered at the modern village of Skala to the northeast of Naupactus. Cf. Lerat, *Les Locriens* I 20-23, 76, and 191. From Naupactus and dated perhaps in 137/6 BC is *IG IX² 1,634*, a manumission with the heading [σ]τραταγέον[τος τῶ]ν Αἰτωλῶ[ν] Ἀντιόχου [Ἀν---]ου, ἐν δὲ [Ναυ]πάκτοι γραμματεύοντος θ[ε]α[ροῖς] Λύκου τοῦ Λύκου, ἐν δὲ Βουττοῖ ἀρχόντων + two names followed by the month and the formula of manumission. Thus, here at Naupactus we find public documents dated by the *strategos* of the Aetolian Confederacy, the secretary of the Naupactian *thearoi*, and the two archons of Bouttos. This number of archons is confirmed by nos. 632, 638 (6) and 639 (2), while no. 639 (3) has three archons used eponymously, and the manumissions in no. 638 (7,11-12) have only a single Bouttian eponymous archon. All of these belong to the middle of the second century. In this period, of course, Naupactus with its territory belonged to the Aetolian Confederacy.

Chaleion

IG IX² 1,721 from the second century contains a short dedication (A), a proxenia decree (B), and a manumission (C). The proxenia decree is dated by the eponymous archon of Chaleion, while the manumission is double dated by the eponymous archon of Chaleion and also of Amphissa (see above). Another decree of Chaleion, found at Delphi (*IG IX² 740* and *F*.

Delphes III 3,145) perhaps from 218/7 BC, is also dated by the archon. The decree honors a woman known also from another inscription (*SIG*³ 532).

Myania and Hypnia

The *sympoliteia* of these two towns is described in *IG IX*² 1,748. Each retains its own statehood, territory, senate, and magistrates, but common magistrates are also instituted, perhaps also a common senate. Lerat, *Les Locriens* II 87-89, dates the document in the period of the Roman siege of Amphissa by Manius Acilius, i.e. 190-189 BC. One of the magistrates in common is an ἀρχός (col. II line 22), who is to be elected alternately by Hypnia and Myania. As Bousquet indicates (*BCH* 89 [1965] 674) he is a civil administrator in charge of the executive branch of the small federal state. In col. III line 48 we see that he is also the eponymous magistrate of the joint state: τᾶς Πανκλέος ἀρχᾶς.

Naupactus

A turning point in the history of Naupactus was the victory of Philip II over Greece in 338 BC, when the Macedonian king captured it by force of arms, put its Achaean garrison to death, and turned the city over to the Aetolians. Naupactus remained Aetolian to the reign of Augustus (Strabo 9.4.7) even after it was ruled from Achaean Patrai (see Pausanias 10.38.9). Thus, we regularly find the eponymous *strategos* of the Aetolian Confederacy appearing in Naupactian public documents: e.g. *IG IX*² 1,612-617, 622, 626-627, 631, 633-635, etc. An important text for eponymity in the middle of the second century (137/6 BC?) is the manumission in *IG IX*² 1,634 (its heading is quoted above, s.v. Bouttos) with its triple dating by the *strategos*, the secretary of the *thearoi* in Naupactus, and the archons of Bouttos. The secretary of the *thearoi* is the eponymous official of Naupactus: nos. 621, 624 (a-e), 625 b, 627 b, 628, 632, 634, etc., all from the second century. For a list of the known Naupactian magistrates, including the *thearoi*, see Lerat, *Les Locriens* II 125ff.

Phaestinus

A manumission of about 168 BC is dated by a *strategos*, who must be the *strategos* of the Aetolian Confederacy. This area of West Locris had been freed from Aetolian domination a few years later, in 166 BC: Lerat, *Les Locriens* II 95ff. The change of authority is reflected in *IG IX*² 709, which contains two short manumissions (of 166/5 and the second of probably the next year), both dated by a Locrian agonothete. Lerat, *op. cit.*, sums up the situation after 166 BC: the West Locrian cities may be grouped into three parts, the first of which remained Aetolian (Makynia, Molykria, Naupactus, Bouttos, Eupalion, Oineon, Polis), the second formed part of the new West Locrian Confederacy (Oianthea, Phaestinus, Tolphon, Triteia, Myania, Physceis,) and the third of cities which maintained their independence (Amphissa and Chaleion).

Physceis

*IG IX*² 1,666 is a decree of the Physcenses from the third century: ἄρχοντος Παμφαί-δα ἔδοξε τᾷ πόλει etc. The eponymous archon is also attested in no. 677 c (137/6 BC?), 680 of the second century, and 705 (137/6 BC?). However, other inscriptions show that this

eponymous archon was probably the chief of a college of archons, since five archons are mentioned in no. 668, a proxenia decree issued soon after Pydna, while no. 683 mentions two archons of the second century, and no. 705 lists three archons among the witnesses. However, in the period of the West Locrian Confederacy, the public documents of Physceis such as proxeniae and manumissions are regularly dated by the eponymous agonothete of the Confederacy either alone as in *IG IX² 1,672 I-II* or in conjunction with the archon of Physceis as in no. 680 II. And in the period of Aetolian control such documents are dated by the *strategos* of the Actolian Confederacy, as in *IG IX² 1,671, 672 V, 673-674*. Care must be exercised to distinguish between the agonothete of the Locrian Confederacy and that of the Aetolians.

Tolphon

A single text from Tolphon, a manumission of the middle of the second century, is dated by the eponymous agonothete of the West Locrian Confederacy and by the eponymous archon of Tolphon: *IG IX² 1,715*

17. MACEDONIA

The ancient homeland of the Macedonians was Pieria, and from there they expanded gradually to the north, the west, and finally to the east. Eventually they confronted the Thracians across the Strymon River and the Greek colonies in the Chalcidic Peninsula. Macedonia remained a monarchy until the second century, and no federal state emerged for that reason. There was only the king and the army and the tribal communities. Down to the age of Philip II there is no evidence of anything resembling a 'government' in Macedonia similar to those of the southern Greeks. No eponymous official has been discovered for this early period. We hear of Macedonian *koina*, but they were merely the tribal states themselves. Later, in the Hellenistic Age, city life developed with central governments that outwardly at least had the structure of the southern Greek democratic states, and the king communicated with them, still called *koina*, through his officials. Cf. F.W. Walbank in *CAH² 7.1.227-28* and N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia III* (Oxford 1988) 484. The cities of the Chalcidic Peninsula, of course, had a different administrative history: see above, No.9.

In Macedonia, as elsewhere, a local era was used for the dating of documents and monuments. In Macedonia, however, this was complicated by the fact that not one but two eras were in use: the first was the provincial era that began in the autumn of 148 BC, and the second an Augustan era that began in the autumn of 32 BC. These dates have been confirmed by M. N. Tod in a careful re-examination of the evidence in *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson II* (St. Louis 1953) 382-96. After Pydna and the organization of Macedonia as a Roman province dating by the eras as well as by eponymous officials continues well into imperial times.

Amphipolis

Originally a Thracian town on the east bank of the Strymon River and thus commanding a strategic position, Amphipolis was colonized by the Athenians and other Greeks in 437 BC. Philip II captured it in 357 BC and, although its city government continued to function for a short time thereafter, it soon lost its freedom and became a Macedonian provincial capital of

great importance for Macedonian expansion. Its use of eponymous officials in the Hellenistic Age would seem to reflect conditions prior to the Macedonian capture. A number of leases recording the sale of houses, similar to those discovered at Olynthus, have been found at Amphipolis, and the oldest of them has been dated to the second half of the fourth century: *SEG* XXIV 583. It is dated [ἐπ]ὶ ἐπιστάτου [Κα]λλίπου, followed by the usual formula of sale. The others are of the third century and are double dated by the *epistates* and the priest of Asklepios: *SEG* XII 373 and 406, *SEG* XIII 406, *SEG* XXIV 584-85, 715, and Demitsas, *Macedonia* p. 699 no. 848. Of special importance for our purpose is *SEG* XIII 406, in which just before the names of the witnesses to the sale we find the expression ἄρχει χρόνος ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἑρμαγόρα ἐπὶ ἐπιστάτου Σπαργέως. This must mean 'the term (of the lease) begins when Hermagoras is the priest and Spargeus the *epistates*.' Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1950 no. 72 a and 1954 no. 163, as well as D. Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 166. The priesthood is that of Asklepios as expressly stated in three of the leases. Similar dating by these two officials also appears in an 'asylia' decree of Amphipolis for the sanctuary of Asklepios at Cos: R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Kl. f. Lit. u. Kunst., 1952 Nr. 1, pp. 15-77, no. 6, lines 18ff. (242 BC). Cf. A. Giovannini in Ancient Macedonia II 465ff. Chaïdo Koukouli-Chrysanthaki has published in Ancient Macedonian Studies in honor of Charles F. Edson (Thessaloniki 1981) 229-41, a marble plaque from Amphipolis that belonged to a pedestal which was part of a votive monument to Artemis Tauropolos. It is only nine lines long and mentions two politarchs. The date is the reign of Perseus, provided largely by the mention of Perseus' campaigns into Thrace. This new text shows that the politarchs, well known in Macedonia during the Roman period, actually antedated the battle of Pydna. See the discussion and bibliographies by Koukouli-Chrysanthaki and by E. Voutiras in *BCH* 110 (1986) 348-55. At some later date the number of these politarchs in Amphipolis had increased to five: see Paul Pedrizet in *BCH* 18 (1894) 419-20 no. 2, his text reprinted conveniently in *SEG* XXIV 580. There is reason to doubt their eponymity, however, since the mere fact that two of them are mentioned by name in a votive text does not necessarily mean that Amphipolis named its years after the politarchs in office. At Thessalonike, for example, the politarchs also existed as city officials, but the eponymous official was a priest. D. Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 161 n. 66, however, unhesitatingly accepts them as eponymous at Amphipolis.*

Beroia

Under the Macedonian monarchy Beroia dated its documents by the year of the reigning king, but one document of 280 or 235 appears to add an eponymous priesthood: *SEG* XII 314 (Pouilloux, *Choix* no. 38; Moretti, *ISE* 2.109). It begins with τύχηι ἀγαθῆι βασιλεύοντος Δημητρίου ἑβδόμου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους, μηνὸς Περιτίου· ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἀπολλωνίδου τοῦ Γλαυκίου and is followed by the formula for manumission. For discussion of date see R.M. Errington in *Ancient Macedonia II* (1977) 116ff. The priesthood here just might be a case of a false eponym. Caution is advised. More important is the evidence of a gymnasiarchal law from the middle of the second century published by J.M.R. Cormack in *Ancient Macedonia II* (1977) 139ff. (*SEG* XXVII 261), which begins also with the date: ἐπὶ στρατηγῶντος Ἴπποκράτου τοῦ Νικοκράτου, Ἀπελλάίου ιθ'. The absence of dat-

ing by the regnal year of Macedonia in this inscription seems to suggest a date after the end of the Macedonian monarchy in 168 BC, but that can only be a possibility since some inscriptions before 168 BC fail to include a regnal date. There is the additional point that politarchs are mentioned in the last line of this law, and C. Schuler in *Classical Philology* 55 (1960) 90ff. concluded that they were introduced into Macedonian cities by the Romans in 167 BC, a point that caused Cormack to date our law 'in the twenty years before 148 B.C.' New evidence, however, has shown that the politarchs existed in Macedonia within the reign of Perseus and thus antedated the Roman intervention—see above, s.v. Amphipolis. Accordingly, I would with hesitation date the law before Pydna and see in Beroia's *strategos* a military functionary of the king. In any case, the *strategos* is eponymous. The use of *stratego*i by the Macedonians outside of Macedonia itself is well known: see Bengtson, *Strategie* II 336ff. However, their use within Macedonia is another matter. Long ago M. Holleaux concluded in *REG* 10 (1897) 454-55 (*Études* I 269-70) that Macedonia as well as its vassal states were divided into military districts, each one commanded by a *strategos*, a view that has not found much favor. The city of Philippi, however, is known to have had *stratego*i: see Herzog-Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden* no. 6, lines 52-54, and cf. Bengtson, *op. cit.* 328-9. I believe the gymnasiarchal law places a *strategos* in Beroia during the monarchy.

Edessa

An inscription in Demitsas, *Macedonia* no. 2, p. 34 (*CIG* 1997d) begins as follows: ἔτους ζο[τ], ἀλε[ιφ]ούσ[ης] τῆς πόλεως, πολιταρχούντων τῶν περὶ (Αἴ)λιον Πεδοῦ-κάϊον etc. This is not sufficient to suggest eponymity, although the possibility remains open.

Leukadia

A number of contracts of sale are recorded in *SEG* XXIV 524 from the third century, dated by *epistates* and a priest of Asklepios.

Pella

A decree of the third century published in Herzog-Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden* no. 7 is clearly dated by a priest but lacks identification of the god or goddess. However, Ph. Petsas in *Balkan Studies* 4 (1963) 158 no. 1 has published a dedication to Asklepios which is dated by a priest. Thus, possibly the eponymous priesthood was that of Asklepios, but only a possibility.

Thessalonika

A decree of 223 BC (*IG* X 2,2) begins: βασιλεύοντος Ἀντιγόνου ἔτους ἑβδόμου, (ἰ)ερέως Νικολάου τοῦ Πασσανίου, Ὀλώϊου ἐνάτη ἀπιόντος, ἐπιστατούντος Παντάχου τοῦ Ἀρκε[σί]νου, ταμιῶν + three names, then the decree formula. The king is Antigonos III. The priest and *epistates* are both eponymous. The god cannot be identified. On the Macedonian *epistates* see D. Hennig in *Chiron* 17 (1987) 162 n. 69. It is impossible to equate this priesthood with that 'of the gods', as Edson has boldly suggested in *HSCP* 51 (1940) 135. In the Roman imperial period, in the reign of Augustus, such a priesthood appears in an inscription concerning the temple of the Divine Iulius, and the inscription is dated

by a whole series of three priesthoods: *IG X 2,31* (lines 5-12) --- ἐπὶ ἱερέως καὶ ἀγων[ο-θέτου Αὐ]τοκράτορος Καίσα[ρος θεοῦ]υίου Σεβασ[το]υ[---]ως τοῦ Νεικοπόλ[εως, ἱερέως] δὲ τῶν θεῶν Δω[---]που, Ῥώμης δὲ κ[αὶ Ῥωμαίων] εὐεργετῶν Νεικ[---] Παραμόνου· etc. Here clearly the priest and agonothete of Augustus is eponymous, and the same is true of the priest of the gods and the priest of Roma and the Romans Euergetai. However, nothing links this priest of the gods to the priest mentioned in *IG X 2,2* of 223 BC. These three same priesthoods also appear in the middle of the second century after Christ in *IG X 2,133*, where they are still eponymous. In the case of *IG X 2,133* there is the additional fact that the priest and agonothete of Augustus is a dynast called [---]τάλκου, whom Edson identifies as Tiberius Iulius Rhoemetalkes, ruler of the Bosphorus AD 131-154. L. Robert, however, in *Revue de Philologie* 1974, 212-13, is sceptical. Nevertheless, a foreign dynast or prince is clearly the eponymous priest, and, like all other foreigners or local gods who hold eponymous offices, some local individual must be appointed to conduct the duties of the office or priesthood in his place. Here the inscription mentions an antagonothete to do precisely that.

18. MAGNESIA

Hemmed in geographically by Macedonia and Thessaly, the Magnesians did not achieve political unity and regularly lay at the mercy of their two powerful neighbors until the second century BC. After the Roman victory over Macedonia, however, the Magnesians were given their freedom by the proclamation of Flamininus (Polybius 18.46.5), and a few years later, as we learn from Livy (35.31.11), they possessed the machinery of a federal state under a Magnetarch with headquarters at Demetrias. Then they were swept up in the political and the military events of the next few years orchestrated by the Aetolians and King Antiochus. With the defeat of Antiochus the Magnesians were dominated by the Macedonians until the end of the Macedonian kingdom in 168 BC. The Magnesian federal state was then revived or refounded under the leadership of a strategos. As such, it continued to function at least into the third century after Christ.

Demetrias

The two decrees of *IG IX 2,1109* (*SIG³ 1157*) of the late second century BC illustrate well the position of Demetrias as headquarters of the Magnesian federal state. It begins ἱερέως Κρίνωνος τοῦ Παρμενίωνος μηνὸς Ἀρείου δεκάτη· Κρίνων Παρμενίωνος Ὁμολιεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἀκραίου καὶ Διονυσόδωρος Εὐφραίου Αἰολεὺς ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Μαγνήτων καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ Αἰτωλίων etc. Krinon is the eponymous priest of Apollo Akraios. He along with the strategos of the Magnesians and the high officials of the Aetolians join together to propose two decrees concerning the oracle of Apollo Koropaios. This document clearly separates the eponymous priest of Apollo at Demetrias from the strategos of the Magnesian federal state. Another inscription, of about 150 BC, also uses the eponymous priest of Apollo at Demetrias to date a document (*SEG XXXIV 553*). Numerous examples of the use of the eponymous strategos of the federal state to date official documents are extant: *IG IX 2,1116-1117* and 1119-1121. No. 1115 begins by naming the emperor T[i-

berius Claudius?]) as the eponymous strategos of the federal state, and perhaps the same emperor is meant in no. 1120.

Homolion

The political independence of Homolion after the founding of Demetrias in 293 BC is well illustrated in a decree published by R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (Berlin 1952) no. 5, lines 18-24. It begins with 'Ομο[λιέων]. ἀγαθῆι τύχηι' ἐφ' ἱερέως [---] etc. Like Demetrias, therefore, this Magnesian city also had an eponymous priest.

19. THE MEGARID

AEGOSTHENA

In the Hellenistic period the entire Megarid lay almost helpless between two great powers, the Boeotian Confederacy to the north and the Achaean Confederacy to the west. The city of Megara formed part of the Achaean Confederacy from 243 to 224 and from 192 to 146 BC, but between those two periods it belonged to the Boeotian Confederacy. Aegosthena, however, remained part of the Boeotian Confederacy after 192 BC and in fact may have remained Boeotian down to 146. Cf. L. Robert, *Opera* 2, 1267-1275. *IG* VII 209 from Aegosthena begins as follows: Καφισία[ο] ἄρχοντος ἐν Ὀρχηστοῖ, ἐπὶ δὲ πόλιος Κλεοδρόμου, followed by a list of ex-ephebes. Kaphisiaos is the eponymous archon of the Boeotian Confederacy with its headquarters in Onchestus, while Kleodromos is the eponymous magistrate of Aegosthena in the northern Megarid. The Boeotians forced non-Boeotian cities who entered their Confederacy to use Boeotian eponymous magistrates: cf. Roesch, *Thespies* 161, and above, s.v. BOEOTIA. The other situation is portrayed in *IG* VII 223, a decree of Aegosthena which begins with ἀγαθῶ τύχα. ἐπὶ γραμμ[ατ]έως [---], ἐπὶ δὲ βασιλέως ἐν Αἰγιοσθέ[νοις Ἡπά]κωνος, μηνὸς τρίτου, etc. Here we find Aegosthena a member of the Achaean Confederacy, whose secretary appears at the beginning. Herakon is the eponymous basileus in Aegosthena.

Megara

From the fourth century, and almost certainly from much earlier as well, the eponymous magistrate at Megara was a basileus. A typical example is *IG* VII 1 (*SIG*³ 331): ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ Εὐφρονίου, etc., dated at the end of the fourth century. *IG* VII 4 has merely the mention of a basileus Euklias at the end of a proxenia decree, as is also the case in nos. 5-9. *IG* VII 27 dates from the period of Boeotian control of Megara, as can be seen in its opening lines ἄρχοντος Κλειμάχου, ἐν δὲ Ὀρχηστῶ Ποτιδαίχου, etc. Kleimachos is the eponymous archon of Megara, while Potidaichos is the Boeotian archon with headquarters in Onchestus. As we have seen in the case of Aegosthena (above), non-Boeotian cities in the Boeotian Confederacy were forced to use the Boeotian eponymous magistrates, usually in conjunction with the eponymous magistrate of the whole Confederacy in the publication of official documents. When Megara was free of Boeotian control it reverted to the use of its old magistrates. Megarian colonies inherited the eponym of their mother city: cf. below, s.v. Chalcedon and Chersonesos, e.g. A very interesting situation is apparent in *IG* VII 188 as republished by L. Robert in *Opera* 2, pp. 1250-1275, who saw that no. 189 belonged with it.

It is a decree of the Megarians thanking the Achaean Confederacy for its arbitration concerning the city of Pagai in the Megarid. It begins with [Μεγ]αρ[έων. --- ἐπὶ β]ασιλέος Ἀπολλωνίδα, μηνὸς Παν[άμου --- ὡς Μεγαρεῖς ἄγοντι, ἐπὶ δὲ γραμμα]ατέος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς Στράτωνος etc. The date is about 192 BC and, as Robert describes it, the situation at the moment of arbitration is such that Megara and Pagai, where the inscription was found, are Achaean, but Aigosthena is Boeotian. Apollonidas is the eponymous basileus of Megara, while the secretary is Achaean. The text is reprinted in *SEG XIII 327*.

20. MESSENA

It was the victory of Epaminondas at Leuctra in 371 BC that signalled the emergence of the new city of Messene and its surrounding perioecic townships, liberated from Spartan control. In the winter of 370-369 on the slope of Mt. Ithome the city of Messene began to take shape. All the inhabitants of the townships around it eventually became citizens of Messene, the political system apparently quite similar to that of Attica and Athens, although the separate cities did have a certain autonomy. Political unity, however, was not long lived, for at the beginning of the second century Messene was forced to enter the Achaean Confederacy, in 182. Kyparissa, Corone, Methone, and Colonides became independent members, and the other Messenian cities soon also acquired an independent status. Cf. E. Meyer in *RE Suppl. XV 284*. Thereafter 'Messenia' was a mere geographical term.

Before the founding of Messene in 370 BC there had been no tradition of political organization in Messenia as a whole, because of Spartan domination. After that date everything had to begin almost from point zero. In Messene the main organ of government was called the synedroi, whose secretary was certainly a very important official in the day-to-day conduct of affairs, and was almost certainly eponymous. A.K. Orlandos in *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 1965, 110ff. (*SEG XXIII 206*) published a decree honoring P. Cornelius Scipio (AD 2-3) with a significant heading: Γραμματέως συνέδρων Φιλοξενίδα τοῦ ἐπὶ Θεοδώ[ρου]. Δόγμα. Clearly the secretary dates the document, but the natural interpretation of the whole phrase would be 'The secretary of the synedroi is Philoxenidas in the magistracy of Theodoros'. That interpretation would imply that Theodoros was the eponymous magistrate rather than Philoxenidas. However, another honorary decree of the Roman period (AD 42) supports the eponymity of the secretary: Orlandos, *ibid.* 116ff. (*SEG XXIII 208*), which begins with [ἀγαθ]ῶ τύχα. γραμματ[έ]ος Μνασιστράτου, [ἔτ]ους ογ' etc., in which the restoration of the secretary seems inevitable. We also learn from Polybius (4.4.3 and 4.31.2) that ephors formed part of the government in Messene, and a short inscription (*IG V 1,1472*) records a manumission text of Roman date: ἐφ' ἱερέος Φιλίδα, ἐφόρου Θαλιδάμου, with the formula of manumission following. The presence of the priest is understandable in a manumission context, but the ephor seems to be used as an eponym. Nevertheless, there is no evidence of such an ephor in the earlier period. It would be rash to believe that Theodoros might also be an ephor. If that were true, why would the secretary's name precede his in such a fashion? Thus, because an eponymous secretary is used elsewhere in Messenia, I am inclined tentatively to believe the secretary was eponymous in the city of Messene and that the practice spread from that city to the others. From Corone in the middle of the first century BC is *IG V 1,1392*: ἀγαθαί τύχαι. ἐπὶ γραμματέος τῶν συνέδρων Νικαγόρου τοῦ Δ[ι]οκλείδα,

ἔτους ὀγ[δ]οηκοστοῦ ἐνάτου, etc. The era is the Achaean. From Colonides comes a short list of ephebes of apparently Roman date with a heading: ἐπὶ γραμματέος Εὐμέν[εος], γυμνασιάρχου δὲ [Φιλ]οκράτεος τοῦ Ξενιάδα, etc. M.N. Tod in the *editio princeps* (*JHS* 25 [1905] p. 49) thought that the secretary here might not be eponymous, but I disagree. In Thuria a decree of about 150 BC (*SEG* XI 972) begins with ἐπὶ ἱερέος τῆς Ἀθάνας Δαμίωνος, γραμματέος τῶν συνέδρων Ἀριστομένεος τοῦ Ἀριστίωνος. I believe the perioecic towns of Messenia originally adopted the eponymous secretary of the synedroi at Messene as their own eponym, just as the townships of Attica had adopted the eponymous archon of Athens. If Thuria begins a decree by citing the priest of Athena and then the secretary of the synedroi at Messene, it may be doing no more than what occasionally happened in Attica, when at times deme documents are dated by both the local demarch and by the Athenian archon. See above, ATTICA f.

21. PHOCIS

One of the original twelve tribes of the Amphictionic League, Phocis created its own federal state in the sixth century for its territorial security. Relations between Phocis and Thessaly had always been bad and a Thessalian invasion had ended in a Phocian victory ca. 500-490 BC: Herodotus 8.27ff. and Pausanias 10.3ff. In the early Hellenistic period the leadership of the Phocian Confederacy consisted of a college of four archons along with secretary and treasurer. Headquarters was at Elatea. With the restoration of the former federal army the strategoi were re-activated and held office annually. During the last half of the third century, however, the highest executives were the Phokarchs. At the end of the third century they were replaced by the strategoi, the chief of them each year being eponymous. In the late imperial period of Rome we find the Phokarchs again in power.

A number of documents attest the eponymy of the Confederacy's chief. *IG* IX 1, nos. 32 (*SIG³* 647), 189-191, and 226-230 (re-published by R. Bogaert, *Epigraphica*, Vol. III (Leiden 1976) no. 39). In all the cities of Phocis there is a very consistent pattern of eponymy, wherever pertinent information is available, and that is the office of archon. An eponymous archon existed at Ambrossos (*IG* IX 1, no. 11 for the late Hellenistic period and no. 12 (*SIG³* 1063) for the third century after Christ); at Anticyra, nos. 1-3 and 6, along with *SEG* XXV 591-593; Daulis, no. 63; Drymaea, nos. 226-230 (Bogaert, loc. cit.); Elatea, no. 110 (*SIG³* 231) and *SEG* III 416; Hyampolis, no. 86; Stiris, nos. 34 and 42; Tithora, nos. 188 and 191-194; Tithronium, no. 223. No change appears to have been made in any of these places right through the period of the Roman principate. The eponymous archon may well have been the dominant magistrate in all Phocian cities.

Delphi

Delphi is unique. The city and the international sanctuary of Apollo lay in Phocis, but the so-called First Sacred War completely altered the political status of the area. In the seventh century Delphi had been dominated by the Phocians, in particular by the nearby city of Crisa. Tradition has recorded that a combination of Greek city-states made war upon Crisa, destroyed it forever, and made Delphi independent of Phocian control. The date was about 590 BC. The Amphictionic League then undertook the general administration of the sanctuary and the Pythian Festival which was held there regularly from the First Pythian in 582/1 BC. The

community of Delphi itself was elevated to the position of a city and removed from the Phocian Confederacy.¹¹ Thereafter the city and the sanctuary became in a special sense two separate entities bound together in a symbiotic relationship under international protection. The Phocians did not passively relinquish control, however, and there was a formal declaration of the independence of Delphi and the sanctuary in the Peace of Nicias (Thucydides 5.18.1-2; 421 BC). Much later, the Romans also recognized the special position of Delphi (Sherk, *RDGE* 37, A 10).

The institutions of the city resembled those of other Greek democratic city-states: boule, agora (later called ekklesia), and elected magistrates. The chief magistrate was always the eponymous archon, and the fact that he was also used to date the official documents of the Amphictionic League reflects the very close relationship between city and sanctuary. No ancient list, epigraphical or literary, of the Delphian archons has survived. It must be reconstructed from the use of the archons to date a variety of documents such as Amphictionic decrees, decrees of the city, lists of proxenoi, grants of promanteia, manumission texts, building accounts of the naopoioi, etc. An important synchronism puts the archon list back to the early years of the sixth century. The scholiast to Pindar (*Hypothesis* of the Delphian Festival, ed. Drachmann II pp. 1-5) explains that in the First Sacred War Eurylochos of Thessaly had defeated the Kirraians (i.e. the people of Crisa in Phocis) 'in the archonship of Simonides at Athens and of Gylidas at Delphi'. Then later, the entry continues, the Thessalians defeated the survivors 'in the archonship of Damasias at Athens and of Diodoros at Delphi'. The *Marmor Parium* (ed. Jacobi in *FGrHist* 239, A 37, of 591/0 BC) also refers to the event but assigns the name 'Simon' to the Athenian archon. For further details see T.J. Cadoux in *JHS* 68 (1948) 99ff. Thus, Gylidas was the eponymous archon at Delphi in 591/0 BC, and Diodoros may be placed in 582/1 BC (Cadoux, *op. cit.* 102-103). That the Delphian records did in fact include material of that age is expressly mentioned by Plutarch, who in his *Life of Solon* (11) speaks of Delphian ὑπομνήματα. The number of known archons who can be dated is very small until we reach the fourth century, when the building accounts of the temple of Apollo are dated year by year. Many names are known for the third century, but few if any can be assigned reliably to fixed years. The situation in the second century is much better, and the results can be seen in the work by G. Daux, *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle jusqu'à la paix romaine* (Paris 1936) 73-209. Thereafter the Delphian archons are used eponymously through to the fourth century after Christ when we learn of an archon (*SIG³* 901) Βάββιος Αὐρ. Φιλισ[τίων] under Constantine and Licinius. For the list of all known archons see G. Daux, *Chronologie delphique* (Paris 1943) in need of revision. The Roman emperors who accepted the office of eponymous archon at Delphi include Titus (*SIG³* 817; *FD* III 4,34) in AD 79; Hadrian (*SIG³* 830 for the first time, and 836 for the second time) in AD 118-120 and AD 125; and Antoninus Pius (*SIG³* 848).

¹¹ For the early history of the city and the League, including the First Sacred War, see Busolt-Swoboda, *Staatskunde* II 1292ff.; J. Jannoray in *BCH* 61 (1937) 33-43; T.J. Cadoux in *JHS* 68 (1948) 99-101; W.G. Forrest in *BCH* 80 (1956) 33-52; W.W. Parke and D.E.W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* I (Oxford 1956) Chapter III; P. Guillon, *Études béotiennes* (Aix-en-Provence 1963).

22. THESSALY

By the sixth century the old tribal state of the Thessalians belonged to the Delphic Amphictionic League and had already (in the seventh century?) formed its own confederacy under the leadership of a tagos. It is certainly to this early period that the remarks of Aristotle in his *Constitution of the Thessalians* refer, when he says (Frag. 497-498 Rose, on which cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Staatskunde* II 1483) that ἐπὶ Ἀλεύα τοῦ Πύρρου Thessaly was divided into four parts (Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis, and Hestiaiotis) with each of them in turn divided into military kleroi. Aleuas son of Pyrrhos must have been an early tagos. The cities themselves used their own eponymous magistrates in the course of time either by themselves or in conjunction with the name of the tagos to date their documents. By 361/0 BC (*SIG*³ 184; *Tod* II 147) a change in the Thessalian Confederacy had been made: an archon replaced the old tagos. And a further change was made, apparently by Flamininus, after Rome liberated Thessaly from Macedonian domination in 197 BC. Henceforth it had a representative government with a synhedrion and its leader was a strategos. Politically weakened, it survived to at least the reign of Hadrian. For the list of its eponymous strategoi see Hiller von Gaertringen in *IG* IX 2, pp. XXIV to XXV, and H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes vom Jahre 196 v. Chr. bis zum Ausgang der römischen Republik*, (Bonn 1978). The names of these strategoi regularly appeared on the coinage: Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 33-34. Rather rare is the appearance in an inscription of Augustus as the eponymous strategos of the Confederacy: *IG* IX 2,425 b, lines 72-78. Roman emperors appear, of course, as eponymous magistrates of Greek cities, but it is uncommon to find one at the head of a confederacy. Another example also comes from Thessaly: *IG* IX 2,1342 from Aiginion, dating from at least the second century after Christ, begins with the phrase στρ(ατηγοῦντος) τοῦ κυρίου [---] which must mean that the name of a Roman emperor followed as the strategos of the Thessalian Confederacy. Augustus himself is said by Pausanias (10.8.3) to have taken an active role in the inner workings of the Amphictionic League, probably in his capacity as the eponymous strategos.

Angeai

A decree granting proxenia and immunities (*IG* IX 2,223) is dated at the end by a board of three archons. Usually such boards had a president and it may well be that here in the Thessalian cities the president of the board was the eponymous magistrate: see below, s.v. Phalanna.

Chyretiai

Two manumissions (*IG* IX 2,340a and 342) are dated by the eponymous tagos of the city. As usual, the treasurers who appear in Thessalian manumissions, and there are very many of them, are false eponyms. These two manumissions appear to date from the early second century after Christ. In 197-194 BC the letter of T. Quinctius Flamininus (Sherk, *RDGE* 33) is directed to the tagoi and city of Chyretiai. Thus, there was an earlier board of tagoi.

Cierion

IG IX 2,258 is a decree granting proxenia of about 168 BC and is dated by the Thessalian strategos followed by six tagoi. No 259 of 117 BC probably also has six tagoi, but the names are mutilated. Similarly nos. 262-63.

Gonnos

IG IX 2,1040 b is a manumission of the Roman period dated by three tagoi—or, of course, as one might assume, by the president of the board of three—and the Thessalian strategos. A decree of Gonnos from Magnesia (*I. Magnesia* 35) begins with ταγεύοντων τῶν περὶ Εὐδήμον τὸν Νικάνορος followed by four names in the Accusative and then the formula of decree. Its date is probably the end of the third century BC. And *IG IX 2,1042 II*, a manumission, is dated by the names of three tagoi in the age of Augustus. No. 1044a, though mutilated, is dated apparently by two tagoi. 'The number of the members in such magisterial boards can vary.

Halos

IG IX 2,107, a proxenia text of the early second century BC, is dated first by the Thessalian strategos and then at the end by three archons, followed by a Hipparch.

Hypata

Located in the southern borderland of Thessaly, Hypata was the largest city of the Aenians. The Aenians were members of the Amphictionic League and had been dominated by the Aetolian Confederacy from 272 to 167 BC, when they gained their independence and formed their own Aenian Confederacy. Their chief magistrates were a board of five Aeniarchs. Under Augustus they were absorbed into the Thessalian Confederacy. *IG IX 2,7 b* begins with αἰνιαρχεόντων + five names, ἐν δὲ Ὑπάται ἀρχόντων [. . . Ἀθ]ανάδα, Πολεμάρχου Δαμ[ί]ωνος κρίματα ἃ ἔκριναν etc. Thus, a board of two archons, the first of whom was probably the eponym. A similar board of two archons is used to date no. 9, a grant of proxenia. Another instance of Augustus' interest in Thessalian affairs is the permission he gives them to use his name, as seen in no. 41 on a base in honor of Germanicus Caesar and erected by a certain Πλείσταρχος Πλειστάρχου [φ]ύσι [δὲ] Σωσάνδρου Σεβάστηος Ὑπαταί-ος. Cf. Dio 54.23. Of course, that permission may have been granted only to Hypata.

Lamia

In the third and beginning of the second century Lamia belonged to the Aetolian Confederacy and often used its strategos to date its own documents—cf. *IG IX 2,61* and 62—but in 190 BC it was captured by Manius Acilius Glabrio (Livy 37.4-5) and added to the Thessalian Confederacy. From that date it began to use the Thessalian strategoi along with its own eponymous archons to date its documents. *IG IX 2,64* of 186/5 BC begins with [ἀγα]θαί τύχαι. [Στρατ]αγέοντος τῶν θεσσαλῶν Λεοντο[μ]ένε[ος Φεραίου, ἐν] δὲ Λαμίαι ἀρχόντων [---]. The number of archons is given elsewhere: three of them in nos. 62 (*SIG³ 532*) of 218/17 BC, 65, 67, and 69. However, a decree of the third century (*SEG XVI 373*) lists four archons.

Larisa

Larisa was the most significant city of Thessaly and the seat of the Aleuadai, i.e. the oldest Thessalian aristocracy, whose members often became leaders of the Confederacy. The eponymity of its tagoi is attested by many of the city's documents: *IG IX* 2,505 (late third century); 506 (early second century); 517 (*SIG*³ 543 of 217 and 214 BC); 549; *SEG XXVII* 202 (decree of 220-210 BC); *SEG XXXI* 575 (decree of 171 BC). There were five members in its board of tagoi, as these texts demonstrate. In AD 41/42 we learn of the president of one such board (*IG IX* 2,544): ταγευόντων τῶν περὶ Εὔδημον Μενεκράτους. In all such boards it is the president who is the eponym. As usual, the treasurer who is named in all the manumissions from Larisa, and there are very many of them, is a false eponym: cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Staatskunde* II 1500.

Melitaia

Since about 260 BC Melitaia belonged to the Aetolian Confederacy, but with the Roman defeat of the Aetolians in 189 BC and the implementation of a *foedus iniquum* Melitaia henceforth was a member of the Thessalian Confederacy. From the period of Aetolian control comes an inscription found at Delphi (*IG IX*² 177 and *SIG*³ 546 A) from which we learn that the Aetolians had arbitrated a dispute between Melitaia and Xyniai near the end of the third century: [στραταγέο]ντος Πανταλέωνος τὸ πέμπτον, ἐν δὲ Μελι[τεῖαι ἀρχόντ]ων + three names, then ἐν δὲ Ξυνίαις + three names. From the period of Thessalian control comes another inscription found at Delphi (*SGDI* 2138), a manumission of Melitaia dated 145/4 BC στραταγέοντος τῶν θεσσαλῶν Ὀμήρου Λαρισαίου, ἐμ Μελιτεῖαι δὲ ἀρχόντων τῶν περὶ Πολυσάωνα μηνὸς [Πυθ]οίου, etc. Thus, at Melitaia we find a board of three archons, its president the eponymous magistrate.

Narthacium

The title of the eponymous magistrate in *IG IX* 2,89 (*SIG*³ 674 and Sherk, *RDGE* 9) is missing. The document is a Roman senatorial decree of about 140 BC concerning a land dispute between Narthacium and Melitaia. Its heading reads [στρατ]αγέοντος τῶν θεσσαλῶν Λέοντο[ς τοῦ Ἀγ]ησίππου Λαρισαίου, ἐν δὲ Ναρθακίω[ι ταγευόν]των + three names. Sherk here has retained the suggestions of Stählin and Accame that the tagoi are the magistrates in question, but others have opted for archons. More evidence is needed.

Oloosson

IG IX 2,1292, a mutilated proxenia decree of Roman date, mentions (three?) archons in the opening lines, the first of whom is most likely the eponym.

Phalanna

In *IG IX* 2,1231, a grant of proxenia and citizenship of the second century, five tagoi are named in lines 9-13. The name of the first tagos is Eubiotos son of Eumelos. Then, following all five names, is added ἐπιμελὲς [δ]ὲ γενέσθω τοῖς [τα]γοῖς τοῖς περὶ Εὐβιοτον, etc. Thus, clearly the first tagos named in the board of five is the president of the board and the eponymous magistrate for that year. Cf. Bruno Helly in *Ancient Macedonia* II (Thessalonike 1977) 540.

Pharsalus

IG IX 2,234 of the third century is dated by five tagoi, and no. 256, a manumission of the Roman period, era of the Flavian emperors, is dated first by the strategos of the Thessalian Confederacy and then by the president of the board of tagoi, who was the eponym. See Vasiliki Misaelidou-Despotidou in *Arch. Deltion* 35 (1980) 226-227 for another example.

Pherai

Although the eponymous magistrate of Pherai is not mentioned in the few inscriptions extant, *IG IX 2,415 b* is an important manumission because it states that the treasurer had held his office in the first half of the year τοῦ ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ (lines 66-78), i.e. when Augustus was strategos of the Thessalian Confederacy. Similar phrases in the same inscription, but of different date, make it clear that the office is indeed that of strategos.

Scotussa

The plural tagoi are mentioned in a mutilated inscription (*IG IX 2,398*) of the third century, but a manumission of AD 71-96 (*SEG XXIII 413*) is dated by the strategos of the Thessalian Confederacy, followed by the hipparch, and then by an entry in which only a single tagos appears possible.

Thaumaci

A grant of proxenia and citizenship (*IG IX 2,215*) is dated at the end by three archons. Similar documents (nos. 216-18) are also dated by three archons. Hellenistic period.

Thetonium

A bronze tablet from Thetonium of about 450 BC honors a Corinthian: *IG IX 2,257* (*SIG³ 55*; Schwyzer, *GDE* 557; Jeffery, *LSAG* p. 98 no. 10). An unusual feature, if it is interpreted correctly, is the fact that the first line (ἐς ἠυλορέοντος Φιλονίκο υἱός) apparently is the conclusion of the last line on the tablet. At the end of that last line are Ὀρέσταιο Φερεκράτ. The antiquity of a magistrate called a hyloros ('forest warden') seems clear enough, but I hesitate to call him an eponymous magistrate, as others have done: cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Staatskunde* II 1480, and M. Sordi in *Rivista di Filologia* N.S. 36 (1958) 59. Within the text itself there is mention of a tagos, but not in a context of eponymity.

23. ISLANDS ADJACENT TO THE MAINLAND

Aegina

Dated about 550-540 BC by Jeffery (*LSAG* p. 60 and 119ff., no. 4) is an inscription (*IG IV 1580*) from the precinct of the temple of Aphaia commemorating the completion of work [ἐπὶ ---]οίτα ἱερέος ἐόντος. The priest [Kle?]oitas might be a false eponym, since his connection with the temple would explain the dating by his name. However, an eponymous priesthood cannot be ruled out. Unfortunately a series of sepulchral notices, painted in red, is dated only by an official's name without giving his title (*SEG XI 8-10*). Of these no. 9 will

serve as an example: ἐπὶ Ἀριστάρχου, Γορπιαίου ιγ', ἐτέθη Θεοξένα. They seem to date from the period 210-133 BC, when Pergamum controlled the island.

Corcyra

The eponymous *prytanis* is well documented in Corcyra from the early Hellenistic Age to the first century after Christ. Earliest is *IG IX* 1,682 (Schwyzer, *DGE* 136) from the end of the fourth century: (at beginning) πρύτανις Στράτων· μεις Ψυδρέυς, ἀμέρα τετάρτα ἐπὶ δέκα, etc. followed by a grant of proxenia. In the second we have the details of private donations of money in *IG IX* 1,694, beginning with ἐπὶ σωτηρία. πρυτανεύοντος Ἀριστομένεος, μηνὸς Μαχανέος τετάρτη ἐπὶ εἰκάδι, etc. A large number of inscribed bricks bearing the names of *prytaneis* in the formula of eponymity are extant from about the third to the end of the first century: *IG IX* 1,735-819 use the preposition with a single name, while nos. 820-823 use the name alone in the genitive. Then there is a decree of Corcyra found at Magnesia which begins with the naming of the eponymous *prytanis* with the preposition and dates from the second century (*I. Magnesia* 44). Finally there is *IG IX* 1,712 probably from the first century after Christ or even later which also uses the eponymous *prytanis*. It is clear from *IG IX* 1,706-709 that in the Hellenistic Age this eponymous *prytanis* was one of a board of *prytaneis* (καὶ οἱ σύναρχοι).

Euboea

For Euboea see above, No. 12.

Issa

Three inscriptions testify to an eponymous *hieromnemon* at Issa from the fourth to the middle of the first century. *SIG*³ 141 records the terms of a decree establishing an agreement between Issa and two Illyrians (dynasts?) about the founding of a colony on the island of Korčula by Dalmatia. It dates from the end (?) of the fourth century according to Schmitt (*Staatsverträge* 3, no. 451) and begins ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι. ἐφ' ἱερομνάμονος Πραξιδάμου, Μα[χανέος, συνθήκα (?) οἰκιστῶν Ἰσσαίων καὶ Πύλλου καὶ τοῦ ὑοῦ Δάξου. τάδε συνέγραψαν οἱ οἰκισταὶ] καὶ ἔδοξε τῶι δάμωι, etc. *SEG XXXI* 593 is a short dedication on a base of the second century: ἐπὶ ἱερομ[νάμονος] + one name, and similar is no. 594 on another base. And *RDGE* 24 of 56 BC from Salona is composed of three documents, the first (A) being apparently an introduction to the others. Document A begins with the date by Roman consuls for 56 BC, including the exact day in the Roman manner and followed by [ἐν δὲ Ἰσση] ἐπὶ ἱεραμνάμο[νος] Ζωπύ[ρου τοῦ ---]νος μηνὸς Ἀρ[τε]μιτίου etc.

Ithaca

The only inscription testifying to the eponymous magistrate of Ithaca was found in Magnesia (*I. Magnesia* 36 = *SIG*³ 558) and is a decree of Ithaca praising the Magnesians. It begins [ἐπ]ὶ δαμιοργῶν Ἀρνίσκο[υ ---] + two names and then [ἐκκλησία ἐν] τῶι Ὀδυσσεΐ[ωι, γραμματέος Ἀ]γλαοτέλεος etc. In addition to this board of three *damiorgoi* an *epidamiorgos* is mentioned at the end, for whom see Thucydides 1.5. Chrissoula (*Damiurgen* 65) points out that this latter magistrate is independent of the board of three.

Salamis

There was an Athenian cleruchy on Salamis from early times, but it is unknown exactly when it was first sent there. It is probable that it happened at the end of the sixth century: see *IG I³ 1* and the discussion in Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* pp. 26-27. Athenian cleruchs were still there in 131/0 BC as recorded in *IG II² 1227 (SIG³ 691)*, which is a decree of the cleruchs praising a gymnasiarch. It begins with the prescript ἐπὶ Ἐπικλέους ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἄστει, ἐν Σαλαμῖνι δὲ Ἀνδρονίκ[ου] followed by the day of the month. Epikles is the Athenian archon for 131/0 BC. Andronikos is the archon at Salamis, but like the other Salaminian archons he was chosen each year at Athens and sent out from there to the island: Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 62.2, and Schulthess in *RE XI* 818.

Same on Cephallenia

The only inscription mentioning the eponymous magistrate of Samē was found at Magnesia (*I. Magnesia* 35), a decree that begins with ἐπὶ ἀρχόντων + three names followed by the other officials. The date may be early Hellenistic.

THE REGISTER

Part II: The Aegean Islands

Only for three short periods of time in the Hellenistic age did many of the islands in the Aegean form part of a larger representative body. The League of the Islanders was first organized by Antigonus the One-Eyed in 314/3 BC when he sent a great fleet into the Aegean (Diodorus 19.62.9) to control its waters in his struggle against his enemies. His son Demetrius became its chief after the death of his father. With the defeat of Demetrius the League passed into the hands of Ptolemy I, who reformed it and used it to control his maritime empire. This Ptolemaic phase began in 286/5 BC and ended some 25 or 30 years later. It was called a Koinon, but it apparently had no assembly of members, merely a council called a synedrion composed of representatives from the member islands. Its leader was a nesiarch, headquarters at Delos. For details see I.L. Merker in *Historia* 19 (1970) 141-60 and R.S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976) 136ff. In the second century the League was brought back to life by Rhodes because of her expanded maritime power in the struggle against Philip. Some 30 years or more later the League disappears forever. There is no evidence of the League having its own separate eponymous officials, for it merely used those of its headquarters or of some member island. Cf. *IG XII 5,824 (SIG³ 620)* lines 32ff.: ἀγαθεῖ τύχει. ἐφ' ἱερέως ἐν Ῥόδῳ Αὐτοκράτους, μηνὸς Σμινθίου, ἐν δ[ὲ] Τήνῳ ἄρχοντος Χαριππίδου, μηνὸς Ἀπατουριῶνος ἔκτει ἰσταμένον, ἔδοξεν τοῖς συνέδροις τῶν Νησιωτῶν etc.

24. AMORGOS

Aigiale

IG XII 7,412 (SIG³ 1190) belongs to the third century and is dated [ἐ]π' ἄρχοντος Λεοντέως μηνὸς Ἀπατουριῶνος, etc. Although mutilated, no. 425 seems to begin with a dating by the archon and belongs to the early Roman imperial period. No. 515 has ἐνιαυτὸν

τὸν μετὰ ἄρχοντα [---] and seems to belong to the second century. The chief magistrate in the age of Caracalla is seen on a coin (Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 58) with a legend that L. Robert (*Monnaies grecques* (Paris 1967, 4) expanded to ἐπὶ ἀρχ(ι)πρυτανεί(ας) Ἐπικράτου.

Arcesine

In a document concerning hypothecation (*IG XII 7,55; SIG³ 1200*), late fourth or early third century, the heading is dated ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Φανοκράτους, μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος etc. Of the same general period is *IG XII 7,67 b (SIG³ 955)* which is dated first by the magistrates of Naxos followed by ἐν Ἀρκεσίνῃ δὲ μηνὸς Μιλτοφοριῶνος, [ἄρχ]οντος Κτησιφῶντος etc. Similarly no. 67a. And *IG XII Suppl. 331*, of the fourth century, begins with a heading εἰς ἐνιαυτον ἐπὶ Κλεισαγόρου ἄρχοντ[ο]ς etc., and later on (lines 10-14) is a mutilated list of names who are identified as archons. Thus, in the early Hellenistic period Arcesine had a board of archons, of which the president was the eponym.

Minoa

A factor of importance in the interpretation of some inscriptions from Minoa is the presence in that city of Samians toward the end of the third century and on into the Roman period. L. Robert (*REG* 46 [1933] 423-42 = *Opera Minora* 1.549-68) has examined the evidence in detail, beginning with *I. Magnesia 50 (SIG³ 562)* which concludes with a list of those islanders who had accepted the invitation to attend the Leukophryena at Magnesia. The three major cities of Amorgos are on that list, but instead of Μινωηταί we find the phrase Σάμιοι οἱ ἐν Μινοίαι. Thus, a Samian colony at Minoa. We have no evidence concerning the date at which the Samians first arrived there, but it was probably soon after 281 BC when Samos fell under Ptolemaic rule. Many documents mention these Samians in Minoa, usually of the second century BC: *IG XII 7, 226, 231, 237, 240, and 279*.

IG XII 7,241 (SIG³ 1046) of about 250 BC is dated by an eponymous demiourgos: θεοί. ἀγαθῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ δημιουργοῦ Παγκρίτου, μηνὸς Κροنيῶνος, ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἱερουργοῖς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰτωνίας etc. It has been supposed (note in *IG* and cf. Chrissoula, *Demiurgen* 116) that this stone had been brought to Minoa from Arcesine because of the prevalence of the cult of Athena Itonia in Arcesine. Objections to this view include the fact that at Arcesine the eponymous magistrate was an archon and, secondly, the fact that the demiourgos was eponymous at Samos and could have been introduced to Minos by the colonists. Thus, *IG XII 7,241* certainly originated at Minoa. An eponymous demiourgos is now attested also in a small fragment from Minoa (*SEG XXXIV 873*): ἐπὶ δημιουργοῦ Βουλ[---] μηνὸς Ἀρτ[εμισιῶνος]. In addition there is *IG XII 7,245* which mentions another such demiourgos and which certainly came from Minoa: [ἐ]πὶ δημιουργοῦ ---, ἱερέως δὲ] τῆς Ῥόδου θρασ[υ---] προτεράϊα etc. Cf. L. Robert in *REG* 42 (1929) 20ff. (*Opera Minora* I.530 ff). Much later we find a change of eponymity, when *IG XII 7,240*, a decree of the magistrates, boule and People of the Samians in Minoa is dated (lines 36-37) ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀττικῶδ β' τοῦ Προτείμου. The date is AD 207 by the naming of the Roman consuls.

What we do not know is the title of the Minoan eponymous magistrate *before* the Samians arrived. Archons, as elsewhere on Amorgos?

25. ANDROS

All the available evidence for the Hellenistic period is consistent with the use of an eponymous archon in Andros: *IG XII 5,715* (decree of third century); *IG Suppl. 248, C III* lines 24 and 28 (decree of the second century); *IG Suppl. 249* (second century). Back in the middle of the fifth century Athenian klerouchoi had been sent there by Pericles (Plutarch, *Pericles* 11.5). We may assume that the eponymous archon continued in use into the second century after Christ, the period of *IG XII 5,733* which has a heading οἱ στρατηγήσαντες ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Ἀριστέου.

26. ASTYPALAIIA

Most specific for our purpose is *IG XII 3,168* (*SIG³ 722*) as read by W. Peek (*Inscriptionen von den dorischen Inseln in Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Phil-hist. Kl., 62, Heft 1, Leipzig 1969, no. 82). It begins with ὁ [δὲ γραμματεὺς] ἀϋτοὺς ἀναγραφέτω καὶ εἰς τὸν τοίχον κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, προγράγων καὶ τὸν δαμιεργόν, ἐφ' οὗ ἕκαστος καθίσταται. One may translate 'Let the [secretary] engrave them (i.e. the names of proxenoi) also on the wall in the same way, writing down first the (name of) the damiorgos who was in office when each (proxenos) was appointed'. This law about proxenoi at Astypalaia concludes with a list of names and may be dated about 100 BC (?). Further evidence for an eponymous demiourgos is in *IG XII 7,67 A*, from Arcesine on Amorgos, from sometime in the early Hellenistic period. It concerns a loan from some Astypalaiaans to the city of Arcesine. An eponymous damiorgos is used for the Astypalaian date. For the complicated details of the loan see Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 124-26. Then *IG XII 3,174* (*SIG³ 780* and Sherk, *RDGE* 67) is a letter of Augustus to the Cnidians but found at Astypalaia. It begins [--- ἐπὶ δαμι]ωργοῦ δὲ Καιρογένεος Λευ[κα]θίου (?). Here the damiourgos seems to be the one at Astypalaia, although the eponymous magistrate at Cnidus was also a damiourgos. The presence of δέ in this position normally means that the eponymous magistrate of another city was named in the preceding phrase. Thus, the eponyms of both places were given on the stone erected at Astypalaia. *IG XII 3,178* is not a decree of the city but of a thiasos. For a list of eponymous damiourgoi at Astypalaia see Peek (*op. cit.* no. 100) and cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1971 no. 486.

27. CALYMNA

It is vital to keep in mind the fact that the island of Calymna was incorporated into the Coan state late in the third century, 205-201 BC or a little earlier, because that event caused Calymna to use both her own eponymous official, a stephanephoros, and also the eponymous monarchos of Cos in dating her official documents. See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, *Hypomnemata* 51 (Göttingen 1978) 124-129. Basic for the epigraphy is M. Segre, 'Tituli Calymnii' in *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente* 22-23, n.s. 6-7, 1944-1945 (Bergamo 1952). At that time Calymna became a deme of Cos: cf., e.g., *SIG³ 567* line 4 where the relationship between the two is expressed by the phrase τῶι σύμπαντι δάμωι, and also Segre 208f. 219 (W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inscriptionen I* (Berlin 1955) no. 946, in which (lines 7-8) a certain Xenocles says that his deme is Calymna and that his fatherland is Cos. Evidence of the relationship in the form of Calymnan manu-

missions (*Tituli Calymnii* nos. 152-212) extends from the second century to the reign of the emperor Claudius. These manumissions vividly illustrate the relationship of Calymna as a deme of Cos, because approximately half of them use the eponymous monarchos of Cos while the rest of them use the stephanephoros of Calymna. A double phrase is used in no. 155: ἐπὶ μο(νάρχου) τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, στεφανηφόρου δὲ Κενέου, μη(νός) Καίσι(α-ρος) ΖΚ. Here the god Asklepios is the eponymous monarchos in Cos, while Keneos is the eponymous stephanephoros in Calymna. Thus, the situation is quite similar to the one in Attica in which the dernes date their decrees sometimes by their own demarchs and sometimes by the Athenian archons: see above, s.v. ATTICA, section f. Also similar is the situation when a member city of a federal state dates its documents by its own eponyms as well as by the eponymous head of the whole Confederacy, usually a strategos. And when Cos issues any documents that happen to concern Calymna we should expect to find the eponyms of both places used for dating.

28. CEOS

Carthaea

In the city of Carthaea the archon was eponymous. *IG XII 5,544* contains groups of names, each group introduced by a heading. Fragment A 2, lines 35ff., begins with ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλεξιτέλου followed by the name of a person honored by the People. The entry in B 2, lines 14-24, is quite different. After the heading τάδε ἔδανείσατο ἡ πόλις each of the next eight lines is dated by the eponymous archon and the amount of the loan(s) for that year. *IG XII 5,1095* is a base with lettering of the second century or later: Σωσίστρατο[ς ---] στρατηγῆσας [ἐπὶ ---]νίκου ἄρχοντ[ος ἀνέθηκεν].

Iulis

IG XII 5,595 is a decree of the city from either the third or second century, beginning with ἐπὶ θεοφανίδου ἄρχοντος, and no. 610 from the third century is a list of names with indications of the amount of money that each one has failed to pay for judgements against them. The whole list is introduced by ἐπὶ Διοκύδου ἄρχοντος.

29. CHIOS

From the fourth century and on into the Roman period there is a clear pattern of the use of an eponymous prytanis in Chios. A sacred law of the fifth or fourth century (*SIG³ 986*) begins with [ἐπὶ Τ]έλλ[ι]ος πρ[υτάν]εος, βολῆς γνώμ[η ---] etc. The famous letter of Alexander to the Chians about the exiles (*SIG³ 283* and *Tod II 192*) has a heading which had been added by the Chians when they engraved the body of the letter itself: ἐπὶ Δεισιθέου πρυτάνεος παρὰ βασιλέως Ἀλε[ξάνδρου] Χίω[ν τῶι] δήμωι. It is usually dated to 332 BC, but A.J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks* (Norman, Oklahoma 1980) pp. 79ff., prefers 334 BC. Also of the fourth century are *SEG XXII 508* and *SIG³ 987*, both of which use the eponymous prytanis. The sale of a priesthood, dated by the prytanis, is recorded in F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques, Supplement* (Paris 1962) no. 78, from the second century. Already by that time the practice had begun in Chios of joining the word stephanephoros with that of prytanis. It is seen for the first time about 200 BC in an in-

scription recording arbitration between Lampsakos and Parion by Chios: J. Vanseveren in *Revue de Philologie* 63 (1937) pp. 337ff., no. 10, in line 12 of which we find τὸν πρύτανιν τὸν στεφανηφόρον]. Thereafter, the 'stephanephoros' becomes the usual title. Vanseveren has shown that the prytanis at first had simply been granted the dignity of a magistrate permitted to wear the crown, i.e. stephanephoros, and that later the mention of 'prytanis' was gradually omitted. Stonecutters were probably responsible. A similar situation existed at Miletus, e.g., where the eponymous aisymnetes was also stephanephoros and in time was simply called stephanephoros. Vanseveren rightly suggests that 'stephanephoros' by itself in the Greek world may mask the earlier title of the eponym.

For Chian stephanephoroi of the later period an interesting example is *IGRR* IV 941 which speaks of an Apollonios who, having been appointed stephanephoros εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν μετὰ στεφανηφόρον βασιλέα Ῥοιμητάλκην, ἔδωκεν τῷ δήμῳ δωρεὰν τῆς στεφανηφορίας εἰς σίτου ὠνὴν δραχμὰς μυρίας, a phrase that shows the amount of *summa honoraria* he had to pay for the post. Cf. L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 139. This Thracian King Rhoemataalkas was a favorite of the Greek cities and became eponymous archon at Athens as well as here in Chios. Robert, working outward from *IGRR* IV 946 which mentions a King Ant[iochos], identified him in *Études* p. 128 and pp. 134ff. with the King Antiochos of *IGRR* IV 940 (now *SEG* XVII 381) from the Roman imperial period. He further identified him with the help of another inscription (now *SEG* XVII 381, frag. D) as King Antiochos IV of Commagene who reigned from AD 38 to 72. Thus, two kings honored at Chios with the eponymous stephanephoros. P.M. Fraser in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens* I (Leiden 1978) 363ff., discussed the list of names in *SEG* XVII 381, admitted it might be a list of eponyms, but tended to reject that view. Robert thought it possible. The fact that both kings are named in that list and the fact that the names are not all of the same period indicates to me that it is indeed a list of eponyms. One of the eponyms at Chios was a woman of the first century after Christ: L. Robert, *Opera Minora* 1,502-503, restores as follows: [οἱ πολέμαρχ]οι καὶ ἔξετασ[ταὶ οἱ ἄρξαντες ἐ]ν τῷ ἐπὶ στεφανη[φόρου Κλαυδ]ίας, Σκυθείνου θυ[γατρὸς, Μητρ]οδώρας τ(ὸ) β'.

Other examples of the stephanephoros: *SEG* XVII 382 (first century BC); *SEG* XVII 393 (first century after Christ); *SEG* XIX 574 (first century after Christ); *SEG* XXXIII 692 (first century BC); Ch. Picard and A. Plassart in *BCH* 37 (1913) 221 (cf. L. Robert, *Opera Minora* 1.486). Some of the very many names that appear on Chian coins might be those of the eponymous: Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 108-110.

30. COS

Internal disorder resulted in a new organization of the whole population on Cos in 366 BC, whereby in an act of synoikismos a Coan state emerged. Democratic institutions were established and the countryside, like that in Attica, became demes. See S.M. Sherwin-White, *op. cit.* (see p. 33) Chapter 2. Six demes are known, increased by incorporation of the island of Calymna about 205-201 BC: Isthmiotai, Halasarnitai, Phyxiotai, Halentioi, Hippiotai, and a joint deme of the Antimachidai, Archiadai, and Aigelioi. Astypalaia on the south end of the island, was the center of the Isthmus. Throughout the whole period of the new Coan government the state eponym was a monarchos, an unexpected title. Since no document uses

the eponymous monarchos before the date of the synoikismos, a controversy has arisen about whether it could have existed before that time. Those who reject an earlier date must then reckon with a statement in the *Life of Hippocrates*, attributed to a Soranus of Cos that the famous physician was born in the first year of the 80th Olympiad μοναρχοῦντος Ἀβριάδα, μηνὸς Ἀγριανοῦ κζ'. Cf. Sherwin-White, *op. cit.* (see p. 33) 189ff. and 355. This information puts the Coan monarchos back into the fifth century. Some have rejected it, and have introduced fanciful theories about the origin of the eponymous magistrate¹² Epigraphic examples of its use do not appear until the third century: e.g. Schwyzer, *GDE* 253 (*SIG*³ 1023, third to second century) is a tribal decree from Halasarna on Cos, beginning with ἐπὶ μονάρχ[ο]υ Πραξι[τιμέν]εως μηνὸς Ὑακινθίου· ἔδο[ξ]ε ταῖς φυλαῖς etc. Similar formula at the head of another decree of the same period (but from Antimachia on Cos) is Schwyzer, *GDE* 254. A subscription list for funds during the war against Philip V, around 201-200 BC, is dated [ἐπὶ μον]άρχου Νικομήδους etc.¹³ In a catalogue of priests of Apollo, which begins very probably in 27 BC and extends year by year to the reign of Trajan, published by R. Herzog in *Sitzungsberichte Berlin* 1901, 483ff. no. 4 (lines 1-13 in *SIG*³ 793), the date is given first by the eponym: ἐπὶ μονάρχου Ῥηγίλλου, μηνὸς Ὑακινθίου τετράδι, etc. Later in the same catalogue it is said of a priest (95) that μετὰ τὸ μο(ναρχή-σαι) Κώων ἱεράτευσε γεννηθεὶς ἐν Ἀλασάρνῃ, which separates that priesthood from the eponymous monarchos and suggests some kind of hierarchy. For discussion of the list of priest see Sherwin-White, *op. cit.* (see p. 33) 147-148. Interesting in this regard is the inscription Paton-Hicks (*The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford 1891) 417 (*SGDI* 3742) from the early years of the first century BC: Στράτων καὶ Εὐταξία οἱ Στράτωνος τὰν στάλαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς Στράτωνος τοῦ β Πρατίω(ν)ος, ἀρχι(ι)ερατεύσαντος καὶ δαμαρχήσαντος καὶ πρηγιστεύσαντος, κατὰ πόλιν μοναρχεῦν[τος ---].

The persistence of local tradition and pride in the deme of Antimachia is seen in Paton-Hicks 391 (*IGRR* IV 1102) where the date is given first by the year of Caligula (AD 37) and is followed immediately by δαμαρχεῦντος Σέξτου Ποπιλλίου[υ ---] υἱοῦ Ῥούφου φιλοκαίσαρος [---].

Very often the Greek cities accepted the priest of Roma and Augustus as a second eponym after their own state eponym. An example of this from Cos appears to be found in Paton-Hicks 344 (*IGRR* IV 1087): ἐπὶ μον(άρχου) Ἀνάνορος, ἱερέως δὲ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεο[ῦ] Σεβαστοῦ Νεικαγόρα followed by the day of the month. Cf. Robert, *Opera Minora* 1.567 note. As for the coins from Cos, it appears that some fifty percent of all the names that are read on those coins agree with the names of known Coan eponyms, at least in the period of about 300 to 145 BC: Sherwin-White, *Op. cit.* (p. 33) 188. And the use of ἐπὶ with a personal name on amphora handles from Cos probably indicates the monarchos as well.

¹² G. Pugliese Carratelli in *La Parola del Passato* 12 (1957) 333-342 theorized that the eponymous monarchos had not been the eponym of Cos back in the fifth century but that it had been introduced only after the time of the synoikismos by the Asklepiadaei of the deme Isthmos. For discussion and rejection see Elizabeth F. Craik in *La Parola del Passato* 22 (1967) 443-445 and Sherwin-White, *op. cit.* (above) 189ff.

¹³ Cos had joined with Rhodes in the attempt to stop the advance of Philip. Paton-Hicks no. 10 (*SGDI* 3624 a, line 1). The list is extremely long, engraved on four sides of a large marble stele, found in Rhodes. See Sherwin-White, *Op. cit.* (above) 120-121.

31. CRETE

On Crete it was not the locality so much as the tribe that formed the rock-bed of society and politics, especially among the aristocracy, and the tribes included not only the Doric Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanes but also many others of the older population, such as the Aischeis, Aithaleis, and Echanoreis. Each tribe, of course, had its particular connections with local land. From the aristocracy in each of the cities the kosmoi were elected, the tribes of each city taking turns in providing them. The resulting college of ten kosmoi (the number varied) was responsible for 'ordering' the affairs of each city. Collectively they could be called simply κόσμος in the singular or οἱ κοσμίοντες. The chief or president of their college was eponymous and he tended in time to be called πρωτόκοσμος. To aid the college was the usual Boule and Agora. By the third century the power of the aristocracy had been broken and each Agora had been transformed into a democratic Ekklesia. Probably connected with that transfer of political power was the emergence in the third century of a Cretan League with its center at Knossos: Polybius 4.53.4. Official documents of the League were dated by the kosmoi of Gortyn and Knossos. This is clear from a decree of the League during the second century which granted asyilia to Anaphe (*IG XII 3,254*): [ἐδο]ξε τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τῶ[ι κοινῶ]ι τῶν Κρηταιέων Κνω[σοῖ ἐ]ν τῶι συνλόγῳι, κορμι[όντων ἐν Γόρτυνι μὲν ἐπὶ τῶ]ν Δυμάνων τῶν σὺν [---]ίῳι τῶι Ἀπολλοδάμῳ [ἔτος τ]ὸ δεύτερον μηνὸς [---]ιήῳι τετραδί, Κνωσο[ῖ δὲ ἐ]πὶ τῶν Αἰθαλέων κο[ρμιόντων] τῶν σὺν Κυψέλῳ[ι τῶι Ἐν-α]ρρέτῳ μηνὸς Αὐδοῦ[ναίῳ ἰκά]δι· etc. See M. Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York 1931) Chapter 1, for the importance of this decree.

All Cretan cities, with two exceptions, used the college of kosmoi collectively or the protokosmos individually as eponym. The formula of eponymity could take several forms, and the one that was most common in the Greek world was also common enough in Crete. *I.Cret.* I, vi no. 2 (Biannos) is a decree of the second century: ἐπὶ κόσμου Δεξίου τοῦ Γλαύκου, μηνὸς Ἐλε[υσίνιου]. Similar formula in *I.Cret.* II, xiii (Elyyros) no. 2. Cf. I, xvi (found in Delos) no. 4 B, 57: ἐπὶ Ἀγήμονος Κνωσοῖ κόσμῳ. I, xxii (Olos) no. 12: ἐπὶ κόσμου + name (reign of Tiberius). The plural is found in I, xvi (Lato) no. 5 (line 84): ἐπὶ κόσμων (Λατῶι) with the president's name, while in the same inscription (line 1) we find κοσμιόντων ἐν μὲν Λατῶι with the president's name.

However, by far the most common formula is ἐπί + tribe + participle + president's name. E.g. I, viii (Knossos) no. 14: ἐπὶ τῶν Παμφύλων κο[σ]μιόντων τῶν σὺν Τι[μο]κράτει ἔδοξε etc. This type of participial formula is found in many cities: I, ix (Dreros) no. 1 A; I, xvi no. 3* (found in Delos, *I. Délos* 1514); I, xvi (Lato) nos. 26, 29, and 32; I, xvii (Lebena) nos. 6 and 8; I, xviii (Lytos) nos. 12 and 13; III, ii (Dictaeum Fanum) no. 1; IV (Gortyn) nos. 165, 167, 182, 184, 197*; 259, where the formula is immediately followed by a list of the eleven names of the kosmoi. Also at Gortyn, no. 186, is a variety of this formula: κορμιόντων Γόρτυνι μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆιας τῶ[ν] σὺν Εὐρύττονι τῶν Μενοντίδα etc. All of these are later than the beginning of the third century. There are several examples of ἐπί + tribe + participle + all the names of the kosmoi in the college, as in I, xvi (Lato) no. 26: Ἐπὶ τῶν Ὑλλέων κοσμιόντων τῶν σὺν Κυδάννῳι τῶ Ἐνίπαντος + six more names in the Genitive. The president's name, included here, is often omitted in this type, although his

name is probably the first in the list of names: I, xvi (Lato) no. 25: [ἐπὶ] τῶν Ἐχανοπέων κοσμ[ιόντων Ἡρ]ακλ[ήτω] τῷ Θιοφείδιος, + four more names; I, xvi (Lato) no. 33 with five names, and no. 34 with five names; I, xix (Malla) no. 3 with four names; III, iii (Hierapytna) no. 9 with ten names; IV (Gortyn) no. 171 with at least six or seven names.

For the use of the word protokosmos in a context of eponymity examples begin in the third century with III, vi (Praesos) no. 8: (end of a decree) ἐπὶ πρ[ω]τοκόσμου Ἀλκαίου τοῦ Κλητωνύμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συνκόσμων φυλαῆς Φαρκαρίδος. Similar is no. 7, also from Praesos. From the Roman period comes I, xxiv (Priansos) on the stele of a Roman soldier: ἐπὶ Εὐκρ[ι]νήτω Σοάρχω πρ[ω]τοκόσμῳ. From the reign of Trajan comes I, v (Arcades) no. 9: ἐπὶ πρωτοκόσμῳ + name. A Roman protokosmos occurs in Gortyn (Vol. IV) no. 300: (A) ἐπὶ πρωτοκόσμῳ Γαίῳ Τερεντίῳ Σατορνείῳ, inscribed on a base of the second century after Christ.

The earliest example of any such formula is in IV (Gortyn) no. 72, col. V lines 5ff. (the famous Law Code of Gortyn of the early fifth century): ὅκ ὁ Αἰθ[α]λεὺς (σ)ταρτὸς ἐκόσμιον οἱ σὺν Κύ[λ]λῳι. etc.

Two Cretan cities, Olos and Polyrrhenia, require special attention, because eponymous damiorgoi are found among their epigraphical remains. *I. Cret.* II, xxiii (Polyrrhenia) no. 7 is a circular base with its front face and circular top exhibiting separate inscriptions (A and B). On the top is A: ἐπὶ δαμιοργῶν + five names in the Nominative, and then Ἐπὶ Αἰγύλω ἰαριτεύοντος Καλλίκριτος ἐποίησε. On the front of the circular base is B: ἐπὶ δαμιοργῶν ἁ πόλις ἐπεσκεύασαν ἐπὶ Σωκράτεος Στρατοκύδεος + four names in the Nominative. The lettering of A appears to be the older of the two, first part of the third century, while that of B appears to be from the end of that century or the beginning of the next. Thus, apparently, at Polyrrhenia there was a five-man college of damiorgoi with its president the eponym. Cf. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 100-101. However, it should be noted that kosmoi are mentioned, although not in contexts of eponymity, from Polyrrhenia: no. 1 of the third or second century; no. 3 of the end of the third century; no. 5 of the second century; no. 10 also of the second. M. Guarducci (in her note on p. 241 of *I. Cret.* II and in *Rivista di Filologia* 8 [1930] 55ff.) equates these damiorgoi with kosmoi. For the city of Olos the case for Cretan damiorgoi is even more pronounced. *I. Cret.* I, xxii (Olos) no. 4, contains a series of proxenia decrees from the first half of the third century. No. 4 A, section V (lines 35ff.): ἐπὶ δαμιοργῶν Λεύκου, ἔδοξε etc. Similar eponymous dates occur in the other decrees. These can now be supplemented by the eponymous damiorgoi in *SEG* XXIII 548 (decree of early second century) and 549 (decree of the second-first century). Guarducci maintains that here too the damiorgoi are to be equated with the kosmoi, despite the fact that in the Roman period the president of the kosmoi at Olos is eponymous: *I. Cret.* I, xxii no. 12 (*IGRR* I 1011): Τε[β]έριον Καίσαρα Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν Σεβαστοῦ ἁ πόλις ἐπὶ κόσμῳ Σωτηρίου etc. Another text, found in Delos (*I. Délos* 1514) but concerning Cretan affairs (*I. Cret.* I, xvi [Lato] no. 3* lines 3-4), implies that Olos had eponymous kosmoi in the second century BC.

How and when these damiorgoi had been introduced into Olos and Polyrrhenia are unknown. Chrissoula (pp. 117-120) has reviewed the evidence and found no solution to the problem. J. and L. Robert (*Bulletin* 1961 no. 494) have offered a reconstruction of another

inscription from Aptera (*BCH* 83 [1959] 752ff) which would also place eponymous damiorgoi at Cydonia. If correct, then there would have been three Cretan cities with eponymous damiorgoi. Perhaps, in one or more of these cities, there had been a change of government as a result of stasis with a corresponding change of eponym. The new government may not have lasted very long and a reversal to the old order of things occurred. Of course, there is no evidence of such a development. And outside influence cannot be discarded. Guarducci has opted for Achaean and Rhodian influences, but cf. Robert, *Opera Minora* 1.565.

32. DELOS

An early use of the eponymous archon of Delos can be seen in the period 434-432 BC in an Athenian record of the temple revenues of Apollo in Delos: *IG* I³ 402. In one of the loan periods described by that inscription (lines 14ff.) we find: χρόνος ἄρχει Μεταγειτινίων μὴν Ἀθήν[ησιν ἄρχοντος ---, ἐν] Δήλωι δὲ Βουφονιῶν μὴν ἄρχοντος Εὐπτέρος. The fact of Athenian interest—and involvement—in Delian affairs after 454 BC is clear from this Athenian publication. This involvement will plague Delian history into Roman times, with interruptions, of course, and it will be reflected in several ways in the use of eponymous officials appearing in Delian documents of all types. Overt action of a serious nature occurred in 426 BC when the Athenians purified the island by digging up Delian graves and moving their remains to the nearby island of Rheneia (Diodorus 12.58.6). Then in 422 BC the Athenians expelled the Delians altogether from their island, having accused them either of secret negotiations with Sparta (so Diodorus 12.73.1) or else of being in a state of pollution (so Thucydides 5.1). The next year, however, they permitted the Delians to return (Thucydides 5.32.1), although they remained in control of the island. At the end of the Peloponnesian War Delos regained her freedom: see *SIG*³ 119 a (Tod II 99; *I. Délos* 87 is best text for final line and for ἦρχεν). Not long afterwards, however, the island fell once again under Athenian control with the re-emergence of Athenian power. Athens administered the temple of Apollo but did nothing to interfere with the external working of the Delian government machinery. Cf., e.g., *I. Délos* 98 (*SIG*³ 153), the account of Athenian officials concerning the Delian temple, 377/6 BC, (lines 1ff.): τάδε ἔπραξαν Ἀμφικτύονες Ἀθηναίων ἀπὸ Καλλέο ἄρχοντος μέχρι τῷ θαρρηλιῶνος μηνὸς τῷ ἐπὶ Ἴπποδάμαντος ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι, ἐν Δήλωι δὲ ἀπὸ Ἐπιγένου ἄρχοντος μέχρι τῷ θαρρηλιῶνος μηνὸς τῷ ἐπὶ Ἴππίο ἄρχοντος, χρόνον ὅσον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἦρξεν. Thus, the Delian eponymous archon still dates documents in an inscription set up in Athens.

For the remainder of this fourth century Delos not only issued proxenia decrees but also gave special prominence to the use of its own eponymous archon Praxiteles in one such decree (Durrbach, *Choix* I 12): ἐπὶ Πραξιτέλους ἄρχοντος τῆς πόλεως· ἔδοξεν etc. Here the addition of 'the city' is most striking and unusual. Thus, Delos managed to retain her own government in this new period of Athenian activity on Delos. Cf. W.A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos* (Oxford 1933) 82.

After the death of Alexander the Great and the actions of Antigonos against his rivals, soon after Antigonos had proclaimed that all Greek cities should be free (Diodorus 19.54), Delos regained her freedom in 314 BC. Cf. Laidlaw, *op. cit.* 88-90, as well as W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 49-51. For the next 148 years Delos was free and in-

dependent, and this time the city also had control over the administration of the temple of Apollo, which was after all the main reason for the prominence of the little island. Delian hieropoioi now replaced the old Athenian Amphictions for the great temple accounts year after year. The accounts (*IG XI 2,135-289*) of these Delian hieropoioi are dated by Delian archons. Choregic monuments of this period are also dated by the Delian eponymous archons: *IG XI 2,105-134*. From all of these records and other evidence a tentative list of Delian archons from about 314 to about 168 has been compiled. There is a list of them in Laidlaw, *op. cit.* 275-277, and for the earlier period before 314 see J. Treheux in *Études d'archéologique classique* 5 (1976) 87-95. Durrbach also has demonstrated that a fragmented list of names (*IG XI 4,1067*) is part of a list of Delian archons from 326/5 to 315/14, from the period 314 to 302, from 298 to 291, from 197 to 180, and from 176 to 174 BC.

The period of 'free Delos' ended in 166 BC, when, after the Roman defeat of Perseus, the Athenians were given control of Delos by the Roman senate (Polybius 30.20), and the Delians were forced to evacuate their island (Polybius 32.7). They sailed away and settled in Achaëa. For the whole history of Delos from 166 BC onwards see P. Roussel, *Délos colonie athenienne*, Paris 1916. Athenian klerouchoi (*I. Délos* 1497ff.) arrived at Delos and replaced the exiled population. The event is mentioned in a document of the period 166-130 BC: *SIG³ 657* (Durrbach, *Choix* II 76) Φωκίων Ἀριστοκράτου Μελιτεὺς γυμνασιαρχήσας ἀνέγραψεν τοὺς γυμνασιαρχήσαντας ἀφ' οὗ ὁ δῆμος διὰ Ῥωμαίων ἀνεκτίσατο τὴν νῆσον. Athenian victory, however, was bitter, for Rome declared Delos a free port and the Athenians were thus denied the lucrative port fees and related revenues. For the next 78 years the history of Delos is the history of traders and foreign nationals. Henceforth the eponymous archon was that of Athens, and the presence of an annually elected governor called the epimeletes added to the dependent nature of the new community. Even the local gymnasiarch was an Athenian from Athens. Occasionally this colonial aspect appears in the documents, when, e.g., the Association of Traders and Shipowners of Berytus honors the People of Athens and dates the document ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Νικοδήμου (Durrbach II 118). Frequently in the documents after 166 BC the Athenian archon and the epimeletes are used together for dating, and, thus, in a special sense they were both eponymous magistrates at Delos. Often, the epimeletes now dates a document by himself, especially in first century or later dedications: *I. Délos* 1562, 1587, 1621, 1624-1626, 1761, and 1873. Very often a priest also appears in such a context, either alone or with the epimeletes: *I. Délos* 1592 (priest of Apollo between 21 and 12 BC), 1593, 1594, 1892, 1894, 1897, 2092-2094, etc.¹⁴ The Athenian archon continued to be employed as eponymous at Delos at least into the reign of Antoninus Pius (*I. Délos* 2538 = Durrbach II 182 in part).

33. IMBROS

The neighboring islands of Imbros and Lemnos generally shared a similar history vis-à-vis Athens, since Athenian klerouchoi were present on both islands from about the middle of the fifth century. See R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 424-425. However, even though Athenian possession or control continued over them until at least the opening

¹⁴ For the cult personnel at Delos see P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970) 504-506.

years of the third century after Christ, there were many periods when both islands were free and independent of Athens, periods in which we might expect to find Imbrian and Lemnian local eponymous magistrates instead of the Athenian archon. A review of those major periods of independence is in order.

At the end of the Peloponnesian War Athens lost the islands but recovered them rather quickly, for by 392 BC she was again in control (Andocides 3.12 and Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.8.15 and 5.1.31). Then, after the death of Alexander the Great and the beginning of the conflict between his generals, Antigonos eventually took to the sea and stirred up rebellion against Cassander and Macedonia. An important aspect of Antigonos' policy was the issuance in 315 BC of a decree that 'all Greeks were free and without garrison, and autonomous' (Diodorus 19.61.3). As a consequence both Lemnos and Imbros gained their independence in 314 BC: Diodorus 19.68.3, and cf. K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² (Berlin 1925) 4.1, p. 123 n. 1 as well as S. Shebelew in *Klio* 2 (1902) 36ff., and W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 49ff. Not long afterwards, in 307 BC, Antigonos withdrew from Imbros and gave the island back to Athens (Diodorus 20.46.4). Diodorus does not mention Lemnos in this regard, but it may be assumed that Lemnos also reverted to Athens at that time, since the accounts of the Treasurers of Athena for 305/4 BC include a considerable amount of money paid to Athens ἐγ Λήμνου καὶ Ἴμβρου (*IG* II² 1492 line 133 [*SIG*³ 334 line 41]). Thus, independence from 314 to 307/6 BC. Cf. Shebelew, *op. cit.* 38, and Beloch, *op. cit.* 152 n. 1.

The picture changes again a few years later, as we learn from a passage in Athenaeus 6.254 f to 255 a (= Phylarchos *FGrHist* 81 F 29). This passage makes clear several historical facts: first, that Lemnos had fallen into the hands of Lysimachus, secondly that Seleucus liberated the island, and thirdly that the Athenians of Lemnos had high praise for Seleucus. The liberation by Seleucus could only have taken place before or possibly because of the victory over Lysimachus at Corupedium in 281 BC. Again, independence of Lemnos (and probably Imbros) was short-lived, for by 279/8 BC three Athenian decrees (*IG* II² 672) then show that Athens is back in control: cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.* 155-156 for an outline of the decrees. But when did Lysimachus obtain possession of the islands? Perhaps 288 BC (Beloch, *op. cit.* 219 n. 1) or even later (Shebelew, *op. cit.* 39-40). Thus, independence from about 288 to perhaps 281 or 280 BC. Athens had recovered her insular colonies. In the later years of that third century the actions of Philip V must have quickly swallowed them up once again. A letter of Philip (*SEG* XII 399) addressed to the 'Boule and Demos of the Athenians in Hephaestia' belongs to this period. After Philip's defeat in 197 BC the new Roman policy was one of freedom for the Greeks, and thus independence came to Lemnos (Polybius 18.44 [Myrina] and 48 [Hephaestia]), and also to the other islands. A new war, against Perseus, some thirty years later changed that independence to Athenian possession once more. In 166 BC Imbros, Skyros, Lemnos, and Delos were restored to Athens by Rome (Polybius 30.20).

With such a checkered history it becomes difficult to make decisions about details of the administration on these islands, as Athenian possession alternated with insular independence, especially in regard to the eponymous magistrate. Was a Lemnian or Imbrian archon the eponym regularly in periods of independence and the Athenian archon in periods of Athenian

possession? At Imbros it is probably in the period 314-307 BC that *IG XII 8, 48* was engraved. It is a decree and an Imbrian archon dates it: [ἐπὶ] Ἀξιόχου ἄρχοντος. In the second century *IG XII 8, 51* (lines 13-14) records that Imbrian πράκτορες were at work 'in the archonship of Ktesikrates', who appears to have been an Imbrian archon. Between AD 160 and 180 Imbros was still in a position of dependence on Athens, since *IG XII 8,216* mentions a strategos ('governor') 'of the Athenians in Imbros'.

34. LEMNOS

For the complex nature of the political situation on Lemnos see No. 33 (IMBROS).

As klerouchic land and peopled by Athenians in the Classical period it is not surprising to find at Lemnos not only the expected Athenian-style administration but also the legal institutions that parallel those in Athens. A case in point is hypothecation, i.e. the legal process by which property is put up as security for a loan. Special markers (ὄροι) were erected on the land with the information engraved on them. The basic study is by M.I. Finley, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.* (New Brunswick and Oxford, new edition 1985). One of the few places outside of Athens where hypothecation existed is in the klerouchic islands of Lemnos, Naxos, and Skyros. Finley has reproduced the texts of all such inscriptions in an excellent appendix, pp. 118-171. One of them (*IG XII 8,18*; Finley No. 104) is dated ἐπὶ ἄρχ[ον]τος Νικοδώρου, and an Athenian archon with that name is known to have held office in 314/3 BC, precisely when a period of Lemnian independence from Athens begins. A second such inscription (*IG XII 8,19*; Finley Nos. 107-108) contains two hypothecations on the same stone. The first is dated to the archonship of Nikodoros and the second to the archonship of a certain Archias. Nikodoros is almost certainly the Athenian archon of 314/3 BC, but Archias is otherwise unknown as an archon in Athens. Therefore, I believe we must accept Archias as a Lemnian archon in the period 313/2-307/6 BC. M. Segre in *Annuario* 15-16 (1932-1933) 298ff. also makes Nikodoros a Lemnian archon, but I believe the chronology bears out my own view. Segre, *op. cit.* 298 no. 6 (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1949 no. 135) published a new hypothecation stone, conveniently reproduced by Finley (No. 10), of the third century. It begins ἐπὶ Μενάιχμου [ἄρχοντος] etc. Segre makes Menaichos a Lemnian archon, and rightly so, for he is unknown as an archon at Athens. For the Roman imperial period, third century, we hear of a P. Aelius Ergochares Prospaltius (*IG XII 8,27*) ἄρξαντα τὴν ἐπόνυμον ἀρχήν, whose career included the offices of gymnasiarch, (local) strategos, and agoranomos. Another inscription, not too many years before AD 212, is also dated by an archon, published by S. Follet in *Annuario* 52-52 (1974-1975) 309-312 (*SEG XXVIII 718*) [--ἐπιμ]ε[λητοῦ τῆς Λή]μνου Μενεκράτο[υς Στ]ειριέως νν ἐπὶ ἄρχον[τος Θυ]μελικοῦ Θορικίου ὁ στρατηγὸς καὶ ἀγωνοθ[έ]της τῶν Ἐφαιστειῶν κ[αὶ] ἐπιμελητῆς γυμνασ[ει]αρχίας Ἀρίσταρχος Γ[εμέλ-]λου Πειραι[εὺς ἀνέγρα]ψε[ν]. J. and L. Robert (*Bulletin* 1979, no. 343) suggest the possibility that the beginning of the text might contain a double date, the first by the epimeletes and then by the Athenian archon Thymelikos, which would require a change in the last word.

35. LEPSIA

This little island, southwest of Miletus, had been colonized by the Milesians at an early but unknown date. Two of its Hellenistic decrees attest the presence of Milesians: ἔδοξε Μι-

λησίων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Λ[ε]ψίαι etc. at the beginning of the first one, and ἔδοξε τῶν πολιτῶν τοῖς κατοικο[ῦσιν] ἐν Λεψίαι etc. at the beginning of the second: G. Manganaro in *Annuario* 41-42 (1963-1964) pp. 318ff., nos. 18 and 19. And in two dedications (Manganaro, *op. cit.* pp. 322-323, nos. 21 and 22) the date is by the eponymous stephanephoros of Miletus. No. 21 is dated to 41/40 BC.

36. LEROS

Located just to the south of Lepsia, the island of Leros was a colony of Miletus at a very early date: Strabo 14.1.6 and cf. J.L. Benson, *Ancient Leros* (Durham, N. Carolina, 1963) 46ff. A long decree from there is dated by the eponymous stephanephoros of Miletus: L. Büchner in *Athen. Mitt.* 21 (1896) 34-34, now republished with photograph by Manganaro, *op. cit.* (above, No. 35, Lepsia) p. 305 no. 2, which begins ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Σωσιστράτο[υ], μηνὸς Μεταγειτνιῶνος εἰκάδ[ι]· ἔδοξε Λερίων κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Λέρῳ etc. Its date is toward the end of the second century.

37. LESBOS

In its first five lines *IG XII Suppl.* 136 indicates that the eponymous magistrate in each of four cities—Mytilene, Methymna, Antissa, and Eresos—was a prytanis. The document is a treaty whereby the four cities agree to form a koinon, a Lesbian Confederacy with its center at a federal sanctuary at Messon in the center of the island. Cf. L. Robert, *Opera Minora* II 730ff. and 818ff. The date is prior to 167 BC, since Antissa is included—Antissa was destroyed by the Romans and its people evacuated to Methymna in 167 BC (Livy 45.31.14)—and after 197/6 BC when Flamininus proclaimed the freedom of the Greeks. The treaty begins: ἀγάθα τύχα· ἐπὶ προτάνιος ἐμ Μ[υτιλήνα ---, μηνὸς] Θεδαισίῳ, ἐν δὲ Μαθύμνα ἐπὶ προτ[άνιος ---, ἐν δὲ] Ἄντισσα[ς] ἐπὶ προτάν[ι]ος Κλεαφέν[εος --- ἐν δὲ Ἐρέσῳ ἐπὶ προτάνι]ος Ἀγεμόρτω Με[λ]αντάῳ, μηνὸς Δα[ισίῳ --- εἰς] τὸν ἄει [χ]ρόνον ἐμ Μέσσω etc. The prytanis of Eresos is amply attested elsewhere, and numerous inscriptions for all the others exist.

Methymna

IG XII 2,498 begins with the names of King Ptolemy (Philopator) and his wife Berenike, gods euergetai, followed by ἀγάθα τύχα· ἐπὶ πρυτάνιος Ἀρχία, ἔδοξε τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Πρωτέων etc. No. 500 begins with [ἐ]πὶ πρυτάνιος [Τ]υφαί[τ]η (?) μηνὸς Πτ[---]νος τεταρίῳ ἔδοξε τῷ κοινῷ etc. Similar formulae in nos. 502-503. *IG XII Suppl.* 116 begins with a prytany dating followed by a decree of the Young Men for 129 BC. *Suppl.* 114 contains an unusual phrase. It is a decree honoring those who had been agoranomoi [κ]ατὰ [πρ]ύτανιν Ἀπελλίαν (line 10). Is κατὰ here a variation for ἐπί + Genitive?

Eresos

Phainias of Eresos wrote the πρυτάνεις Ἐρεσίων in at least two books: Frag. 17a in F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* IX (Basel 1957) p. 14, quoted from Athenaeus 8.333a. An interesting variant of the formula for eponymity is used in *IG XII* 2,526 (*OGIS* 8, *Tod* II 191), which is a series of documents concerning tyranny at Eresos (332 BC and later). The

sixth document is dated (line 105) by simple mention in the Nominative of πρότανις Με-λίδωρος. *IG XII Suppl.* 124 is dated in the body of the text by ἐν τ[ε] προτάνει Κλα]υδίῳ Νέρωνι (lines 4-5) and ἐν δὲ προτάνει Γαίῳ Καίσαρι τῷ παίδι τῷ Σεβάστ[ῳ ἀ]γίμονι [τᾶς νεότατ]ος, member of the imperial house.

Mytilene

It is at Mytilene that we can track the eponymous office of prytanis to the end of the seventh or very early in the sixth century BC. There was political upheaval at that period in Mytilene, brought on by the oppression of the citizenry by the aristocratic ruling society. Both Sappho and Alcaeus had been caught up in it. Finally, Pittakos was summoned by the people to end the crisis. For the details see Diogenes Laertius 1.74ff. and Strabo 13.617. Pittakos ruled for ten years as a special kind of tyrant, elected by the people to the office of aisymnetes with unlimited power: see the remarks of Aristotle, *Politics* 1285a 30ff. and 1311b, as well as Dionysius of Halicarnassus 5.73, who equates him with the Roman dictator. A reference by Theophrastus of Eresos connects this early age of stasis in Mytilene with the office of prytanis. It is found in Fragment 97 (Wimmer) as cited by Stobaeus (*Florilegium* 44.22.1) and begins as follows: οἱ μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ κήρυκος κελεύουσι πωλεῖν καὶ προκηρύττειν ἐκ πλειόνων ἡμερῶν, οἱ δὲ παρ' ἀρχῆς τινι, καθάπερ καὶ Πιττακὸς παρὰ βασιλεῦσι καὶ πρυτάνει. 'Some issue orders that sales (of property) be conducted by a herald and that an announcement be made many days in advance, but others (do so) in the presence of some authority, just as Pittakos did in the presence of basileis and a prytanis'. The unusual phrase 'basileis and a prytanis' in the terminology of Mytilenean government recurs in several places. A decree from Eresos of the Hellenistic age shows that it was current there as well, published by S. Charitonides (αἱ ἐπιγραφὰὶ τῆς Λέσβου, Συμπλήρωμα, [Athens 1968] 84-85, no. 122). Line 3: [πρ]ύτανις Λέων Δαμάρχω καὶ οἱ βασιλέες + three names that obviously formed a college with the prytanis perhaps at its head. Cf. Gschnitzer in *RE Suppl.* 13, 746. It would appear that when the power of the Lesbian kings had been curtailed, they were forced to accept a prytanis (from the aristocracy, no doubt) as some sort of partner in rule, much the same way as it had happened in Athens. A college of 'kings' then shared power with the prytanis down through the centuries. This prytanis is still in existence, with a different set of powers perhaps, in the third century after Christ, when an inscription (*IG XII* 2,255) mentions a woman as τὰν λόγιον πρύτανιν—the stone reads ΤΑΝΑΟΓΙΟΝΠΙΠΙ-ΤΑΝΗΝ. There is another λόγιον πρότανιν in *IG XII Suppl.* 65. Another decree of Eresos also records the 'basileis and a prytanis', found at Miletus (*Milet* I 3,152 and *IG XII Suppl.* 139), from which we learn that they are to invite the Milesian judges—who had arbitrated a dispute for them—to the Prytaneion. The date appears to be early in the second century. Cf. L. Robert, *Opera Minora* II 721ff. I do not know what to make of the plural 'prytaneis' in *IG XII Suppl.* 137, lines 45-46, where the 'basileis and the prytaneis' are to announce the bestowal of crowns. It also belongs to the second century, from Mytilene. I am equally puzzled by the above-mentioned Milesian inscription in which (A 15) occurs the phrase ὁ πρύτανις καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς, both in the singular. Stonecutter's error?

In the age of the Antonines we find a certain Flavia Publicia Nikomachis (*IG XII* 2,240) τὰν δι' αἰῶνος πρύτανιν. On the phrase see L. Robert, *Opera Minora* II 811. *IG XII* 2,74

(*SIG*³ 968) of the third century begins with ἐπὶ προτάνιος Ξενοκλῆ in a catalogue of property, repeated with different names year after year. Finally, *IG* XII 2,6 is concerned with the return of the exiles to Mytilene at the orders of Alexander the Great, and it is dated line 36 in the usual form. The inscription also mentions the college of basileis. See Heisserer, Chapter 5.

The coinage of Mytilene, Eresos, and Methymna very often bears the legend ἐπὶ στρ(ατηγοῦ) and a single name. I assume the strategos was simply in charge of the mint or else authorized the issuance of the coins. All of these range from the age of Augustus to the middle of the third century. See Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 79-80.

38. MELOS

For Melos there is no evidence to indicate the nature of the eponymous magistrate until the first century after Christ. *IG* XII 3,1226 (Suppl. p. 93) is a sepulchral monument to a citizen of Melos who ἔζησε μέχρι Μνασέα ἄρχοντος ἡμέρας δισμυρίας βψπ'. *IG* XII 3,1116 (lines 7ff.): ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησεν ἄρξαντα δις τὴν στεφανηφόρον τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἀρχὴν etc., said of a person who had been life-long priest of Tiberius and (the dead) Augustus. No. 1119 is an honorary inscription of the Flavian period (or later) dated in line 5 by mention of the person responsible for setting it up, a person described as τοῦ πρώτου ἄρχοντος Πο(πλίου) Αἰλίου Λειοῦ Φλαουιανοῦ Μηνογένου ἀρχιερῆως καὶ (ἰ)ερῆως. And a coin in the British Museum (107) bears the legend ἐπὶ ἄρχ(οντος) Φλ. Ἐπαφοδίτου. Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 58. Perhaps the tradition of an eponymous archon began with the sending out of 500 Athenian colonists after their massacre of the Melian population and the enslavement of the rest. *IG* XII 3,1104 indicates the existence of a college of three demiourgoi involved in the construction or restoration of a temple of the Augustan period, but they are not eponymous. Their primary purpose is to record their involvement in the project.

39. MYKONOS

Among the few epigraphical remains of Mykonos is a religious calendar (*SIG*³ 1024), which fortunately indicates that its government was not only democratic but also that it possessed a college of archons. It begins: θεοί. τύχηι ἀγαθῆι· ἐπ' ἀρχόντων Κρατίνου, Πολυζήλου, Φιλόφρονος, ὅτε συνωικίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, τάδε ἔδοξεν Μυκονίοις etc. I assume that the archon named first, Kratinos, was the eponymous member of the college of three.

40. NAXOS

An obstacle to the correct understanding of eponymity in Naxos is the presence of *IG* XII 5,38 among the inscriptions of that island, because it clearly shows the use of eponymous demiourgoi. However, L. Robert has shown that the stone did not originate from Naxos but from Amorgos. See his remarks in *Opera Minora* 1.530ff. Throughout the Hellenistic period the eponymous magistrate of Naxos was not an individual but a pair of aisymnetes, as is perfectly clear from *IG* XII 7,67 B (*SIG*³ 955) fourth or the third century. It was found at Arce-sine on Amorgos but concerns both places: [τύ]χ[η] ἀ[γαθῆ]. μη[νὸς Ἐκ]ατομβαιῶνος

ἐν Νάξῳ αἰσυμνών[των ---]ένους καὶ Σωστράτου, ἐν Ἀρκεσίνῃ δὲ μηνὸς Μιλοφοριῶνος, [ἄρχ]οντος Κτησιφῶντος, etc. Also a treaty (?) between Eretria and Naxos, of the third century, supports the pair of aisymnetes: *IG XII 9,223* (lines 4ff.) may be restored [ἐμ μὲν Νάξῳ] αἰσυ[μ]νόντων Σω[---] etc. The restoration of 'Naxos' here is assured by the mention of the Naxians later in the same document, which may or may not be a treaty.

A problem now arises in this third century BC, for a dating by archon appears in a hypothecation marker (see No. 34. LEMNOS). *IG XII Suppl. 195* (Finley No. 156): [ὄ]ρος οἰκίας ἀπ[ὸ κε]ράμου καὶ σκευ[ῶν τῶν ἐν] τῇ οἰκίᾳ πάντων τῶν ἀποτετιμημένων τῇ δεῖνι ἐν προικὶ ἐπ' ἄρχ[οντος Τιμα]γόρου etc., followed by the valuation of the property. Despite the fact that Naxos had been klerouchic land back in the fifth century, I see no reason to believe that [---]goras was an Athenian archon in the Hellenistic period. He must be a local Naxian archon and, accordingly, we must accept a change in eponymy in Naxos from aisymnetes to archon sometime in the third century. And there is support for this in the Roman period. *IG XII 5,54* appears to be a list (in the Genitive) of the officials in a religious association in the second century after Christ, headed by ἄρχοντος τὸ δεύτερον τ[οῦ ἀρχ]ι[ε]ρ[έ]ω[ς] τῶν Σεβαστ[ῶν ---]νος τοῦ Ῥούφου, etc. One might argue that he was archon in the association (cf. F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* [Leipzig 1909] 361-363 for such an archon), but then there is *IG XII 5,1016*, also of imperial date, which reads ἄρχοντος Βλάστου τὸ β' Κερῶ Διογένου ὑπὲρ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς Ἑρμέος ἐπὶ ναποοῦ Φλα. Κίσσου [---]. Of course, this too might be explained differently. However, I accept a change in eponymy.

41. NESOS

The Hekatonnesoi are located northeast of Lesbos and just off the coast of Asia Minor, the largest of them called simply Nesos. Down to the age of Alexander Nesos was politically dependent on Mytilene, but then 333 BC onward it was free to develop its own democratic institutions. Nesos became the central power of the other small islands around it, and the inhabitants were called Nesiotai. Inscriptions are few in number, but *IG XII 2,646* is revealing. It is a very long record, probably from the temple of Asklepios, mentioned in line 37, a record of the amount of money paid to the temple from fines exacted against various people. The first group of fines concerned sailors who had deserted: οἱ [λι]π[όν]αυ[τα]ι ἐπ[ὶ] πρυ[τά]νι[ος] Παῖσι[κρέοντος]. The names of four such eponymous prytaneis are listed in the badly mutilated text, perhaps the first of those instituted after the founding of the state in 333 BC, as W. Schwahn suggests in *RE XVII 71*.

42. NISYROS

Down to the last decade of the third century BC there are good reasons for believing that the island of Nisyros had been independent of Rhodes: see P.M. Fraser and G.E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (Oxford 1954) 147-148. This is supported by the existence of an eponymous damiergos at Nisyros in the third century. Michael Chaviaras in the *Archaiologike Ephemeris* for 1913, p. 8 no. 2, published a decree of Nisyros dated by the lettering to the third century: ἐπὶ δαμιεργοῦ Ἀγλ[---] μηνὸς Σμινθίου· προστα[τῶν τῶν σὺν] Χαίροξένου Ἐχελ[αίδα]. ἔδοξε τῷ δάμωι· βουλᾶς γνώμα. ἐπειδὴ [Κα]λλίθεμις Σατύρου [---],

and there it ends. If Nisyros had been incorporated into the Rhodian state by that time, the eponymous official would have been the priest of the Sun at Rhodes and the word δάμωι would not have been used. Further evidence that independent Nisyros had an eponymous damiergos can be seen in another decree of Nisyros, also dated by the lettering to the third century: *IG XII 3,89*. Its prescript begins with [ἐ]πὶ δαμιεργοῦ Πεισίου καὶ προστα- [τ]ᾶν τῶν σὺν Θαλιάρχῳ Διδυμάρ[χ]ου, μηνὸς Δαλίου· [ἔδ]οξε τῷ δάμωι, βουλᾶς γνώμα· etc. The addition of the prostatai does not make them 'Quasi-Eponyme', as Chris-soula has called them, as an examination of the first decree, quoted above, and of *IG XII 3,88* and 91 will show. There was only the eponymous damiergos at Nisyros in the third century.

The whole picture changes toward the end of the third century, as Fraser-Bean, *op. cit.* 148ff., have shown. This is the period when Philip V of Macedon began his aggressive actions against the Greek cities of Asia Minor. In 205 or 204 BC Philip turned a certain Dikaiar-chos loose in the Aegean against the islands of the Cyclades and the cities of the Hellespont area to commit acts of piracy, and he helped the Cretans in their war against Rhodes (Polybius 18.54.8 and Diodorus 28.1; see M. Holleaux on these events in his *Études IV*, 124ff.). Eventually, after further advances, Philip moved south among the islands in 201 BC and faced the combined navies of Rhodes and Pergamum, but without a decisive victory for either side. Later, at Lade, Philip fared much better and Rhodes was humiliated. A short letter of Philip to Nisyros and the reply of Nisyros at this point in time now commands our attention: *IG XII 3,91 (SIG³ 572)*. In this letter Philip says that he has sent his envoy Kallias to Nisyros with orders 'to tell you what I want you to know'. The Nisyrians had this letter engraved on a marble stele, and then also engraved on the same stone, immediately below it, their reply. Their reply begins with the prescript to a decree: ἐπὶ Λυσικράτεος δαμιεργοῦ, μηνὸς Καρνείου ἰκάδι, ἔδοξε τῷ δάμωι, βουλᾶς γνώμαι· etc. Their reply also is precise and businesslike, but it breaks off just as the formula of resolution begins. The extant portion of their reply, however, is important: 'Since Kallias is present bringing with him a letter from King Philip and the king's seal and announcing that the king has allowed us to enjoy our existing ancestral laws, it has been decreed by the Nisyrians that Kallias announce that [---] enjoy all [---]', where it breaks off. W.E. Thompson in *TAPA 102 (1971) 615-620* is the latest scholar to have analyzed this inscription since Fraser-Bean, *op. cit.* 148ff. He proceeds on the assumption that 'There is fairly good evidence that Nisyros was actually part of the Rhodian state as early as the First Cretan War, which probably began in 204'. There is no such good evidence. All is assumption, not based on any sort of factual evidence. The use of the old eponymous damiergos of Nisyros in the decree indicates, of course, that it is at that time independent of Rhodes. Philip may simply have captured an independent Nisyros and then announced that it could continue to use its regular government as before. Nothing about Rhodes. Philip turned to more important operations on the mainland. Both Fraser-Bean, as well as earlier investigators, and Thompson have used an honorary inscription on a base of white marble from Nisyros to explain relations between Nisyros and Philip and to determine the status of that island in relation to Rhodes: *IG XII 3,103 (SIG³ 673)*. M. Holleaux has done the most in illustrating the background and the career of the honorand, in *Études IV* 163-177, but the text has its complications and the results of many attempts at solution are all inconclusive. The name of the honorand is missing, but the mutilated remains of the opening

lines show that several persons erected the monument to honor him, their grandfather whose accomplishments in Rhodian public service are then listed in the following order: strategos in a Cretan war ἐπὶ Ἀσ[---]ς; honored with a public commendation, with a golden crown, and with a front seat at games celebrated by the Nisyrians; (earlier?) military service in war [in company with or under the command of] the admirals Kleonaios, Akesimbrotos, and Eudamos; and a public expression of thanks in various places. The grandfather was from Nisyros but was also a citizen of Rhodes—how else could he have held high command in Rhodian service? This makes Nisyros a part of the Rhodian state at the time of the Cretan war when As[---] was eponymous priest of the Sun at Rhodes. There were two Cretan wars, the First in 204-201 BC and the Second in 155-153 BC. See M. Holleaux, *Études* IV 163-177, for the First one. Which one is meant in our inscription? Despite all the intricate, sometimes tortuous, explanations given by scholars—notably Holleaux (169ff.), Fraser-Bean (148ff.), and Thompson (617)—we simply don't know which one is meant. The most we may say is that sometime in or after 204 BC Nisyros became a part of the Rhodian state. The name of the eponym dating that war is probably an Astymedes, known to have been priest of the Sun in the first half of the second century: Polybius 27.7.3 (171 BC); 30.4.1 ff. (168 BC); 30.30ff. (165 BC). However, his was a prominent family, and older members of it could have been our priest in the First Cretan War rather than the Second. The three admirals are also known to have been active in the period 201-190 BC, but was the grandfather's 'military service' before or after his 'strategos in a Cretan war'? Too many unknown factors are present in this text to make a reliable time-table. Nevertheless, Fraser-Bean believe that the island of Nisyros became Rhodian 'at the latest by 200 BC' (p. 151). Maybe.

43. OLIAROS

Immediately adjacent to Paros, the island of Oliaros has brought to light only one inscription of importance, a decree of late Hellenistic times that gives evidence of the normal Greek democratic institutions of government. Its prescript contains a date [---]ος ἄρχοντος, and another date appears in line 5: [ἐ]πὶ Σκύλωνος ἄρχ[οντος] etc. The suggestion by Hiller von Gaertringen in the *Corpus* that the stone might have been transported from Paros is possible, for Paros also had an eponymous archon. However, equally possible is the view that Oliaros was politically dependent upon Paros and, thus, used the Parion archon as eponym.

44. PAROS

The famous monument dedicated to the seventh century poet Archilochus of Paros appears to give us evidence of an archon list for Paros that extends back to the seventh century. The inscription on the base has long been known: *IG* XII 5,445, with new restorations and readings in *IG* XII Suppl. pp. 212-214; cf. E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*³, fasc. 3, pp. 17ff., and *SEG* XV 518 (latest text of lines 1-20). Col. 1, lines 1ff., states that a certain Demeas wrote a detailed account of Archilochus which included not only his actions in life but also his writings arranged κατ' [ἄρχοντα] ἕκαστον καὶ ἦρκται ἀπὸ ἄρχοντος πρῶτον Εὐρ[---,] etc. This must mean 'year by year, and he (Demeas) began first from the archon Eur[---].' The conclusion must be that Demeas had access to a list of Parian archons extend-

ing back to the seventh century. Cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis* p. 364 n. 64. And the use of the Parian eponymous archon is well attested to the third and even fourth centuries after Christ.

The Marmor Parium (*IG XII 5,444* and *FGrHist 239*) begins with a statement by its author that he began his chronological record from the time of Kekrops of Athens 'down to the archonship at Paros of [---]yanax and at Athens of Diognetos', i.e. in 264/3 BC. A document from Delos (*IG XI 4,1065*) is dated ὡς δὲ Πάριοι (ἄγουσιν) ἐπ' ἄρχοντος θου[---], from the second century. Also from the second century is *IG XII 5,186*, which is a list of the names of women who contributed to the repair of a fountain, altar, and shrine, dated in a heading ἐπ' ἄρχοντος τοῦ Δειφάνου. From the Roman imperial period is *IG XII 5,141*, which should be dated to the third century after Christ rather than third century before Christ: see L. Robert, *Études épigr. et phil.* p. 233. It begins with [ἐ]πώνυμος Α[---]ς Λουκίου, and in line 9 ἐπώνυμος ὁ καὶ θεοπρόπος Αὐρ. Δημο[---] *vacat* ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος Αὐρ. Ζώσιμ[ος ---]. And *IG XII 5,173* belongs to the late second or early third century after Christ. It contains a series of six short texts that are concerned with a religious superstition about hair: see J. Sommer, *Das Haar in Religion und Aberglauben der Griechen* (Diss. Münster 1912) 29ff. Four of them are dated by an archon. A text of similar nature, also of the imperial period, will be found in *IG XII Suppl.* p. 106 no. 203, which begins in a most unusual fashion: ἄρχοντος ἀγαθῆ τύχη Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Συμφόρου, etc. *SEG XXVI 968*, from the third or fourth century after Christ, concerns a ritual banquet for Serapis: ἀγαθῆ τύχη. [ἄρχ]οντος Αὐρ. --- etc.

45. PATMOS

Famous largely as the place of exile for John the Evangelist, Patmos was a backwater throughout the classical period, but one inscription of about 200 BC is a decree of the Association of Torch-Race Runners: *SIG³ 1068*, re-edited by G. Manganaro in *Annuario* 41-42 (1963-1964) 332-333 with photograph and notes. Its prescript contains the date ἐπὶ Σωπόλιος, Ἀρτεμισιῶνος etc. Because Patmos was almost certainly part of the territory of Miletus—no text, however, gives direct evidence on this point—Sopolis was probably an eponymous stephanephoros of Miletus. Cf. Haussoullier in *Revue de Philologie* 26 (1902) pp. 138ff., and N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien* (Frankfurt-Bern-New York 1983) 15 and 149 for the so-called Milesian Islands of Lepsia, Leros, and Patmos.

46. RHODOS

Homer (*Iliad* 2.653-656) calls the island 'Rhodos' and explains how Tlepolemos brought the three (Dorian) tribes and settled them there, producing the three cities of Lindos, Ialysos, and Kamiros. However, there was no city called Rhodos until the final years of the Peloponnesian War. Diodorus (13.75) reports under the year 408 BC that the inhabitants of the island had contributed settlers for the founding of a new city, Rhodos. The synoikismos at that time was the most important political event in Rhodian history. A Rhodian state, a Republic, was the result. The three old cities lost their autonomy, except in certain sacral matters, but retained their own assembly, council, and magistrates. However, their assembly was not called 'damos'. Their decrees were issued by 'the Lindians' or 'the Ialysans' or 'the Kamireans'. 'Damos' was reserved for the Rhodian state, the σύμπας δᾶμος. Likewise, the local city

council was not 'boule', for that term was reserved for the Rhodian state. The local councils consisted of *μαστροί*. When one of the cities issued a decree it was subject to approval of the state: cf. *SIG*³ 931. However, each of the three cities did retain its own eponymous magistrate. The eponymous official of the whole Rhodian state was the priest of the Sun.

The Island, except for the city of Rhodos itself, was divided into demes, some of which were also in the Rhodian Peraea in southern Caria and in some of the neighboring islands.

For details of the state organization see H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague 1900) 234-249. For Rhodian history and its territory see Hiller von Gaertringen in *RE* Suppl. 5.731-840, with a list of the eponymous priests of the Sun. On the Peraea see P.M. Fraser and G.E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (Oxford 1954). Useful for the Hellenistic period is R.M. Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca [N.Y.] and London 1984), which is concerned largely with the history of the Rhodian Republic rather than the separate cities.

Kamiroi

The eponymous *damiourgos* of Kamiroi is well attested from the fourth century into Roman imperial times. A corpus of the inscriptions of the city has been assembled and published by M. Segre and I. Pugliese Carratelli, 'Tituli Camirenses' in *Annuario* 27-29 (1949-1951) [Rome 1952], 141-318. *T. Camirenses* no. 105 was dated by Segre to the fourth century, and it is a decree of the city: *θ[εοί]. ἐπὶ δα[μιοῦργοῦ --- Ἀ]γεπόλι[ος, γραμματεῦντος] ἐπιστ[ατῶν τῶν Πει]σιρόδωι Ὑ[---] ἔδοξε τοῖς [μαστροῖς καὶ] Καμιρεῦσι etc.* No. 107 belongs to the third century, a very mutilated decree: *[ἐπὶ --- δαμιοῦργοῦ, --- γραμματεῦντος] etc.* No. 108 [*IG* XII 1,696] is another decree and seems to date from about 272 BC, if the name of the *damiourgos* is correctly restored: *ἐπὶ δαμιοῦργοῦ Σα[τύρου τοῦ Ἐργοῖτα] etc.* No. 111, a decree of the second century, is most interesting and deserves to be quoted in full: *[ἐπ' ἱερέ]ως τοῦ Ἀλίου Ξενοφάνεως [τοῦ Ἰέρω]νος καὶ δαμιοῦργοῦ Μελα[νῶπου, Ἀρταμι]τίου δεκάται. ἔδοξε [τοῖς μαστροῖς καὶ Καμιρεῦσι, Πύθις [τοῦ ---] εἶπε· [---].* Here the Rhodian state eponymous priest of the Sun and the local eponymous *damiourgos* of Kamiroi are used together to date the decree. Xenophanes son of Hieron is the father of Melanopos, for in no. 3 (a list of *damiourgoi*) we find a Melanopos son of Xenophanes. Melanopos is *damiourgos* in that list for the year (about) 189 BC. This is a unique example of father and son both appearing as eponyms in the same text, each in a different capacity. No. 4 (e) from the first century after Christ is a series of three separate items on the stone, the second as follows: *δαμιοῦργὸς ττ Κλεισίτιμος Αἰνησιτίμου ἐφ' ᾧ ἐγένετο εὐθηνία καὶ εὐκαρπία ἅπασα.* The two letters *tt* appear to be the name of a deme. Here the *damiourgos* is singled out for praise.

The religious function of the Kamirean *damiourgos* is evident in a number of inscriptions, particularly in no. 152 from the third century: *Δαλίου νευμηνία Ἀλίωι βοῶν λευκὸν ἢ πυρρὸν, ἰκάδι βοῶν λευκὸν ἢ πυρρὸν δαμιοῦργὸς θύει. Πανάμου ἔσω ἰκάδος αἴγας τρεῖς ἱεροποιοὶ θύον[τι] καὶ ἱερ[---].* Not only does he sacrifice but he also is here linked with the sacrificial aspect of the *hieropoioi*. In addition, nos. 9-53 are inscriptions on bases from the Hellenistic period dedicated by the *damiourgos* of the year,

whose name appears first, and by the hieropoioi. Cf. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 133ff. (with tables of these officials and priests from those inscriptions). She concludes that the office of damiourgos at Kamiros developed into a sacral office down to the Roman imperial period. 'Bezeichnend dafür ist die Verschmelzung der Damiurgie mit einern Priestertum' (p. 135).

No. 3 is a list of damiourgoi that was engraved probably all at the same time in the beginning of the first century AD. The beginning of the list is lost, but J. Benediktsson in *Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Archaeologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser*, II 6 (Copenhagen 1940) pp. 8ff., has dated the first 153 names to the period 279-127 BC, plus or minus five years. The other 122 names appear to belong to the period 126 BC into the reign of Augustus. No. 4 also is a list of damiourgoi, the parts preserved dated by Segre to the years AD 55-90 and 150-190. Many of the damiourgoi in the Roman years of no. 3 held the office twice, one of them four times. No. 5 is a list of the priests of Athana Polias from about 330 BC to perhaps about 217 BC, but there is no reason to think of them as eponymous. That term must be reserved for the damiourgos.

Lindos¹⁵

The rich harvest of Lindian inscriptions from the fourth century BC to the third century after Christ, most of it being of a religious nature, makes it possible to trace that city's eponymous priest of Athena Polias throughout the whole of that period in some detail. Aside from the material in *IG XII 1,760-955* there are 710 inscriptions in Chr. Blinkenberg, *Lindos II* (two vols.; Berlin and Copenhagen 1941). In the famous Chronicle of Lindos (no. 2 in *Lindos II*) we have an invaluable source of information, engraved in 99 BC, which is a decree of the mastroi and the People of Lindos authorizing two men to be chosen who will prepare a stele containing a record of lost dedications and divine manifestations. The original dedication and manifestations had been destroyed, and the two men are empowered to search records and other evidence to restore the wording of the lost inscriptions. One of the earliest dedications recorded on the stele (section 38, lines 103ff.) states that 'King Alexander (dedicated) [ox-heads] on which had been inscribed: King Alexander, having defeated Dareios in battle and having become master of Asia, made a sacrifice to Athena Lindia in accordance with an oracle, in the priesthood of Theugnis son of Pistokrates'. This would date the event in 330 BC, after the Battle of Gaugamela in the fall of 331 BC. In section 39 another entry records a dedication by King Ptolemaios, probably 304 BC ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀθ[ά]να τοῦ Ἀθαναγόρα. Votive altars and bases are very frequently dated by the eponymous priest of Athena. The usual formula is in ἐπ' ἱερέως τῆς Ἀθάνας + name and patronymic.¹⁶ A base of about 184 BC (no. 165) uses the formula ἐπ' ἱερέως τῆς Ἀθάνας τῆς Λινδίας + name and patronymic, with many similar examples thereafter. A fragment of a stele from about the same year of about 184 BC (no. 166) is dated by the same priest as no. 165, a certain Nikagoras son of Panaitios, but this time the formula includes another aspect of his priesthood not mentioned in no.

¹⁵ Blinkenberg, *Lindos II* col. 62 n. 2, follows the practice of some epigraphists in the use of psilosis for the stem ἱερ-, but others do not. I have followed Blinkenberg in the Lindian inscriptions. Cf. the remarks in Fraser-Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (Oxford 1954) 174.

¹⁶ Nos. 140 (about 202 BC), 149 (about 198 BC), 154 (about 196 BC), 193 (about 170 BC), 195 (about 169 BC), 200 (about 164 BC), and then nos. 201-202, 212, 215, 242, 254, 258, 296, 301, 306, and 318 of 63 BC.

165: [ιερεὺς Ἀθάνας Λινδία]ς καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως [Νικαγόρας Πα]ναϊτίου. This demonstrates that the phrase 'and of Zeus Polieus' need not always appear in the priest's title. Blinkenberg (col. 102) has calculated that the cult of Zeus Polieus was introduced into Lindos probably a little after the beginning of the third century BC. The earliest appearance of a priest of Athena Lindia and Zeus Polieus is in an inscription on an altar block of great size from about 266 BC (no. 106 a): Καλλικράτης Εὐφραντίδα ἱερατεύσας Ἀθαναίας Λινδίας καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως καὶ Ἀρτάμιτος Κεκοίας. Apparently Athena Lindia shared her sanctuary with Zeus Polieus, beginning some time in the period 283-273 BC (so Blinkenberg, col. 103). No. 106 a is also the earliest known appearance of Artemis Kekoia. This combination, with or without Artemis Kekoia, continues on into the Roman imperial period: no. 465 a-i of AD 180. No. 678, second to third century after Christ, has all three divinities together.

A double dating of interest is found in a decree of 129 BC (no. 233): ἐπ' ἱερέως τῆς Ἀθάνας [τῆς Λινδίας] Ἀριστοκράτους [τοῦ δὲ Ἀλίου] Ἀγεστράτου, etc. Agestratos is known to have been priest of the Sun in Rhodes: cf. *SIG³* 931 line 29, and his name also appears on a number of Rhodian amphora handles. Another example is in a decree of AD 22 (no. 419): ἐπ' ἱερέως τῆς Ἀθάνας Ἀριστείδα τοῦ δὲ Ἀλίου Πλε[ι]στάρχου. This double dating has its analogy in the practice of the mainland Greek cities sometimes using their own local eponymous magistrates along with the strategoi of the confederacies to which they belonged.

A very large base (no. 465 a-i) of about AD 180 contains nine separate entries, eight of them beginning with οἱ ἱερεῖς τῆς Ἀθάνας τῆς Λινδίας καὶ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως καὶ μαστροὶ καὶ Λίνδιοι, followed by the name of the person being honored. Blinkenberg (col. 104) believes such entries show that former priests retained their titles and rank and that they then formed some kind of an association.

For the *cursus honorum* at Lindos at the beginning of the third century after Christ no. 486 is instructive: it is a base whose inscription tells us that the mastroi and People of Lindos honor Eukrates son of Agloudamos. He is a priest of Athena and Zeus and Artemis and Dionysos, whose earlier career is then outlined: prytanis (i.e. one of the magistrates connected with the Boule at Rhodos), tamias, thesmophylax, antitamias, agoranomos, sitones, various other priesthoods, envoy and syndikos for his city on many occasions.

Of exceptional importance is no. 1, a long list of the eponymous priests of Athena Lindia. It begins with the year 375 BC and extends, with lacunae, to AD 27. Blinkenberg has estimated that the list began originally with 406 BC, i.e. very soon after the synoikismos in 408 BC. The estimate is based on the presence of notations in the text itself at regular intervals, the letter delta marking every tenth name and an eta with multiples of it for every hundredth name. The first delta appears at the year 367 BC, HHH at the year 107 BC, and HHHH at the year 7 BC. The stones once formed part of the pronaos of the temple of Athena, to the right and left of the entrance to the cella (Blinkenberg, col. 100). The lettering of the first fragment (A) suggests the fourth quarter of the second century BC. A new fragment of the list was published by M. Segre in *La Parola del Passato* 3 (1948) p. 65, which contains the names of 24 priests in succession, whom, with some modification of Blinkenberg's arrangement, Segre fitted into the period between 238 and 170 BC.

From an examination of the names in this great list we can see that often a Lindian priest of Athena Lindia (later) became priest of the Sun in Rhodes, the central city of the Republic. In Blinkenberg's publication such a connection can be detected for the years (BC) 369, 230 (?), 169, 139 (?), 123, 117 (?), 116, 95, 89 (?), 82, 64 (see Hiller von Gaertringen in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 [1929] 352: ἐπιλ[αχὸν ἱερ]εὺς Ἀλίου), 46 (?), and 37 (?). In addition, Pausanios (sic!) son of Klinombrotos was priest of Athena Lindia in AD 26 and also the eponymous damiourgos at Kamiros (*T. Camirenses* no. 3 line 60), a situation explained by the heading of the group of damiourgoi in the list where the name Pausanios is found (*T. Camirenses* no. 3, Δ c, lines 56-57): δαμιουργοὶ ἀφ' ἧς ἔδοξε ἐκ πάντων αἰρεῖσθαι. It has also been observed by Blinkenberg (cols. 95-96) that brothers (or other family members) held the priesthood of Athena at Lindos at intervals of two and sometimes three years, a practice which he calls the *règle triennale*. This indicates, as one would expect everywhere, that the priesthood was jealously guarded at Lindos and kept within certain families.

The City of Rhodes

A text of capital importance for the city of Rhodes—to use the common English spelling, at least for the city—is an extract from a Rhodian law of about 100 BC, which orders the official keeping of a record of Rhodian priests: *SIG*³ 723, now superseded by Hiller von Gaertringen's new reading in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 (1929) 350. The opening lines are as follows: ἐκ τοῦ ψαφίσματος τοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀρχεστράτου Ἀρταμιτίου κε'. ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνῳ ἡ ἀναγραφὰ τῶν [ἱ]ερατευόντων γίνηται κατὰ τὸ ἕξαν, οἱ μὲν ἱερεῖς ἀναγραφόντων τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ αὐτῶν πατριαστί καὶ δάμο[υ] καὶ τὸν ἱερῆ τοῦ Ἀλίου, ἐφ' οὗ ἔλαχε· etc. A translation is in order: '(Extract) from the decree in the time of (the priest of the Sun) Archestratos, the 25th of Artamitios. In order that in the future the registering of the priests in office might be kept in continuous succession the priests are to register their names, with patronymic and demotic, and also the priest of the Sun in whose time (each one of them) had obtained his office by lot.' As Hiller von Gaertringen has made clear (*op. cit.* 350-351), the priests mentioned here are not the numerous annually changing priests but those who held office for life, the στατοὶ ἱερεῖς of *IG* XIII 1,786, line 9. An interesting point brought out in the text is that only the priest of the Sun in Rhodes was eponymous. Nevertheless, the law orders all the other priests to record their names in a list of their respective priesthoods and to date them by addition of the current priest of the Sun. This implies the existence about 100 BC of a list of those eponymous priests of the Sun.

In 1944 a stele was discovered in the ruins of a medieval church in Rhodes, broken into four fragments and with the lower half missing. It contained a list of the priests of the Sun from the beginning of the Rhodian synoikismos in 408 BC. The list is in two columns and was published by L. Morricone in the *Annuario* 27-29 (1949-1951) 351-380 (*SEG* XII 360), with photograph. The names of the priests run from 408 to 299/8 (or 293/2) BC, with a long lacuna in the fourth century. The heading is preserved: Ἀλίου ἱερεῖς τοῖδε.

The inscription discussed above (*SIG*³ 723) makes it very clear that the Rhodian priest of the Sun was eponymous, but in the actual dating practices of the Rhodian state the phrase 'of the Sun' is regularly omitted. Even in decrees of the Nesiotic League it is missing. Cf. *IG*

XII 5,824 (*SIG*³ 620): Ἀγαθεὶ τύχει. ἐφ' ἱερέως ἐν Ῥόδῳ Αὐτοκράτεως, μηνὸς Σμινθίου (line 31), etc. On the monument of Eudemos at Seleucia in Cilicia, about 172 BC, one section (lines 11-15) records that Eudemos was a proxenos of Rhodes (*SIG*³ 644): Ῥοδίων. ἐπὶ ἱερέως Δαμοκλέους τοῦ Δαμέου, πρυτανίων τῶν σὺν Ἀστυμήδει τοῦ Ἀρχοκράτεως, Δαλίου· ἐκ τῶν λευκωμάτων, etc. In a decision of Rhodians concerning Priene and Samos (*I. Priene* 37 = *SIG*³ 599, lines 33ff.): ὡς μὲν Ῥόδιοι ἄγοντι, ἐπὶ ἱερέως Πρατο- [φάνεως, μηνὸς ---] etc. Similarly an inscription on a base containing a list of Rhodian offices from the first century (A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*, Florence 1925, no. 20): [---] ἐξάμηνον τὰν ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀγλωχάρτου καὶ ἐπ' ἱερέως Φαινίλα etc. (cf. Hiller von Gaertringen in *RE Suppl.* 5.767 for discussion). Rhodian private associations also regularly used the bare ἐπ' ἱερέως formula + name to date their own documents: *IG* XII 1,9 (*SIG*³ 1116) from the second century, without patronymic; *IG* XII 1,155; *SEG* III 674, decrees of the Association of Aphrodisiastai of the second century. A letter from Nero is published at Rhodes and given a heading (*SIG*³ 810) which is dated by this bare formula without patronymic. And the ubiquitous stamped amphora handles from Rhodes use an even more abbreviated form, merely ἐπί followed by the name of the priest, with or without the patronymic. Only occasionally is it expanded to ἐπ' ἱερέως + name. See the old collection of these stamps in *IG* XII 1,1065-1209. Most useful is the article by Virginia R. Grace in *Hesperia* 22 (1953) 116-128, with a list of the names of 173 eponymous priests of the Sun, none of them probably before the last quarter of the fourth century. A fuller list which includes epigraphical material is in Hiller von Gaertringen's article in *RE Suppl.* 5.834-840. The latest discussion of the names known to me is by Yu.S. Badalyants in the *Sovetskaiia Arkheologiia* 1980, No. 2, 161-166. Cf. also *SEG* XXVII 1033 to 1105, from Egypt. Much more work remains to be done on the names of the eponymous priests of the Sun found on the amphora handles. Their numbers run into the tens of thousands, but of course one stamp could be used to produce the name of a single eponymous priest a hundred times or more. They are now being computerized.

The names on Rhodian coins must also enter into consideration, for out of the 173 eponymous priests mentioned on the stamped amphora handles of Grace's list—not counting the epigraphical material—29 of them appear on the coins in Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 126-128. And a comparison with the list of the priests of the Sun published by Morricone shows that 18 of them appear on Grace's list, and at least one appears on all three. Such comparisons, of course, do not prove identity of person, merely identity of name. All of the epigraphical evidence must be correlated with the amphora handles and the coins. A peculiar problem emerges in *Lindos* II no. 465 (f), which is a base of great size from about AD 180 (see above, s.v. LINDOS), found at Lindos. It begins: οἱ ἱερεῖς τῆς Ἀθάνας τῆς Λινδίας [καὶ] τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Πολι[έ]ω[ς] καὶ μαστροὶ καὶ Λίνδιοι Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Καλλίστρατον τὸν καὶ Πλαγκιανὸν Ἀντιπάτρου Ἐρ(ειναῆ) τὸν δι' αἰῶνος φιλοτειμότετον ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ πόλει Ῥόδῳ ἐπόνυμον γυμνασσίαρχον νεώτερον etc. To the present writer it is inconceivable that a gymnasiarch could be the eponymous official of the whole Rhodian state. Blinkenberg (col. 848) believes that the word 'eponymous' here refers only to the internal life of the gymnasium, and I find that an attractive explanation. Lists of gymnasiarchs were regularly kept in many, perhaps all, of the Greek cities and, I suppose, in any

reference to past events of the gymnasium this or that gymnasiarch could be called 'eponymous'. The word would add lustre to the office. This text offers still another peculiar aspect. How could Kallistratos be both eponymous gymnasiarch and gymnasiarch for life? Perhaps he would hold that post only when no others could be found to hold it, even after his death by means of an endowment.

The Rhodian Peraea

On the Carian coast, directly north of Rhodos and due east from the small island of Syme, is the Loryma Peninsula, which P.M. Fraser and G.E. Bean (*The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*, [Oxford 1954] 65ff.) have determined with great probability is the location of the Carian Χερρονήσιοι of the Athenian tribute lists. They believe that this area, southwest of Phycus, had already been incorporated into the territory of the three Rhodian cities of Lindos, Ialysos, and Kamiros before the synoikismos of 408 BC (pp. 94ff.). In the very next century further territory had been added, including communities such as Phycus, Erine, Euthana, Cedreae, and the more distant Daedala and Megista. They call these the Incorporated Peraea, to be distinguished from the Subject Peraea. Rhodians on the Incorporated Peraea showed their status by the use of their demotic, while on the Subject Peraea they are ῥόδιοι: see Fraser-Bean 52-53. The Subject territory was acquired relatively late, by the Peace of Apamea of 188 BC as a result of Rome's political decisions: see H.H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (München 1957) 81ff. That territory was very large: Lycia and Caria south of the Maeander, except for those cities which had been free (Magie, *RRAM* 952 n. 61). In an ill-conceived attempt to mediate between Rome and Perseus in 168 BC Rhodes fell into disfavor with the Roman senate and in 167 BC the island Republic was stripped of its recent possessions: Polybius 30.5.12 and Livy 45.25.6. However, Rhodes was permitted to retain that part of her Incorporated Peraea which she had held prior to 188 BC: Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* 157.

The demes of the old Incorporated Peraea were distributed among the three Rhodian cities as follows (based on the results of fresh investigation by Fraser-Bean 79ff.). The demes of Lindos included Phycus and Casara, and probably Amos. The demes of Kamiros were Tymnus and Tlos. The demes of Ialysos were Cryassus and Erine. There were other demes, but their attributions to the three cities are unknown. Still others are in the form of demotics which may refer either to location on the mainland or on the island itself. The city of Rhodes stood outside the deme-system. In addition to the mainland communities various islands also had been incorporated into the Rhodian state, such as Syme, Carpathos, Chalke, Telos, Nisyros, and Casso. See Fraser-Bean 138ff.

The political connections of all these communities should be considered when their epigraphical remains mention eponymous magistrates.

a) AMOS. Large fragments of a stele discovered at this community in the Loryma Peninsula at Hisarburnu reveal the details of a lease containing the provisions for payment of rent and the obligations imposed on a tenant: Fraser-Bean no. 8 (*SEG* XIV 683). It begins with the date: [ἐφ' ἱερέως Ἀριστείδα, μ[η]νὸς Πανάμου, etc. Aristeidas is known from amphora handles and coins to have been a Rhodian priest of the Sun about the beginning of the

second century. In Fraser-Bean no. 10 (*SEG XIV 685*), line 7, it is stated that rent on the lease will begin in the [μεῖ]ς Κάρνειος ἐφ' ἱερέως ὅς κ[α ἐπὶ τῷ --- γένηται]. A decree of the Rhodian state was also found at Gölenye (between Amos and Physcus): Fraser-Bean no. 15 (*SEG XIV 690*). Its prescript runs as follows: ἐπὶ ἱερέως Πεισιστράτου, Θεσμοφορίου διχομηνίαι, ἔδοξε τῷ δάμωι· [Βασ(?)]ιλείδας Κλευμβρότου Βυβάσσιος, καθ' ὑθεσίαν δὲ θευφάνευ[ς], εἶπε etc. Peisistratos is a known priest of the Sun at Rhodes, and Bybassus is a community or area in the Peraea.

b) HYLLARIMA is northeast of Stratonikeia. When all Caria lay under the control of Rhodes after the Treaty of Apamea this community recorded the sale of various priesthoods on a marble stele: A. Laumonier in *BCH 58* (1934) pp. 345ff., no. 39 (Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure* no. 56). The stone originally carried an inscription in the Carian language of the fourth century, then a few lines of Greek, and finally (lines 5ff.): ἀγαθῆι τύχει. ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀγλουμβρότου, Πανάμου εἰκάδι· ἐπὶ τοῖσδε ἐπρίατο τὴν ἱερωσύνην Λέων Θευδώρου παρὰ Ὑλλαριμέων διὰ βίου δρα. ΞΠ followed by a list of many deities, including a priesthood 'of the Demos of the Rhodians.' Agloumbrotos is well known as a priest of the Sun at Rhodes, and the remarkable cult of the Demos of the Rhodians is additional evidence of Rhodian domination.

c) MOBOLLA. An inscription on an honorific shield of marble was found long ago at the modern Muğla, the ancient Mobolla, in south-central Caria: G. Cousin and G. Deschamps in *BCH 10* (1886) 488 no. 2, now in J. and L. Robert, *La Carie II*, Paris 1954, no. 2. It is a dedication to the gods for a Rhodian epistatas by the three archons, the secretary, and the three agoranomoi of a Carian confederation—perhaps that of the Tarmianoι—sometime prior to the age of Sulla. It begins with the date ἐπ' ἱερέως Χρυσάορος, and Chrysaor is known to have been a priest of the Sun at Rhodes. Thus, the inscription must have been engraved in the period 188-167 BC. The ethnics of the archons include a Ταβηνός and a Λωμεύς, the secretary is a Μοβωλλεύς, and the agoranomoi include a Ταβηνός, a Λωμεύς, and a Μνιεσύτης. Scholars have usually thought that Tabai (Davas) could not be included in such a group, but the Roberts (*op. cit.* 95) have concluded that it was indeed the well-known Tabai and not some obscure little community that was a member of this Carian confederacy.

d) NISYROS. See above, No. 42.

e) SYME. Fraser-Bean (*op. cit.* 138-141) have shown that this small island between Rhodos and the mainland was almost certainly a part of the Rhodian state before the synoikismos of 408 BC, and it continued to be part of it into the Roman imperial period. Thus, it dated its documents both by its own eponymous official and also by the eponymous priest of the Sun at Rhodes. *IG XII 3 Suppl.* 1,1269 begins with the prescript to a decree of Syme: ἐ[π]ὶ ἱερέως Ἐπιχάρμου καὶ δαμι[ο]ργοῦ Ἰπποκρά[τ]ευσ, [μη]νός Ἀγρ[ιανί]ο[υ] τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα, etc. The lettering appears to be of the second century. The same formula of eponymy appears also in no. 1270, of the second or first century. Since territory of the Rhodian state was assigned to one of the three Rhodian cities as demes, it is highly likely, as Chrissoula (*Damiurgen* 121) says, that Syme belonged to the territory of Kamiros, where the local eponymous magistrate was also a damiourgos. Fraser-Bean (*op. cit.* 140) suggest that Syme 'formed only part of a deme, most probably that of the Lindian Casareis', a suggestion

that fails to consider the origin of the eponymous *damiourgos* on Syme. Of course, it could have been the old native eponymous official before the island had been made part of the Rhodian state—cf. L. Robert, *Opera Minora* 1.568 note—but I think it acquired it from Kamiros.

f) SYRNA. The modern Bayir in the Loryma Peninsula is the site of Syrna (Fraser-Bean, *op. cit.* 29), and its attachment to the Rhodian state is attested by a decree (Fraser-Bean no. 16) 'apparently of the second century B.C.'. Its prescript begins as follows: [ἐπὶ] ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀλίου Ἀγησίππου, Βαδρομίου ἀμ[φεικ]άδι, ἔδοξε Συρνίοις· etc. Another sign of its attachment to Rhodes is found in the body of the decree where (lines 24-25) is found the cautionary clause κυρωθέν[τος τοῦδε τ]οῦ ψαφίσματος.

g) TELOS. A treaty between the island of Telos and the Rhodians from the third century shows clearly that it was independent of the Rhodian state at that time: S.I. Charitonides in the *Archaiologikon Deltion XVI A* (1960) 94-97, no. 1 (*SEG XXV*) 847). Also from the third century is a list of Pythaistai dated [ἐ]πὶ δαμιοργοῦ Δαμοφέλεω[ς] (Charitonides, *op. cit.* 97-100, no. 2 [*SEG XXV* 852]), and a similar list was published by G. Susini in the *Annuario* 25-26 (1963-1964) 275ff., no. 1 (*SEG XXV* 853) dated ἐπ' ἱερέως Τιμοδόκου, δαμιουργοῦντος Ἀριστοφίλ[ου]. Thus, it appears that by this time Telos had been incorporated into the Rhodian state. Its older, native eponymous magistrate was a *damiourgos*. Cf. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 123. The eponymous priest of the Sun at Rhodes now appears first, with the older eponymous *damiourgos* second. And in a decree of the People of Telos (*IG XII* 3, 30), only the priest of the Sun is used to date the time when the recipient of honors had been chosen *hieropolos*. That decree can be dated prior to 108 BC: see Fraser-Bean, *op. cit.* 146 n. 6.

h) TYMNUS. Fraser-Bean no. 26 (*SEG XIV* 702; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* [Paris 1962] no. 111) is a decree of the first century BC from Bozburun in the Loryma Peninsula. It contains regulations of a religious nature which are designed to care for and safeguard cult facilities in Tymnus. It begins with a date: [ἐπὶ ἱερ]οθύτα Κλεινία τοῦ Ἐπιγόνου, Πανάμου [δευτέραι?] ἱσταμένου, ἔδοξε Τυμνίων τῶι κοινῶι· etc. In the absence of other evidence I think we must accept Kleinias as the eponymous hierothytas of Tymnus. However, the mention of κτοίνα in line 5 reveals the attachment of Tymnus to the Rhodian state, for the word is distinctly Rhodian and refers to a geographical unit: Fraser-Bean, *op. cit.* 95. The date of the inscription appears to be the 'first rather than second century B.C.' The hierothytas must have been the eponymous magistrate of Tymnus before its incorporation into the Rhodian state. Also, we miss the use of the eponymous priest of the Sun in the prescript to the decree. Like all the other cities of the Rhodian Peraea, Tymnus was a deme of the Rhodian state and it could only issue decrees that were binding on itself alone. The Tymnian hierothytas was to Tymnus what the Athenian demarch was to an Athenian deme, a purely local magistrate of limited power and subject to a higher authority.

47. SAMOS

The history of Samos in the fifth and fourth centuries is very tightly connected with that of Athens. As an early member of the Delian League the island eventually collided with the growing imperial policy of Pericles as soon as she began to expand her territory on the mainland of Asia Minor. Pericles sent an Athenian naval force to the island, imposed democratic

government in 441 BC that was pro-Athenian, and took hostages from the Samian oligarchs. The party of the oligarchs rescued the hostages and freed Samos of the Athenian control. Then they revolted from the League. After a siege they capitulated in 439. See C.W. Fornara in *JHS* 99 (1979) 7-19. The new democracy at Samos continued at Samos despite the efforts of the oligarchs to subvert it, and in the years of 411 and later Samos remained loyal to Athens. However, she resisted joining the Second Athenian League of 377 and Mausolus, the satrap of Caria, conquered the island about 366. Athens liberated it the next year and sent out to the island Athenian klerouchoi, perhaps enough of them to replace the Samian people who were sent into exile (Aristotle, *Frag.* 611.35 Rose). Thus, Samos became an Athenian possession. Some 40 years later, in 324, Alexander issued his Exiles Decree: Diodorus 18.8.3-5, and *SIG*³ 312 (A.J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks, The Epigraphic Evidence* [Norman, Oklahoma, 1980] 182-186). There is also evidence that the exiled Samians tried to return to Samos not too long afterward but were met with resistance by the klerouchoi: Chr. Habicht in *Athen. Mitt.* 72 (1957) 156-169, nos. 1-2, and cf. R.M. Errington in *Chiron* 5 (1975) 55, as well as E. Badian in *ZPE* 23 (1976) 289-294. That action was geared to the Lamian War of Athens against Macedon after Alexander's death, for which see now G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800-188 BC* (Oxford 1987) 165-168. In 322 BC Perdikkas finally restored the Samians to their island (Diodorus 18.18.9). The new government was democratic but fell under the domination of the Ptolemies (about 280-260 and about 246-195 BC) and of the Rhodians thereafter.

Fundamental for eponymity at Samos is Michel, *Recueil* 832 (*SGDI* 5702, and full publication of the whole text by D. Ohly in *Athen. Mitt.* 68 (1953) 46-48 with photograph), a marble slab of 346/5 BC containing an inventory of sacred objects in the Heraion. It begins with a heading: [ἐπὶ] Πεισίλεω ἄρχοντος ἐν Σάμῳ, Ἀθηναῖσι δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀρχίου ἄρχοντος,] etc., and lines 3-6 παρὰ ταμιῶν τῶν ἐπὶ θεο]κλέους ἄρχοντος ἐν Σάμῳ, Ἀθηναῖσι δὲ θεμιστοκλέους Σω[σθέν]ους. This is later repeated (lines 56-58), and clearly shows that the klerouchoi had their own separate eponymous archon on Samos to date their documents along with the Athenian archon, as one would expect. Fortunately, in the inventory itself (lines 12-79), there are a few indications of when some of the objects had been dedicated. Significant are lines 28-31: κισθῶνες ἐπὶ θρασυάνακτος τούτους ἢ θεὸς ἔχει, κισθῶνες ἐπὶ Ἴπποδάμαντος δύο τούτους ἔχει ἢ θεός, ἐπὶ δημιουργοῦ Δαμασικ[λ]έους χλάνδιον ἀλοργῶν τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁδοῦ, ἐπὶ Δημητρίου ἄρχοντος κισθῶνες δύο τούτους ἢ θεὸς ἔχει, etc. Since the Klerouchoi do not date by demiorgoi, Damasikles must have been the eponymous demiorgos at Samos before the coming of the klerouchoi in 365 BC. Demetrius is either the klerouchic or Athenian archon, and the lack of the word 'archon' with the names Thrasyanax and Hippodamas should mean that they too were old Samian demiorgoi. Another document (*SIG*³ 276) also illustrates the juxtaposition of klerouchic and Athenian archons in 334 BC.

With the end of klerouchic government on the island the older Samian demiorgos is once more eponymous. For some unknown reason, but probably because of political changes in Samos, about the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century we find two demiorgoi in a Samian decree: ἐπὶ δημιουργῶν Χαριδήμου καὶ Ὀρχαμενίου μηνὸς Πελυσσιῶνος τετράδι. This is unambiguous evidence of two eponymous demiorgoi in the same

month, and just a short time before, in 306/5 BC, a decree honoring the actor Polos (M. Schede in *Athen. Mitt.* 44 [1919] 16-17, no. 7 [SEG I 362]) refers to an agonothete ordered to work 'with the demiorgos' in the announcement of honors for Polos. Thereafter eponymous pairs of them appear in *I. Priene* 67 (decree of unknown date) and in Habicht, *Athen. Mitt.* 87 (1972) 225, no. 10, dated between 250 and 235 BC: cf. Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 113-116, and Shipley, *op. cit.* 211. After that date the single eponymous demiorgos appears to be the rule: Michel, *Recueil* 901 (G. Dunst in *ZPE* 1 [1967] 203) of the second century; *CIG* 3091 A 6, of about 240 BC; *I. Priene* 42, of the second century; E. Buschor in *Athen. Mitt.* 68 (1953) p. 15; *IGRR* IV 984 shows the Samian People honoring a certain Lollia, daughter of a Quintus, and she is a priestess of Hera and of the goddess Iulia Augusta. She had earlier been a demiorgos. L. Robert (*Opera Minora* I 566) questions whether Lollia's demiorgia at that time was still eponymous. See also L. Robert, *Opera Minora* II 746-747, and Chrissoula, *Damiurgen* 114 n. 5 for other examples of the single demiorgos. Very often these single eponymous demiorgoi appear in the inscriptions without the title, and J.P. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos*, London 1966, 105ff., believes that the names on many Samian coins are those of the eponymous magistrate. Such is always a possibility with the coinage, but no more than that.

Finally, E. Buschor published an inscription on a Samian base of the late second century style after Christ: [ἐπ]ὶ ταμίου Ἀνδρο[κ]λέου τοῦ Σχεινίου [εὐσεβῆ]ς νεοποίης [καὶ] παραφύλαξ Ἀβάσκαντος Μοσχίωνος ἀνέθηκεν Ἡρῆ. Habicht (*op. cit.* 253 n. 134) suggests accordingly that a change in eponymity had taken place sometime earlier, but the tamias here may be simply a false eponym. I feel that the demiorgos was certainly eponymous to the age of Augustus and perhaps later, but evidence is lacking after the end of the Roman Republic.

48. SAMOTHRACE

The island of Samothrace was of little strategic importance in the ebb and flow of great events in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, and in the Hellenistic age only in a few cases do its relations with the great monarchies bring it to the attention of historians: see R.S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976) 160-168, and P.M. Fraser, *Samothrace 2,1: The Inscriptions on Stone* (New York 1960) 4-12. Its importance in the ancient world lay in its prestige as the religious center for the worship of the Great Gods, the Cabiri. Thus, a typical feature of the island's epigraphy are the many lists of theoi and mystai who came there from abroad. Most of those lists date from the second century.

When King Perseus of Macedon and a Cretan called Evander were at Samothrace just prior to the war with Rome, a Roman fleet put in at the island and a distinguished young Roman addressed the Samothracians. When he charged them with harboring Evander, who had tried unsuccessfully to assassinate King Eumenes, the Samothracians took action: *Theondan, qui summus magistratus apud eos erat—regem ipsi appellat—ad Persea mittunt qui nuntiaret argui caedis Euandrum Cretensem* (Livy 45.5.6). Thus, the highest Samothracian magistrate was a basileus, and very many of the Samothracian inscriptions show that he was also eponymous from about the end of the third century BC to the Roman period of the Antonines.

The earliest of the theoroi lists may be Fraser, *Samothrace* no. 22, from the middle or late third century. Its formula is typical. It begins with ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἀ[θ]ανοδώρου τοῦ Αἰ[γ]? ---], followed by the ethnic of the place from which the first group of theoroi came, and then the names of the individuals themselves. The lists of mystai are somewhat different. No. 32 is typical of those from Roman times: [ἐ]πὶ βασιλ[έως τοῦ ---], and then in the field in Roman letters *Cn. Oc[tavio M.f.] C. Scrib[onio C.f. cos.] a.d. x[---] mustae [piei]*, followed by the names of the initiates. In the first century and later inscriptions listing mystai we find what appears to be an eponymous agoranomos, either alone or in company with the basileus. No. 36 will serve to illustrate the point: first comes the date in Greek by the eponymous basileus, followed by the date in Latin by the consuls (of AD 19), then the names of the mystai in two columns, then the epoptai, and finally at the end, in Greek, [ἀγοραν]ομοῦντος Ἀπολλ[οδώρου (?) τοῦ] Διοδότου. And in *IG XII 8,221* we find ἐπὶ βασιλέως Μ. Ῥουβίου Φρόντωνος· ἀγορανομοῦντος Φλαβίου Κτησιφίλου. Μύσται εὐσεβεῖς followed by four names. Other examples: Fraser, *Samothrace* nos. 34, 41, 57, 61, Appendix IV; *IG XII 8, 187, 195, 221, and 224*. Cf. L. Robert in *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 67-68 (review of Fraser), where he calls these agoranomoi false eponyms. I suspect that they are named alone or along with the eponymous basileus simply because they were involved in some way with the process of initiation or some ceremony in connection with the mystai. In all cases of using the basileus as eponym the usual formula is ἐπὶ with the genitive, but one inscription (of AD 160-180) is different in that it uses the form βασιλεύοντος + name: *IG XII 8,216 (SIG³ 1054)*.

A most unusual form of eponymity is illustrated by Fraser, *Samothrace* no. 53, as originally read and interpreted by J.H. Oliver in *AJA* 43 (1939) 464-466: *Regibus Iove et Minerva(a) iterum, M. Acilio Glabrione, [C.] Bellicio Torquato cos. Mystae pii [s]acra acceperunt V Idus Novembr(es)*, etc. followed by the name of the initiate. Here Jupiter and Minerva are used for the Great Gods, as Oliver has shown, and the date by the eponymous basileis is rendered into Latin as *regibus*. Thus, in these two years of AD 123 and 124 the Cabiri served as eponyms themselves, because nobody could be found with sufficient wealth to hold the office. See Oliver, *loc. cit.*, and L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2.57 n. 2. The latest example of the eponymous basileus is in Fraser, *Samothrace* no. 60, sometime in the second to the fourth century after Christ. Several names in Münsterberg, *Beamtennamen* 28-29, agree with those of known Samothracian basileis, such as Theondas, Phrynikos, and Metronax.

49. SKIATHOS AND PEPARETHOS

From the fifth century BC Athens had exercised control of this island, as we can see in *IG I³ 110 (SIG³ 114)*, a decree making Oiniades a proxenos of the Athenians and calling upon the future Athenian government and τὸν ἄρχοντα τὸν ἐν Σκιάθῳ ὃς ἂν ἦ ἐκάστοτε to safeguard him. This 'official in Skiathos' was one of those sent out by Athens to protect her interests in general: see n. 5 in *SIG³* and also R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 213-215. In the Hellenistic age it lay at the mercy of Macedon, but in 41 BC Marcus Antonius gave to Athens the three islands of Ikos, Skiathos, and Peparethos (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 5.30). They were apparently free by the period of Septimius Severus, when two inscriptions from Skiathos pay special honor to the emperor. *IG XII 8,634*: ἀγαθῆι τύχηι. τὸν μέγιστον καὶ θειότατον Αὐτοκράτορα Λ. Σεπτίμιον Σευῆρον Περτίνακα Σεβαστὸν ἡ

βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος Σκιαθίων ἐπιμελησαμένου Πίστου τοῦ Ὑακίνθου ἀνθ' ἧς ἤρξεν ἐπωνύμου ἀρχῆς. Similarly no. 635. There is no real evidence, however, to connect any possible freedom at this time to the notice in SHA (*Septimius Severus* 3.7) that the emperor had suffered certain injustices at the hands of the Athenians and had deprived them of *privilegia*.¹⁷

Skiathos and Peparethos shared much of their history with one another *vis-à-vis* Athens and later empires. *IG XII* 8,645 is an inscription copied by Cyriac of Ancona, from Peparethos. It shows that Athenian klerouchoi were present on the island, or at least their descendants, AD 96/7-101/2. It is as follows: ἀγαθῆ τύχη. ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀθήναις Κωπ[ω]νίου Μαξίμου, μηνὸς Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, ἐν δὲ Πεπαρήθῳ Ἀσκληπιοδώρου τοῦ Φιλίππου Ῥαμνουσίου, μηνὸς Πιθοικιῶνος, Τιβ. Κλαύδιος Χαροπεῖνος Φρασινείκου Ῥαμνούσιος.¹⁸ Is it possible that the 'official in Skiathos' is really the 'archon in Skiathos' and that Skiathos also had Athenian klerouchoi? In the decree of Athens making Oinades a proxenos there would have been no need to mention the Athenian archon at that place in the decree, for the instructions concerned conditions on Skiathos.

50. SYROS

It is not until the second century after Christ that the meagre remains of inscriptions on Syros furnish evidence of its eponymous archon. In *IG XII* 5,659 we learn that Aristagoras son of Aristagoras ὁ στεφανηφόρος ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος σὺν ἀρχεῖνῃ Πώλλῃ Σκύμ[νου] conducted favorable sacrifices to Hestia Prytaneia and to the other gods and goddesses for the health and well-being of Antoninus Pius and his family. Similar is *IG XII* 5, 660,662 (under M. Aurelius), 663 (Commodus), 664 (Septimius Severus), and 667 (Decius). The association of the ἀρχεῖνη with the eponymous archon is not constant, for she appears only in nos. 659, 660, and 662 in that capacity. In no. 662 she is called the wife of the eponymous archon, and in no. 668 she is associated with the archon in public service of a different nature. She seems to have been a priestess of some sort, but in no. 665, a decree of the second or third century after Christ, the woman in question is both an ἀρχεῖνη and an εἰέρεια.

51. TELOS

See above (no. 46) s.v. RHODOS.

52. TENEDOS

IG XII 2,640 is a dedication to the Dioskouroi when a certain Rhodian by the name of Philiskos son of Agesandros was the priest of the Dioskouroi. The priesthood is not eponymous. Much earlier in time is the slim possibility that Aristagoras of Tenedos, the subject of Pindar's Eleventh Nemean Ode, may have been the eponymous prytanis. The entire ode is in honor of Aristagoras upon his entry into the office of prytanis. There is nothing to suggest that the office was eponymous, but the mere fact that Pindar devotes a whole ode to the occa-

¹⁷ Cf. S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e Siècle* (Paris 1976) p. 159 n. 2.

¹⁸ For the Athenian archon Coponius Maximus see Follet, *op. cit.* 171-173. She distinguishes three individuals of this name and dates his archonship to the period 96/7-101/2. Others have placed it later, under Hadrian.

sion suggests he may have been more than a simple member of a whole college of prytaneis. Aristagoras may have been the president of such a group, and, if so, then he may have been the eponym of the twelve month period mentioned by Pindar (9-10).¹⁹

53. TENOS

IG XII 5,872 is a very large marble tablet containing a list of sales of various properties and of gifts dated [ἐ]π' ἄρχοντος Ἀμ[ει]νό[λα] and provides the earliest evidence of the eponymous archon of the island. Hiller von Gaertringen, supported by the judgement of A. Wilhelm on the lettering, dated it to the third century. Also in the third century are nos. 822, a mutilated proxenia decree which directs τὸν ἄρ[χοντα τὴν στεφανηφό]ρον ἀρχὴν to make an announcement in the theater, and 804, which is a similar document with identical formula. Numerous documents of later date then confirm the eponymity of the archon: nos. 824 (after 188 BC), 901-903 (first or second century after Christ), and *IG XII Suppl.* p. 135 no. 307 (second century BC). Then there are the unusual catalogues 880-884, which list the major officials and magistrates in groups year after year, each group headed by the title and name of the archon, e.g. (880 line 4): ἄρχοντος Σίμου τοῦ Εὐκράτου οἶδε ἤρξαν followed by the secretary of the boule, the prytaneis (3), the strategoi (4), the gymnasiarch, the tamias, the trapezites, the astynomoi (3), the agonothete, the praktores (3), the logistai (3), the agoranomoi (2), and the eisagogeis (3). We also learn from this text that, except for the archon, the officials served for only six months. These catalogues seem to date from the first century BC, and others (895-909, *IG XII Suppl.* 312 and 314-315) push the lists to the Roman imperial period. *SEG XIV 553-554* are somewhat different lists but still headed by the archon's name. *SEG XIV 555* belongs to the third century after Christ and is also a list, one of which is headed by [στε]φανηφόρος ἐπόνυμος Αὐρ. Ο[---, ἀρ]χὴς Αὐρ. Πρίσκιλλα ἡ θυγατὴρ Τ[---], while the next group has ἄρχων ἐπόνυμος Αὐρ. Ἀριστόλοχος β' (?) [Ἀν]τωνεῖνου. The association of the archon at this date with an archis has its parallel in *IG XII 5,903* of the first or second century after Christ. Cf. nos. 900-902, 908 and 909 (for the second time). In no. 902 the archis is the wife of the archon. The same association was observed at Syros (above, No. 50). This archis seems regularly to have been a wife or close relative of the archon and aids him in public ceremonies. And as usual, the use of the word 'eponymos' belongs to the imperial period. Early in the second century the revised League of the Islanders frequently met in Tenos and *IG XII 5,824* (*SIG³ 620*) contains one of its decrees, double-dated by the priest of the Sun in Rhodos and Charippides the archon at Tenos (lines 31-32).

54. THASOS

Sometime within the period 710-680 BC the old Thracian population of Thasos was confronted by Greek colonists from the island of Paros. The colonists had been led there by Telesikles, father of the poet Archilochus, and apparently new contingents from Paros continued to arrive for many years. The poet himself was one of the many to arrive after the initial col-

¹⁹ Gschnitzer in *RE Suppl.* 13,740, does not consider the possibility. The prytany at Tenedos should not be confused with the Cleisthenic institution at Athens, and Gschnitzer rightly points to the old task of the prytanis, 'seine Stadt zu regieren.'

onization and he spent some time on Thasos. He even fought against the Thracians, an action that shows the Thracians did not peacefully accept the presence of Greeks on what had been formerly their island.²⁰ The fact that Thasos had been a colony of Paros is important for our purpose, since the eponymous magistrate of Paros was the archon and colonists regularly brought with them the institutions and customs of their mother city. At Thasos the eponymous magistrate was also an archon, and the first Thasian eponymous archon would have been a continuation of the tradition that had existed at Paros (see above, No. 44).

Very many Thasian documents are lists of *theoroi*, in groups of three, while others are of the eponymous archons. The Thasian archon list was engraved on the wall of a public building toward the middle of the fourth century and then brought up to date in the succeeding years (Dunant-Pouilloux, *Recherches* II 104). The original publication seems to have begun with the archons back in the middle (or earlier part) of the sixth century and eventually included those of at least the third century AD.²¹

From the archon lists and other inscriptions it is clear that there was a college of three archons at Thasos, for they are grouped in threes in the lists and three are often named in other documents with the formula of eponymity. One of the earliest is Pouilloux, *Recherches* I no. 18 (Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 83) of 411-409 BC (?), which consists of two laws offering rewards for information about plots against Thasos. At the end of the first law (line 6) the date is ἐπὶ Ἀκρύπτο, Ἀλεξιμάχου, Δεξιόδεω ἀρχόντων, and in the second (lines 13-14) the date is ἐπὶ Φανοδίκου, Ἀντιφάνεος, Κτησίλλου ἀρχόντων. In *IG* XII 8,262, as republished with commentary by Pouilloux, *Recherches* I pp. 163ff., there is a double date at the end, the first of an unknown city and the second of Thasos: ἄρχ[ων ---]ς, ἐν δὲ Θάσῳ + three names in the Nominative, from the end of the fifth century BC and concerned with the restoration of democracy. Other examples of three (eponymous) archons include *IG* XII 8,267 (third century) and Dunant-Pouilloux, *Recherches* II no. 173 (era of the Mithridatic War?). Despite these examples of three-fold eponymity, there was only one of the college of three archons who was the actual national eponym. He must be the first one to be named in the groups of three. Proof of this is found in *IG* XII 8,589, a short list of Thasian officials. It begins with the word ἄρχων in the singular but is followed by three names, the first of which is in larger letters than the next two. From the lettering and nomenclature it belongs to the Roman imperial period. And there are other examples to support this conclusion. The following texts are dated by the ἐπί formula of eponymity with only a single archon mentioned: *IG* XII 8,265 (*SIG*³ 1217), from the fourth century BC; *IG* XII 8,354 from the first century BC; Pouilloux, *Recherches* I no. 152; *IG* XII Suppl. no. 347, probably from the fourth century BC. This

²⁰ For the entire history and epigraphy of Thasos see the two volumes of *Études Thasiennes* III and V, the first published by J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I* (Paris 1954), the second by Chr. Dunant and J. Pouilloux with the same title (II, Paris 1958). For the founding of the colony see *Recherches* I pp. 9ff.

²¹ The extant fragments are very numerous and putting them in the proper order is a difficult problem. They can be found in *Recherches* I nos. 28-34, with a diagram on p. 276, and in *Recherches* II nos. 199-220, which extend the list to the Roman imperial period. Dating depends largely on the identification of individuals known from other documents, especially the lists of *theoroi*. Pouilloux and F. Salviat have announced their intention of reconstructing this archon list: see *Praktika of the Eighth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy* (published in Athens 1984) 233ff., and cf. *Revue de Philologie* 1985, 13-20.

last text is interesting: ἐπὶ Νικάδου τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου τὸ β', ἄρχοντες εἶπον, etc. This mixture of single and multiple archons through the centuries might suggest that the three archons took turns during the year at being the eponym, but similar colleges elsewhere are well-known. Only the first in the list is the true eponym.²²

Although the college of three was the regular institution, there were periods when changes were made. *IG XII 8,275* from the pre-Roman period is a list of theoroi, one group of whom is introduced by a date ἐπὶ τῶν δωδέκα ἀρχόντων, and Pouilloux, *Recherches I* no. 34 contains two entries in which six archons are listed in each of them. There can be little doubt that these are the results of political changes in Thasos.²³ I see no reason to believe that the single eponymous archonship had been affected in such periods. After such periods of change or anarchy the lists indicate that the old and normal college of three was restored.

55. THERA

The Dorian colonization of Thera is clear in the archaeological monuments of the island and also in its political life, as we can see from its epigraphic remains. It is very plain in the matter of Thera's eponymous magistrate. *IG XII 3,336* is a list of manumitted slaves introduced by the heading [ἐπὶ] ἐφόρων [Ἀρισ]τομάχου καὶ ---ωνος καὶ (*erasum*) [Θρα]-συλέοντος, καὶ [ἱερ]ομνάμονος ---δάμου τοῦ [Τελ]εσικρ[ά]τε[υ]ς, etc. It would appear (so Hiller von Gaertringen in the corpus) that there were three ephors, and I would label the hieromnamon a false eponym. I would also think that the first ephor of the college of three is the national eponymous magistrate, a belief supported by *IG XII 3,330* which is the famous testament of Epicteta, who appears to have lived toward the end of the third and at the beginning of the second century BC. It was engraved on four marble tablets that formed part of a long base. Her name (Ἐπικτήτα Γρίνου) stands at the head of cols. IV-V, and col. 1 begins ἐπὶ ἐφόρων τῶν σὺν Φοιβοτέλει τάδε διέθετο νοοῦσα καὶ φρονοῦσα Ἐπικτήτα

²² See the remarks of Pouilloux, *Recherches I* p. 400. On page 401 he addresses the suggestion of each archon being eponymous for a period of four months: "Cette coutume, si constamment attestée, pose un problème: le même personnage était-il archonte éponyme toute l'année, ou chacun des membres du collège exerçait-il cette prérogative à tour de rôle pendant quatre mois? La difficulté serait résolue si l'on pouvait comparer un plus grand nombre d'actes datés avec les listes officielles des archives: dans le seul cas où la comparaison est possible, les archontes sont nommés dans le même ordre dans les deux documents. Si le même, personnage exerçait l'éponymat κατ' ἐξοχήν toute l'année, chacune des trois divisions administratives devait jouir à tour de rôle de cette prérogative. Enfin les listes de l'époque classique que l'on possède, laissent croire qu'on n'exerçait pas cette charge deux fois. Si au II^e siècle ap. J.-C. l'éponyme Nikadas joue ce rôle pour la seconde fois, il faut y voir, semble-t-il, une modification tardive imposée par les conditions particulières à la société romaine." The two documents to which he refers are no. 34 in his own volume of *Recherches* and *IG XII 8,267* (which he corrects on page 258).

²³ On the arrangement of the blocks on which the huge list of Thasian theoroi was engraved see now the proposals made by F. Salviat in *Thasiaca (BCH Suppl. 5 [1979] 107-127)* and the response by A.J. Graham in *The Ancient World 5* (1982) 103-121. Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1983 no. 297. The fact that political trouble could affect the government needs no defense, but the point is specifically mentioned in Pouilloux, *Recherches I* no. 28, in which (line 37) amid archons of the fifth century we find the entry Ἀναρχίη μῆνας 111. See the comments of Pouilloux pp. 265-267. A similar indication of political turmoil can be seen in *IG XII 8,276*: ὑπὸ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν οἱ ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσιοι ἦρχον οἶδε ἐθεόρεον etc., a phrase that may reflect conditions of the anarchy. On the other hand, a period of economic depression is evident in no. 225 of Dunant-Pouilloux, *Recherches II*, where we have in a list of Thasian magistrates (archons?) of the Roman imperial age a certain Gaius Iulius Hecataeus holding the magistracy a second time, and where also we find the god Asklepios amid a group of two other magistrates.

Γρίννου etc. And col. III begins ἐπὶ ἐφόρων τῶν σὺν Ἰμέρτωι, Διοσθύου, etc. Phoiboteles and Himertos are the eponymous magistrates of two separate years.

By the time of the emperor Tiberius the eponymous magistrate is a priest and we hear no more of the eponymous ephors. *IG XII 3,338* is a base found in the gymnasium and it begins [ἐ]πὶ ἱερέως Σωσισ[τρά]του, followed by the gymnasiarch with his name. This inscription cannot be dated, but it shows the eponymity of the priest, while *IG XII 3,339*, a tablet from the same gymnasium, shows the nature of the priesthood (line 1): [ὁ ἱερ]εὺς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος etc. Thus, a priest of the imperial cult. Another example is found in *IG XII 3,325* (*SIG³ 852*), a stele erected in the reign of Antoninus Pius for his continued good health and that of his family. Lines 17-21 give the exact date: Λ. Σεργίῳ Σκειπίωνι Ὀρφίτῳ, Κ. Σοσίῳ Πρέισκῳ ὑπάτοις πρὸ ἐ' Καλανδῶν Αὐγούστων, ὡς δὲ Θηραῖοι ἄγουσιν, ἐπὶ ἱερέως Φιλομήτορος τοῦ Φιλομήτορος, μηνὸς Ὑα[κ]ινθίου ἕκτη λήγοντος, etc. A generation later a new college of eponymous archons appears to have been instituted: *IG XII 3,1397* is only nine lines long and begins with [Α]ὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Λ. Σεπτίμιον Σεβήρον Περίνακα Σεβαστὸν ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Θηραίων ἐπὶ ἀρχόντων and is then followed by three names with patronymics. Here also I believe that only the first-named archon is the national eponym.

(To be continued)

State University of New York
at Buffalo

Robert K. Sherk

ZPE 89 (1991) 38

CORRIGENDA

S.231 letzte Zeile lies: *Continued from *ZPE* 83,1990,249ff.