

DAVID WHITEHEAD

THE ΚΩΛΟΚΡΑΤΑΙ OF KYDANTIDAI AND IONIDAI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 95 (1993) 159–162

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE ΚΩΛΟΚΡΑΤΑΙ OF KYDANTIDAI AND IONIDAI

In Horos 7,1989,7-16 A.P.Matthaiou has published one of the more arresting epigraphic discoveries of recent times.¹ For the convenience of readers, here (at the request of the editor) is the text in full:

Θ ε ο ί

Λεοντεὺς Ἀντιφάνους Κυδαντίδης εἶπε[ν]·
 δεδόχθαι Κυδαντίδαις καὶ Ἴωνίδαις·^{vv}
 ἐπειδὴ οἱ κωλοκράται οἱ ἐπὶ Ἀριστοφά-
 5 νους ἄρχοντος καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἡρακ(λ)έως
 καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν
 Ἡρακλέων τῶν τε σπονδ(ε)ίων καὶ τῶν θερι-
 νῶν, ἐπαινέσαι ἀν(τ)οὺς καὶ στεφανῶσαι
 θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι ἕκαστον αὐτῶν δικαιο-
 10 σύνης ἔνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς Κυδαν-
 τ(ί)δ(ι)δας καὶ Ἴωνίδας, τὸν ἱερέα Μείδωνα Ἀρ-
 κεφίλου Κυδαντίδην καὶ τοὺς κωλοκρά-
 τας Λεοντέα Μενεστράτου Κυδαντίδην,^v
 Φόρμον Προκλείδου Κυδαντίδην· ἀναγράψαι
 15 δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλ(ε)ι λιθίνῃ καὶ
 στήσαι ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλείωι. vacat

vacat

Hitherto, a list of Attic demes providing us with decrees or other documents² could not have included the two tiny Aigeid communities of Kydantidai and Ionidai,³ but the two birds are now killed with Matthaiou's one, excellently preserved stone, commemorating as it does a joint resolution of these two exiguous bodies of rural demesmen (line 3, cf. 9-11). Such a thing, as he rightly notes, is unparalleled (Matthaiou 9) - the same adjective used, and again rightly, by M.K.Langdon in 1987, when publishing what 'is very probably a joint tribal decree of Aigeis and Aiantis'.⁴ It is intriguing that Langdon's date of c. 330 for this latter document coincides to perfection with the archon date of 331/0 (Aristophanes) in the new

¹ Cited hereinafter by author's surname only. The same goes for D.Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.: a political and social study* (Princeton 1986).

² As in Whitehead appendix 3; cf. N.F.Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: a documentary study* (Philadelphia 1987) 67-72.

³ For Kydantidai, note merely: (1) Michael Jameson's speculative Κυδ[αντ]ιδ[αι] -- ? in Lewis's apparatus for IG I³ 247.1, a document equally likely to have emanated from a genos or phratry, and (2) Κυδ[] on side A of the as yet unpublished deme decree Agora 16.54 (but the provenance as well, perhaps, as the rather grandiose character of the stele point to Kydathenaion; Whitehead 383).

⁴ M.K.Langdon, 'An Attic decree concerning Oropos', *Hesperia* 56,1987,47-58, at 51.

deme decree, and if there is any true significance in that fact one can only hope for further evidence to explain it; meanwhile, however, caution would obviously be advisable. Following a connection suggested by David Lewis, Langdon attractively links his double tribe decree with the post-338 shareout of Oropian territory mentioned in Hyperid. Eux. 16-17. If that is correct, the ten tribes were acting *κύνδυο* in ways and for reasons which originated, in the first instance, at city level, and the phenomenon as a whole was a sort of ad hoc variant on the routine fivefold grouping of the tribes which we find several times in the second part of the Aristotelian Ath.Pol. (explicit in 52.2; implicit in 51.3, 54.1, 56.3, 62.2). Joint decision-making between two demes, however, may have stemmed from different considerations altogether, whether "national" or local; perhaps (again) reflecting the immediate circumstances of the 330s, but equally plausibly a legacy from the pre-Kleisthenic past.

Since speculation on this and allied points (such as the location of 'the Theseion' where the stele was to be erected: lines 14-16) would be otiose, I eschew it, and concentrate instead, as my title suggests, upon one feature of the decree's contents. Its purpose is honorific; there are three honorands, all of them Kydantidai; two are described as οἱ κωλοκράται (sic) οἱ ἐπὶ Ἀριστοφάνου ἄρχοντος (lines 4-5) and one as ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἡρακ(λ)έως (line 5). All three men are said to have shown *dikaiosyne* and *philotimia* towards (the) Kydantidai and Ionidai, with particular reference to their superintendence of two festivals of Herakles, evidently local ones, the Spondeia and the Therina.

Readers of Matthaiou's commentary are left to conclude, surely correctly, that the priest Meidon Arkephilou is discharging a local, deme-oriented office - but who, or rather what, are these κωλοκράται? Are they local officials too? Matthaiou does not consider this possibility. Instead, in a rather confusing, two-stage presentation (Matthaiou 9 and 13-15) he develops a theory which revolves around identifying them with a city magistracy, the κωλακρέται, for which the Suda implies religious functions - their original ones, he believes - in addition to their well-attested financial ones (below). The persuasiveness of this in terms of lexicographic Quellenkritik I must leave others to judge, but as an interpretation of the new inscription it strikes me as problematic.

(1) Orthodoxy - as represented by (e.g.) P.J.Rhodes⁵ - has it that the κωλακρέται were abolished in a financial reorganisation of c.411, and orthodoxy looks very cogent indeed. For half a century beforehand they are constantly mentioned in inscriptions at city level⁶ (and never once at local level); then, for the next eighty years, nothing, until the decree we are

⁵ P.J.Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 98-102, and *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 139-140, 391-392, 558; cf. (e.g.) Meiggs/Lewis p.258, and M.H.Hansen, 'Seven hundred archai in classical Athens', *GRBS* 21,1980,151-173, at 166.

⁶ See *IG I³* 7, 11, 23, 32, 36, 71, 73, 75, 78, 80, 82, 84, 89, 130, 136, 149, 153, 159, 165, 180, 193, 195, 199, 200, 224, 395, 435. Every item of literary evidence, too, either comes from (Aristoph. *Wasps* 695, 725, *Birds* 1541) or pertains to (?Aristot. *Ath.Pol.* 7.3; Androtion *FGrH* 324 F36) a time before the fourth century.

considering here. It is an uncomfortably wide gulf to bridge, even if the (on Matthaiou's theory) removal of financial functions from officials who continued to exist would have led them to be mentioned less often.

(2) Fifth-century references to the κωλακρέται usually say or imply nothing about their period of office, but a clutch of three decrees brought together by Wilhelm in 1939 indicate a change of personnel each prytany (expressed in one of the three instances as month).⁷ Yet Leonteus Menestratou and Phormos Prokleidou here, honoured for their services in 331/0, had evidently been in office for the whole of the year of Aristophanes.

(3) To pursue the implications of the previous point: reference to a plurality of κωλακρέται officiating in each prytany necessarily implies a minimum of twenty in a whole year, but the demesmen of Kydantidai and Ionidai are seeking to reward two. In statistical terms it is just about acceptable that two out of the (say) twenty officials of 331/0 were from the tiny deme of Kydantidai, at any rate if their system of appointment called for two representatives from tribe II Aigeis. But could the pair of them properly have merited exclusive (and misleading) description as the year's incumbents?⁸

These difficulties disappear if we take the line I have already hinted at and envisage Leonteus and Phormos as purely local officials; annually changing ones unlike (it would seem) their colleague the priest; both of them, this year, Kydantidai rather than Ionidai either by chance or as the manifestation and outcome of a system of alternation. In the nature of things I cannot prove this but I can at least dispose of a number of objections which it might occur to others to place in its way. No impediment to my interpretation, I maintain, is presented by the following three aspects of this pair of κωλοκράται:

(a) Their year of office is dated by a city magistrate, not a local one such as a demarch. That is also true of Athmonon's οἱ μεράρχαι οἱ ἐπ' Ἀντικλείου ἄρχοντος (IG II² 1203.2-4), Aixonian (local) choregoi in IG II² 1198 and 1200, and others.

(b) Their title is (almost) the same as that of city officials.⁹ A common phenomenon in the Attic demes, where one finds numerous (e.g.) ταμίαι and ἱεροποιοί, and the occasional (e.g.) ἀντιγραφεύς, γραμματεὺς and λογίτης. See generally Whitehead 139ff.

(c) Their title is not attested in any other deme. Granted, but also the case with the μεράρχαι of Athmonon, already mentioned, the ὀρισταί of Peiraieus (IG II² 1177.21-24),

⁷ Now IG I³ 36, 73, 224. See A. Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden* 5, Sitzb. Wien 217.5 (1939) 52-72, esp. 61-65 (= *Akademieschriften* 1 (Leipzig 1974) 572-592, esp. 581-585). With three documents to call upon, the inference will still stand even if one prefers the Dittenberger/Tod punctuation in I³ 36, which connects τῷ Θ[αργηλ][ιῶ]νος μηνός with ἀποδιδόναι rather than with τὸς κωλακρ[έται] | οἱ ἄν κωλακρετῶσι; and Rhodes' scepticism (Boule 22 n.3, 102 n.8, noted in the Corpus) about Wilhelm's restoration of what is now I³ 224 must fall short of any complaint against τὸς κωλακρέται[ς τὸς ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγείδος].

⁸ SEG 21.520.3-5 (τοῖς βουλευ[ευστὰς τοὺς ἐ]π' Ἀριστ[ι]οφ[ων] ..5.. ἄρχ[οντος]) is no true parallel, as Teithras filled four seats on the city council year in and year out.

⁹ Matthaiou 9 and (esp.) 15-16 pursues the κωλακρέται/κωλοκράται discrepancy, to no great avail.

the νομαφύλακες of Rhamnous (IG II² 1311.8, with Kirchner's note), and several others: Whitehead 140-141.

It will probably be safe to assume that their duties were financial with religious overtones, as those of their city namesakes had been, but to go further would be to risk elucidating *obscurum per obscurius*.¹⁰

University of Manchester

David Whitehead

¹⁰ My thanks to Peter Rhodes for his scrutiny of this opusculum.