

FROM POLIS TO PROVINCE

**FROM POLIS TO PROVINCE: AN ANALYSIS OF
THE ATHENIAN GOVERNING CLASS FROM 167/6 B.C.
TO A.D. 13/4**

by

Roger S. Fisher, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School

of Graduate Studies In Partial

Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

1986

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(History)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: From Polis to Province: An Analysis of the Athenian Governing Class
from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 13/4

AUTHOR: Roger S. Fisher, B.A. (University of Ottawa)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. D.J. Geagan

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi , 445

Abstract

The magistrates, priests and families attested between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 13/4 belong to a governing class which may be regarded as a large civic class and several partly overlapping elites: a political elite, comprised of the members of the Areopagus, as well as a religious elite, a liturgical elite, a military (or ephebic elite) and a cultural-educational elite. The political elite is the most exclusive segment of the governing class. The other elites and the civic class form a descending hierarchy of peripheral families. In the course of seven chapters, the following conclusions are presented: (1) the governing class is in a constant state of flux as new families are recruited from below or through the admission of new citizens to Athens; (2) the analysis of the careers (or sequence of offices held by the members of the governing class) shows that certain types of offices are usually held at a particular age or point in an individual's public life, and changes in the number and type of offices available to an individual reflect changes in the nature of political life at Athens during this period; (3) during the generation following the acquisition of Delos in 167/6 B.C., pro-Roman families of the established aristocracy are predominant in the ranks of the governing class at both Athens and on Delos; (4) these families soon decline and the recruitment and composition of the governing class evolve during the transition to the second generation following c. 130 B.C.; (5) the revolution of 88/7 B.C. is an indirect consequence of demographic changes at Athens during the preceding generation; (6) during the Roman civil wars the governing class is found to be divided into competing factions; (7) finally, the emergence of a new and primarily hereditary governing elite may be documented during the reign of Augustus. An appendix tabulates all dated Athenian magistrates (and inscriptions) during this period. Other appendices discuss several chronological difficulties, the ephebic instructors and undated archons.

Acknowledgements

I must first thank Dr. D.J. Geagan, who suggested this topic for my dissertation and directed me in its completion; I especially thank him for his critical and careful reading of the final drafts. I would also like to thank Dr. J. Trueman, who chaired the supervisory committee, and Dr. T. Hoey of the Department of Classics, who has always been very helpful. The assistance of the following institutions is also gratefully acknowledged: The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for a doctoral fellowship in 1983-84; the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, where, in 1984-85, the research for this dissertation was completed; the Thompson-Waisglass Fund for a bursary which paid my fees at the American School; the Program Committee of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens for awarding a fellowship which enabled me to reside in Athens during 1984-85; and Memorial University of Newfoundland. I would also like to mention here Dr. A.G. McKay of the Department of Classics, whose support and kindness helped make my graduate study at McMaster University both challenging and rewarding. Finally, I thank my wife, Anne-Marie Lewis, for all her help.

Table of Contents

Preface	vii
1. The Nature of the Governing Class	1
2. The Offices of the Governing Class	38
3. Governing Families and the Cleruchy on Delos	81
4. The Governing Class in Transition	107
5. The Revolution of 88/7 B.C.	143
6. Athens During the Roman Civil Wars	178
7. Conclusion: The Governing Class Under Augustus	211
Appendix A. Fasti Magistratum Atheniensium	242
A.1. Introduction	242
A.2. Some Chronological Notes	374
A.3. Index of Dated Texts	404
Appendix B. Ephebic Instructors	416
B.1. Athens	416
B.2. Delos	423
Appendix C. Undated Archons	427
Bibliography	435

List of Tables

Table 1-1:	Average Age of Fathers at Birth of a Son	12
Table 1-2:	Age Interval Between Siblings	13
Table 1-3:	Foreign Ephebes at Athens	17
Table 1-4:	Roman Names Among the Athenian Citizen Population	21
Table 1-5:	Tribal Contingents of Ephebes between 128/7 B.C. and 13/2 B.C.	28
Table 1-6:	Age-Distribution in a Hypothetical Council	32
Table 5-1:	Family Participation in the Pythaiids	154
Table 5-2:	A Comparison of Families Based on the Number of Attested Members	157
Table 5-3:	The Monopolization of Offices by the Governing Elite	158
Table 7-1:	Members of "Old" Families Related to Areopagites in Office Under Augustus	215
Table 7-2:	Members of "Old" Families Related to Non-Areopagites in Office Under Augustus	216
Table 7-3:	Members of "New" Families in Office Under Augustus	227
Table 7-4:	The Monopolization of Offices Under Augustus by Families of the Governing Elite	236
Table 7-5:	Number of Offices Held by Individuals Belonging To Families First Attested Before or After 88/7 B.C.	238
Table A-1:	Tribal Cycles of Priesthoods on Delos (167/6-89/8 B.C.)	375
Table A-2:	Tribal Cycles at Athens (After 88/7 B.C.)	391
Table A-3:	Archons and Ephebic Instructors (59/8-38/7 B.C.)	397

Preface

The composition of the Athenian governing class and its evolution from 167/6 B.C., when Athens recovered from Rome her former colony of Delos and embarked on a period of renewed political and economic activity, to A.D. 14 and the end of the reign of the Roman Emperor Augustus, is an important topic in Athenian social history which hardly needs to be justified. The prosopography of Athenian society during this period, in contrast to the two centuries following the reign of Augustus (for which there are several monographs based on prosopographical studies), has been neglected. The only published prosopography of Athenians, J. Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* (1901-3), quickly became obsolete. So many new inscriptions had been discovered in the decade following its publication that an entirely new index was considered necessary. J. Sundwall's *Nachtraege* (1910) was limited to emendations and additions to entries already in the Kirchner index.¹ The file of names compiled at Princeton over several decades under the direction of B.D. Meritt has become indispensable to epigraphers and historians, especially for the period of the Roman Empire, but it is still somewhat incomplete for the period between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14.² The large volume of names mentioned in the inscriptions from Delos, moreover, have not, apart from a few exceptions, been entered in either the Kirchner or Meritt prosopographies, an omission which is compounded by the lack of an index to the *Inscriptions de Délos* (1935-37).³ This has been a major impediment to

¹J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, Leipzig, 1901-3 (2 vols.); J. Sundwall, *Nachtraege zur Prosopographia Attica*, Helsingfors, 1910.

²Professor J. Traill is now putting this prosopography on computer in a major project at the University of Toronto called *ATHENIANS*.

³F. Durrbach, M. Launey and P. Roussel, *Inscriptions de Délos* (vols. 4-6), Paris, 1935-7. Roussel's index of Athenian names in "Les Athéniens mentionnés dans les inscriptions de Délos," *BCH* 32 (1908) pp. 306-366, is obsolete.

research because of the many Athenians who were active in the administration and cults of the island.⁴

The research for this thesis is based on an index, as complete and up-to-date as possible, of Athenian magistrates from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 13/4.⁵ It was necessary to compile a special index because of the inclusive nature of this study. The dissertation attempts to incorporate all attested and identifiable Athenians during the period between 167/6 B.C. and 14 A.D. A card file of inscriptions was first prepared taking into account new discoveries and the most recent editions. This file, which excludes *tituli sepulchrales*,⁶ covers almost 2500 documents. The name index has been compiled from these texts and contains about 6000 file card entries (including ephebes, *prytaneis*, liturgists, priests and magistrates) which accurately record the names as they are given in the published texts. A separate entry has been made for each tenure of a given magistracy, so

⁴The controversy over the date for the beginning of the annual output, eventually spanning more than a century, of "New Style" silver tetradrachms has complicated efforts to identify the magistrates named on the coins and the role of the mint magistracy in Athenian administration and politics. The entire coinage has been catalogued and organized by M. Thompson in her major study of the coinage (*The Athenian New Style Silver Coinage*, New York, 1965). The names of over 600 mint magistrates are provided by these coins. Thompson's prosopography of mint magistrates is now in question because of recent efforts to shift the beginning of the coinage from 196/5 B.C. to c. 166 B.C. D.M. Lewis ("The Chronology of the Athenian New Style Coinage," *NC* 2, 1962, pp. 275-300) and H.B. Mattingly ("Some Third Mint Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Coinage," *JHS* 91, 1971, pp. 85-93) have attempted to identify some mint magistrates on the basis of their "low" chronology but no systematic study of these magistrates has been carried out. Thompson's sequence of magistrates may be accepted although her dates should probably be reduced by about a generation. (I indicate Thompson's dates for a mint magistrate by a capital "T" before the year, e.g. T155/4 B.C.).

⁵This index is now entered in an *SPSS*-readable database. The *SPSS* format allows each "record" (that is, all the information relating to a particular magistrate) to be sorted by computer. At the present time each record contains only the most basic information (name, patronymic, tribe, deme, year of tenure, magistracy and source). The index was used only as a reference aid to my file card index.

⁶In the late Hellenistic Period grave monuments are much less elaborate than they were before Demetrius' sumptuary legislation. This means that grave monuments are not a reliable indication of wealth (cf. J. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford, 1971, p. xix). Also, the dating of gravestones (usually letter forms are the only criterion) and the identification of the individuals named on them make their inclusion in a study such as this too problematic.

that an individual who held more than one magistracy is represented by several entries. The index, therefore, does first service as an index of magistrates. This method was adopted to allow each magistracy to be studied separately and to facilitate the preparation of synchronic tables which form the basis for an annual list of dated Athenian magistrates (Appendix A).⁷ After the index was complete, individual careers were reconstructed by collating references to the offices held by one individual. Family stemmas were then researched by hand with the assistance of an index of patronymics, demes and tribal affiliations. These careers and stemmas form the basis for the chapters presented in this dissertation.

The dissertation seeks to apply a method which has not yet been tried in prosopographical studies of Athenian society. The emphasis in the dissertation is on reconstructing a historical narrative based on a broad analysis of the prosopographical evidence. I have relied on the standard texts published by epigraphers and editors. I have collated fragmentary or partial references to individuals where there seemed to be reasonable or probable grounds for doing so. Because so many names are only partially complete (archons, for example, are usually named only by their personal name without patronymic or demotic) many careers must remain conjectural. Generally, in Athenian prosopography during this period, a name and patronymic or a name and demotic must be present for there to be reasonable grounds for collation into a individual career. Similarly, in

⁷Appendix A attempts to provide for Athens during this period what T.R.S. Broughton, in his monumental *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (2 vols, New York, 1951-2), offers the student of Roman History: "Broughton's MRR is an attempt to establish the historical and/or list positions of not only the consuls but also of the other magistrates" (A.E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology, Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*, Munich, 1972, p. 254). C. Nicolet insists that Roman social structure determined in a particular way the uniqueness and importance of the Roman magisterial fasti and would downplay the significance of magisterial fasti in the Greek world ("Prosopographie et histoire sociale: Rome et l'Italie à l'époque républicaine," *Annales* 25, 1970, p. 1213). At a time when the lot was used less extensively, however, the objection that Greek magistrates were chosen at random is not valid.

attributing individuals to families, I have relied for the most part on demotics or, less frequently, the combination of homonymous names within two generations. This was not always possible. Most of the *pythaistai paides*, ephebes, *hippeis* and *theoroi* who participated in the four Pythais of 138/7, 128/7, 106/5 and 98/7 B.C., comprising in total several hundred individuals and therefore a significant proportion of the names on which this dissertation is based, are named without their demotics. The *hippeis*, furthermore, are named without their patronymic, although their tribal affiliation is indicated. I point out in the text instances where career collations or family attributions are highly conjectural. It must be pointed out that it is in the nature of prosopographical evidence based on epigraphical sources that all career collations and family attributions, no matter how plausible, can never be proven.

For a study of this nature, the period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14 conveniently divides itself into two nearly equal parts; the period down to 88/7 B.C., when Athens was prosperous and relatively autonomous, and the period after 87/6 B.C., when, following internal strife and finally open rebellion against Rome in favour of Mithridates VI of Pontus, the city was sacked by the Roman general L. Cornelius Sulla, precipitating a new constitution and a new era in Athenian history.⁸ The following chapters define the governing class in relation to the entire population of Athens, describe the offices and institutions of the governing class and trace how the governing class evolved in four periods (or "generations") from the acquisition of Delos in 167/6 B.C. to the end of the reign of Augustus. Identifying and describing the governing class is strictly a demographic problem and will be the focus of the first chapter. The political organization and behaviour of the governing class and the history of the class, as much as this can be inferred from the prosopographical evidence, will be the topics of the remaining six chapters.

⁸On the Athenian constitution during the Roman period, see D.J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, *Hesperia* Supplement XII, Princeton, 1967.

A Note on Prosopographical and Epigraphical References

For the sake of legibility, Athenian names will be rendered in Greek capitals (for example, *ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ*). In the text, names are cited without textual or philological ornamentation. In citing Greek names in the text the symbol [] only indicates missing letters in the epigraphical document and not letters restored by an editor (e.g. *ΑΘΗΝ[]ΟΣ*). All dated magistrates and the texts on which they are named are listed in Appendix A. The reader may turn there for quick access to the textual support for the prosopography of these dated magistrates (see page 247 for a note on the prosopographical and epigraphical references in Appendix A). In the case of magistrates or individuals named in the text who held office in unspecified years (e.g. "ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ was a priest in c. 130 B.C." or "ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ was *hieropoios* between 140-30 B.C."), the textual reference is provided immediately after the date in brackets. But where a specific date is provided (e.g. 106/5 B.C.) the name and/or the textual reference will be found in Appendix A. Appendix A lists the names of all individual magistrates who can be dated to specific years. Generic offices such as *ephebes* and *prytaneis* are cited by inscription number only. The names of *prytaneis* and other numerous office-holders such as *hippeis*, *ephebes*, *theoroi* and *pythaistai* are not listed in Appendix A because these names may be more readily consulted in the comprehensive indices to *Agora XV* and *FD III, 2*. This method was adopted in order not to duplicate unnecessarily the previously published prosopographies of Athenian names. Abbreviations for journals and epigraphical collections correspond to those of *L'Année Philologique* or "le Bulletin Epigraphique" (in *REG*). The title of a frequently cited book or article will also be abbreviated. The abbreviation always follows the author's name, and the full title is listed in the bibliography.

Chapter 1

The Nature of the Governing Class

The prosopographical evidence for Athenian society in the period between the acquisition of Delos in 167/6 B.C. and the death of the Roman emperor Augustus in A.D. 14 concerns almost entirely the governing class, those Athenians who held the civic magistracies, served in the priesthoods of the public cults and performed the liturgies necessary for the maintenance of the civic and religious life of the city.¹ The abundance of prosopographical information for the population of Athens after 167/6 B.C. has caused historians to question what relation these thousands of names have to the actual size and class structure of

¹I have chosen to define the governing class in this way because of the nature of the evidence from this period. A large number of civic magistrates and priests are named in the sources and the greatest majority of names known from this period belong to individuals holding such offices. J. Sundwall's *Epigraphische Beiträe zur sozial-politischen Geschichte Athens* (*Klio* Beiheft 4, Leipzig, 1916) attempted to analyze the social status of Athenian magistrates in the fourth century by an exhaustive study of careers and families. Davies employed a different criterion in defining the elite of classical Athens (*APF*, p. xix). He concluded his study of propertied families in c. 300 B.C. because his criteria for identifying an individual as a member of a propertied class all become inoperable after this date (the festival liturgies are replaced by a civic magistracy, for example, and the trierarchy is hardly attested after 306/5 B.C.): "...to pursue the investigation later calls for another study, with other techniques" (*APF* p. xxv). P. MacKendrick's *The Athenian Aristocracy from 332 B.C. to 31 B.C.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969) employed the criterion of gentile status (membership in the hereditary nobility). But many magistrates from this period are not known to belong to the nobility and, as will be argued in Chapter 2, membership in a aristocratic *genos* may not have been a significant factor in the political career of an individual magistrate. For these reasons, I have defined the governing class as broadly as possible.

Athenian society during the second and first centuries B.C.,² and some, perhaps out of despair at the prospects for such an inquiry, have complained that the epigraphical sources for this period often provide little more information than long lists of names, lists which are "exasperatingly complete".³ Although the history of Athenian families can only be discussed within certain limits, the names and activities of thousands of individual Athenians which have been preserved in diverse non-literary sources provide more information for the organization and history of Athenian society during this period than has hitherto been allowed.⁴ Most of the members of the governing class attested in office between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 13/4, for example, can be identified prosopographically to some degree. Over one-half of the five hundred and fifty careers⁵ which have been reconstructed for this period belong to members of known families. In addition to these careers, many more individual magistrates or priests who are attested only

²The literary evidence for the history, population and social structure of Athens during this period is negligible. Literary sources are limited to brief notices in contemporary authors such as Polybius and Cicero or writers of the Roman Empire, none of whom wrote with Athens as their main interest. Only one of our sources, a fragment from Posidonius quoted by the second century sophist Athenaeus (V.212bff), is a contemporary historical narrative. The history of Athens during this period, therefore, cannot be written with the completeness or the variety that has been possible for the better attested fifth and fourth centuries. Ferguson's *Hellenistic Athens* (New York, 1911; reprint ed. 1969), narrates Athenian history from the time of Alexander to 88/7 B.C. His work is the foundation for C. Mossé, *Athens in Decline: 404-86 B.C.* (London, 1973). A.J. Papalas, "Studies in Roman Athens: 29 B.C.-A.D. 180" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1969) does not consider the prosopographical evidence for the reign of Augustus in any detail.

³Ferguson, *HA*, p. 415. Roussel also laments that the epigraphical evidence from Delos provides little more than lists of names (*Délos: colonie athénienne*, Paris, 1916, p. 28; see also W.A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos*, Oxford, 1933, p. 172).

⁴It has often been pointed out that Greek historians have made less use of their prosopographical evidence than their Roman counterparts. See for example, L. Robert, *BE*, 1979, n. 221 and Ch. Habicht, "Beitraege zur Prosopographie der altgriechen Welt," *Chiron* 2, 1972, pp. 104-34. The prosopographical evidence for this period has been indexed and studied in great detail (in the commentaries of corpora such as the *I.G.* II², *I.D.* and *Hesperia* publications) but there has been no synthetic study of this evidence. S. Tracy's *I.G. II² 2336: Contributions of First Fruits for the Pythais* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1982) is a major re-edition of this large inscription, but his prosopographical analysis is limited to individuals named in the text.

⁵Each "career" consists of a single individual attested in two or more offices.

in a single magistracy or priesthood or other office can be identified as relatives of at least one other public figure. On the basis of such identifications, over five hundred and forty family stemmas may be reconstructed.⁶ The initial rank or status of these families and their rise and fall can be inferred from the prosopographical evidence, although it must be cautioned that this evidence is not biographical in any personal sense. Basically it can provide only an outline of offices held by an individual or his family. In no case is it possible to document an individual's unrealized ambitions or failure to attain certain goals.⁷ In addition, the true cause of a family's failure to maintain its position is difficult to discover. Few families can be said with confidence to have disappeared for political reasons,⁸ and it must always be allowed that a family has disappeared from our records as much from the lack of evidence as from social or political factors. These limitations, however, do not seriously detract from the importance of the available prosopographical evidence. To the extent that the political events of the period under consideration are reflected in the composition and behaviour of the governing class, the history of Athens at this time can be told only from the history of its governing families.

The population of Athenian citizens after 167/6 B.C. consisted of several

⁶A "family" may be defined as two or more individuals who are closely related. It is important to distinguish between genealogy, the reconstruction of a particular family stemma, and prosopography, the investigation of patterns of behaviour over a large group of families or individuals. The genealogical evidence for this period has been published and studied in great detail, but there has been no demographic analysis of this evidence. The methodology is known as "family reconstitution" (see E.A. Wrigley, "Family Reconstitution" in E.A. Wrigley, *An Introduction to English Historical Demography*, London, 1966, pp. 96-159). Many of the families which can be reconstructed for this period will be related to one another through marriage and adoption, but the evidence for marriages and adoption is very limited. In this study I have focused on male linear descendants only, although other evidence will be used where it is available.

⁷This is where the contemporary Athenian evidence for prosopography differs the most from the Roman evidence.

⁸The absence of apparent descendants of *XPHMONIΔΗΣ* and *ΓΛΑΥΚΩΝ ΕΤΕΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΙΘΑΙΔΑΙ*, aristocrats who went into exile with Ptolemy (II) Philadelphus and attempted to forcibly liberate Athens (Ferguson, *HA*, p. 188), must be due to the extinction of their family at Athens.

geographically distinct groups. The largest group, of course, resided at Athens. But there were, in addition, several island cleruchies (or colonies) at places such as Lemnos, Skyros, Imbros and Peparethos. Theoretically the members of these cleruchies were full Athenian citizens with the right to participate in Athenian government and public life. But very little information is known about these cleruchs -- who and how many there were, for example, or how often they actually did travel to Athens to participate in public life there.⁹ The important exception is the cleruchy on Delos. Independent since 314 B.C., the island was returned to Athens by the Roman Senate in 167 B.C., whereupon a new contingent of Athenian cleruchs moved to the island. Athenian officials took over the administration of the island and Athenian priests served the newly acquired public cults of the colony. The prosopographical evidence for these Delian cleruchs is very extensive.¹⁰ In addition to the names of hundreds of Delian cleruchs recorded on the inscriptions from Delos, other inscriptions occasionally provide the name of a resident of a different cleruchy or an Athenian residing elsewhere.¹¹

In addition to its geographical distribution, the governing class can be described, perhaps more profitably, in terms of its social structure. The governing

⁹Very few cleruchs can be identified prosopographically. *ΑΠΑΤΟΥΡΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, an ambassador of the cleruchy on Imbros (*I.G.* II² 1224), might be a cousin of *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ*, a priest of Hermes on Imbros (*BCH* 7, 1883, p. 166). *ΘΑΛΕΑΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΧΟΛΑΡΓΕΥΣ*, an orator on Imbros in the second century B.C. (*BCH* 7, 1883, p. 192), might be related to *ΑΡΙΣΤ[]*, a *prytanis* there between 148/7-135/4 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 6, pp. 204-6). Also, the family of *ΕΥΦΑΝΗΣ ΕΥΩΝΥΜΕΥΣ* seems to have migrated from Salamis to Athens (He was a general on Salamis, *IG* 2800; two sons of a *ΕΥΜΕΝΗΣ* are attested as participants in the Pythaiads of 138/7 B.C., *ΕΥΜΑΡΕΙΔΗΣ* *FD* 23, and 128/7 B.C., *ΑΛΚΙΔΑΜΟΣ* *FD* 33).

¹⁰The relationship between the population of the Athenian colony and the *polis* is discussed in Chapter 3.

¹¹I have attempted to incorporate all such references in this study. Ch. Habicht, "Vom gegenwärtigen Standard wissenschaftliches Bemühens um eine Prosopographie der Athener," *Vestigia* 30 (1979) pp. 147-52, laments the fact that many Athenian prosopographical indexes fail to incorporate non-Athenian sources.

class of this time may be defined as the population of Athenian citizens who held public office of some kind, but it was not a homogenous or unchanging group. Some individuals accumulated a large number of senior magistracies while many others are attested in only one or two unimportant offices. Similarly, while members of some families over several generations consistently attained senior offices, other families can offer only one or two magistrates over several generations. These observations suggest a general outline for the structure of Athenian society at this time. In addition to a relatively unknown but presumably much larger population of Athenian citizens residing at Athens or on an island cleruchy, there was a group of moderately well off citizens who held local offices as well as an elite of Athenian families which moved freely between senior public offices at Athens and the cleruchies, in particular that on Delos. And just as the magistracies and priesthoods available to an individual differ in their rank or status and in the prerequisites for tenure, so too the members of the governing class fall into several sub-groups or elites according to the types of offices attained by their members. These elites, listed in order of their exclusiveness and importance in Athenian society, may be distinguished by their function, their rank or status and their size:¹²

1. The Political Elite: every year nine archons and a secretary were elected. After one year of tenure these individuals joined the council of the Areopagus, whose members held office for life. These Areopagites, about three hundred in number, constituted the political elite of Athens. Within this elite there was a loose governing oligarchy, consisting of those individuals who for a period of time provided political leadership and policies. The elite was renewed through the election of archons and its membership was susceptible to

¹²T.B. Bottomore, *Elites and Society*, Middlesex, England, 1966, pp. 7-23. The following discussion attempts to sketch out the structure of Athenian society and in particular the governing class. Davies recognized a similar need for the proper understanding of classical Athens. He argues that if a satisfactory definition of the propertied class could be compiled, "One might be in a position ... to estimate the proportion of the upper class which attained high functional status, or to identify the positions and offices which were particularly open to the claims of property-power, or to pinpoint the ways and the areas in which it had to yield ground to the claims of other skills" (*APF*, p. xx). Davies also indicates that, given the difficulty of such a task, the time is not yet right for the writing of a social and economic history of classical Athens (*APF*, p. xxx).

change. Several senior magistrates, in particular colonial administrators, were elected from the ranks of the Areopagus, making membership in the Areopagus a desirable goal for members of the governing class.¹³

2. The Religious Elite: Several religious elites may be identified at this time. On the one hand there were numerous families which served in the priesthoods of Delos. The members of these families, as their priesthoods indicate, were prosperous and active in the religious life of the cleruchy.¹⁴ In many cases members of these families are unattested in any civic magistracies. At Athens, on the other hand, there was a religious elite composed of the families of the aristocratic *gene*. Several of these families possessed the hereditary priesthoods of the cult at Eleusis. On Delos the religious elite also seems to have been based on family membership.¹⁵ The religious elite, therefore, tended to be hereditary. Because few such families are attested in senior magistracies, however, the religious elite does not seem to have been important politically and must be distinguished from the governing elite.¹⁶
3. The Liturgical Elite: This elite consists of well-off individuals who performed the public liturgies or expended private funds on public services. Members of this elite will have been wealthy, although they

¹³Ambassadors were elected "from all the Athenians". Ambassadors during the first generation of the Delian cleruchy are often members of the governing elite. But other ambassadors are less prominent. Perhaps expertise and personal interest were important factors in the appointment of an individual as ambassador such as when *AΘΗΝΙΩΝ* was sent as an ambassador to Mithridates VI.

¹⁴Tracy also observed that many of the Delian priesthoods were confined to Delian families (*I.G.* II² 2336 , p. 145).

¹⁵The college of Pythaists must also be considered part of the religious elite. Participants in the Pythaids were often related to one another and here also family membership seems to be a significant aspect (see Table 5.1). The importance which families attributed to their membership in the religious elite, either for reasons of piety or as a mark of social status, is indicated in the two instances where the name of a participant in a Pythaid was not inscribed until several years after the event (Appendix A.1). Presumably the individual or the family was anxious that the participation be recorded.

¹⁶Previous scholarship, in particular MacKendrick's *The Athenian Aristocracy*, has equated the religious elite with the political elite.

were not necessarily active in politics.¹⁷ The source of their income is largely unknown, although it can be inferred that many liturgists were involved in trade or agriculture.

4. The Cultural-Educational Elite: This elite is composed of individuals with artistic talent (such as actors, poets, and sculptors)¹⁸ or educators (such as philosophers and even ephebic instructors). Membership in this elite was often inherited, and many sons can be shown to have followed their fathers into the same profession.¹⁹ Membership was also frequently renewed through the recruitment of foreigners as Athenian citizens.
5. The Military Elite: This elite consists of individuals who served in the Athenian cavalry²⁰ as well as individuals who graduated from the

¹⁷On the basis of the prosopographical evidence it seems that the mint magistrates should be assigned to the liturgical elite. Many of the approximately six hundred mint magistrates cannot be identified. Family relations among the mint magistrates are common, and identifiable mint magistrates are often attested in liturgical positions. It is clear that many mint magistrates had non-political careers and belonged to wealthy families. L. Robert, "Les monétaires et un décret hellénistique de Sestos," *RN* 15 (1973) pp. 43-53, however, argues that mint magistrates were not liturgists.

¹⁸Sculptors are well-attested during this period. Over seventy individual sculptors are known to have been active between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 13/4 (see the useful table in A. Stewart, *Attika: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, London, 1979, pp. 106-9 and Appendix). Among these sculptors twenty-two family stemmas can be identified. But only two sculptors are attested in a different capacity, and both individuals served as ephebes. Before Augustus other family members are well attested in liturgical or religious positions, occasionally in the *prytaneia*, but not in any senior civic magistracy (the highest ranking magistracy attested for these families being the gymnasiarchy on Delos). This is an important body of evidence for comparative purposes. When four families which first placed a member in the Areopagus under Caesar or Augustus can be plausibly identified with a sculptor, the contrast to the status of these families before Augustus is particularly striking (Δ ΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ, Chapter 6; ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΝΕΣΤΟΡΟΣ ΦΛΕΤΕΣ and ΔΗΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΥΘΟΓΕΝΟΤΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ, Chapter 7).

¹⁹This is especially evident in the case of families of sculptors; some families can be shown to have carried on the profession for five or more generations (see preceding note). No families of the governing elite, in contrast, can be shown to have maintained that status for as long a period. On families involved in the instruction of the ephebes, see Appendix C.

²⁰The generals, on the other hand, were elected and probably belonged to the Areopagus (see Chapter 2).

ephebeia.²¹ Service as a cavalryman or as an ephebe required wealth and indicates standing in Athenian society. Membership, being based largely on wealth or property, could be inherited and many families can be shown to have participated in the *ephebeia* over several generations.

In addition to these elites, the governing class also included a much larger civic or peripheral class of families. This civic class comprises the individuals who served in the *prytaneia* and in the lower-ranking magistracies. Initially, a *prytanis* served for only one year as a member of the Council, although iteration was allowed and seems to have been common. Men who took an interest in the politics and civic affairs of the city would hold the junior civic magistracies, attend the *ecclesia* or visit the Athenian Agora on meeting days. This was the largest, least exclusive, and least clearly defined segment of the governing class and its membership was constantly changing.

These elites, together with the civic class, all overlap to some extent, and theoretically an individual during a single career or a family within a single generation could be attested in offices belonging to virtually all of these categories. But these elites are also partly hierarchical and exclusive in their membership. The political elite constitutes the most exclusive elite and was much smaller, for example, than the civic class. The other elites also differ in the mechanism by which they were recruited. Areopagites were elected and held office for life. An Eleusinian priest, on the other hand, inherited his office from his father or a relative although he also held his office for life. A liturgist or a cavalryman, however, belonged to a less formal elite and only needed to maintain his wealth to retain his status in the governing class. The *prytaneis*, finally, were elected from the members of their tribe according to a system of deme-quotas. Membership in any one of these groups could always, to one degree or another, be

²¹Ferguson (*HA*, p. 415), O. Reinmuth ("The Ephebate and Citizenship at Athens," *TAPA* 79, 1948, pp. 211-31) and C. Pelekidis (*Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 1962, p. 186) all noted the large increase in the *ephebeia* during the second century B.C. Pelekidis concludes that attendance in the *ephebeia* became almost universal.

inherited. The only elite where membership was theoretically the least inheritable was the Areopagus, and even here the prosopographical evidence suggests that sons or relatives often managed to follow a father or relative into its exclusive ranks.

In spite of this hereditary aspect to membership in the governing class, the governing class was also in a state of constant change or tension and it may be assumed that there was competition to rise into the political elite or even into the governing oligarchy. How a family first attained a place in the governing class and then managed to retain that position are difficult questions. The renewal of the governing class in this way involves both demographic problems such as marriage and replacement rates as well as more complicated factors such as social mobility. Recruitment into and demotion from the governing class must have occurred. There is evidence, for example, that families of obscure or unknown origin joined the governing elite for the first time under Augustus.²² Similarly, many prominent families from the second century are never heard of again.²³ Several explanations could account for their disappearance. These families might have been the victims of political events such as the revolution of 88/7 B.C. The scarcity of epigraphical evidence from the first century B.C. must also be considered a factor in such instances. But families might also have disappeared from our records by falling into the ranks of the peripheral or civic class, for membership in the governing class required the acquisition and retention of sufficient wealth to participate in institutions such as the *ephebeia* and to meet the expenses involved in the cults of the community. The means by which wealth was acquired at Athens remain unclear, but many civic magistracies and other functions such as the membership in the liturgical, religious and military elites involved the unproductive expenditure of personal wealth. Families seem to have acquired their wealth before joining the ranks of the political elite, and this may

²²See Chapter 7 for such "new" families.

²³Chapter 5 discusses the survival of families after 88/7 B.C.

suggest an explanation for the rise and fall of families. The first step in a family becoming part of the governing elite involved the acquisition of wealth, leading to potential membership in the military and liturgical elites and eventually leading to the attainment of political office such as the archonship. Because membership in the elite involved expenditure, however, a family might quickly lose its ability to pay out money. This would lead to the demotion of the family until more resources were accumulated and a descendant might once again become a member of the governing class.²⁴ The recruitment and renewal of the governing class through the mechanism of social mobility, therefore, is a complicated process which cannot be quantified but may at least be inferred from the prosopographical evidence.

Apart from the recruitment of new members of the governing class through social mobility, the established families of the governing class would have renewed and maintained their ranks in three ways; by birth, by adoption and by the recruitment of new citizens. The minimum size of a family, the average interval between generations and life-expectancy of members of the governing

²⁴This might explain why gentile families which possessed the Eleusinian offices do not seem to have held many political offices. These families survived for generations and even centuries and avoided the exhaustive competitive display exhibited by political rivals such as ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ and ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ.

class can all be determined from the prosopographical evidence.²⁵ Except in a few cases where a family monument records the names of all the members of a particular generation, the actual size of particular families can never be known for certain. Consequently, most family stemmas are limited to the name of one male for each generation,²⁶ although the stemmas of several well-attested families indicate that families could be large. Over one hundred stemmas allow us to infer the minimum age of the father at the birth of a son (Table 1.1). The Average interval between generations was 25-35 years, although fathers as young as twenty

²⁵Information such as this must be carefully culled from the references for each individual's career and family. S. Dow's comment, "... we have three interesting dates in the career of Attinas son of Heracleides of Phyla: *pais pythaistes* in 128/7, age 9, *ephebe* in 119/8, age 18 and *thesmothetes* in 88/7, age 49. A parallel series of dates is not known I believe in the case of any other Athenian", is no longer correct ("The Lists of Athenian *Archontes*," *Hesperia* 3, 1934, p. 140, n. 1 and p. 146). Information about age at marriage and the age of a father when his children were born is the most difficult to infer from the prosopographical evidence. Few women are named in the evidence and it is virtually impossible to infer their age in a particular year. Because of the importance of information about women for the calculation of fertility rates and other demographic analyses, our picture of Athenian society during this period is quite lopsided. Apart from epigraphical evidence, the only other source of information about family life is literary, often from the philosophers (Cf. W.K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece*, London, 1968, pp. 106-7). Davies indicates where possible "... the dates of births, marriages and deaths ..." in his index (*APF*, p. xxx). If the ages of the individuals supplied with such information could be ascertained even in part from the epigraphical evidence, Davies' index of propertied families could be used as the basis for a social study of the demography of the Athenian elite in the classical period. But such a study would have to begin with a review of the chronological evidence similar to that undertaken for this present study.

²⁶The prosopographical evidence for women, consequently, is very limited.

Table 1-1: Average Age of Fathers at Birth of a Son

Age of Father	No. of Cases
20-24	9
25-29	42
30-34	47
35-39	14
40-44	22
45-49	5
50-	2

or as old as fifty years of age or older are recorded.²⁷ In addition, as many as fifteen years might separate siblings (Table 1.2).²⁸ This evidence indicates that men fathered large families and that remarriage might have been common.²⁹ The minimum life expectancy, finally, can also be inferred from the prosopographical

²⁷The youngest attested father is *NOTMHNIOΣ EPMIOY AAMITTPETΣ*, who served as an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. and was born in 141/0 B.C. *NOTMHNIOΣ*, his son, was himself an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. and so was born in 120/19 B.C. when his father was 21 years of age. *KAMMETPATOS*, the grandson, was also an ephebe, between 80/79-78/7 B.C. He was born between 98/7 and 95/4 B.C. when his father was between 22 and 25 years of age. Members of this family, therefore, seem to have married at a young age. The oldest attested father would be *ΞΑΡΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ*, A *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C. His eldest attested son was an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. and was born in 146/5 B.C. A second son was an ephebe in 111/0 B.C. and was born in 129/8 B.C. when the father was 56 years of age. A second father might also have been in his fifties. *ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΝΙΟΣ* was a *prytanis* between 165/50 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 226). He was born, at the latest, between 195/80 B.C. His son, *ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ*, served as an ephebe in 107/6 B.C. and so was born in 125/4 B.C. If the father was born in c. 180 B.C., he would have been 55 years of age when his son was born. This is uncertain, however, since *ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ* could have been born in c. 195 B.C. and have been a grandfather of *ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ*.

²⁸Evidence for the age interval between siblings is even rarer than it is for the minimum age of a father. For this calculation a stemma has to provide two brothers for both of whom the approximate year of birth can be calculated. The large number of closely dated ephebic lists in the last half of the second century B.C. provide most of the 24 instances where the interval between two siblings can be calculated.

²⁹Cf. K. Bradley, "The Social History of the Roman Elite: A Perspective," *EMC* 28 (1984) pp. 481ff.

Table 1-2: Age Interval Between Siblings

Interval in Years	No. of Cases
1-5	6
6-10	12
11-15	6

evidence. A large number of magistrates are attested in their fifties and sixties and occasionally in the seventies.³⁰ It seems that the members of the governing class might have enjoyed a reasonably long life.

A second means by which families of the governing class would have been renewed and preserved was adoption. Fourteen instances of adoption are recorded for this period.³¹ Five of these adoptions occur in families belonging to the hereditary *gene*, but in only one of these can it be shown that the adoption

³⁰The older the magistrate, however, the greater suspicion that we are dealing with a homonymous grandson.

³¹These fourteen adoptions are indicated in the inscriptions referring to magistracies held by individuals by a double patronymic indicating the adoptive and the natural fathers. References to an individual known to have been adopted do not always provide the double patronymic. Tombstones also occasionally record adoptions, although I have not made a systematic survey of the *tituli sepulchrales* for this study (but see following note).

involved the transference of a hereditary priesthood from one family to another.³² The adopted son often took a name from his adoptive family. If the adopted individual were an adult, this necessitated a change in name.³³ Two adoptions occur within the same deme,³⁴ and in one family an uncle adopted two of his nephews.³⁵ The purpose of such adoptions remains obscure. A father with several sons can be shown to have given a son in adoption, but at the same time two adoptions occur where a father with a large family adopts another son.³⁶ These observations suggest that adoptions within the ranks of the governing class were common and often involved close relatives. Because the hereditary

³² *AMTNOMAXOΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ* was adopted by *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ*. He was from a gentile family and his brother served as *hierophantes*. *AMTNOMAXOΣ* himself later became *hierophantes* (*I.G.* II² 3469). MacKendrick concludes that adoptions within the religious elite were employed to assure the adoptive family the prestige of the priesthood hereditary in the *genos* of the collateral line (*The Athenian Aristocracy*, p. 60). But the name *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* occurs with *AMTNOMAXOΣ*' natural family also. This might suggest that the adoption occurred within the same family or *genos*. Also, *AMTNOMAXOΣ* could only have assumed the priesthood if his brother had no heirs. Meritt observed that families could belong to two or even three *gene* (*Hesperia* 9, 1940, pp. 86-96). The families of *ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* (Gephyraioi/Bouzygoi and Erysichthonidai) and *ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ* (Gephyraioi/Bouzygoi, Eupatridai and Ceryces) are related through adoption (*I.G.* II² 5477). I wonder if it was through this adoption that the latter family acquired membership in the double *genos* Gephyraioi/Bouzygoi? (See Oliver, *ibid.*, and also Geagan, *Hesperia* 52, 1983, pp. 155-61). Adoptions within the hereditary *gene*, therefore, would have led to the accumulation of gentile affiliations.

³³ Cf. Isaeus VII.14-7.

³⁴ *ΕΡΜΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ* was adopted by *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ* (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 24 and 27). *ΕΡΜΩΝ* takes his name from his natural grandfather. *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ* was adopted by *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ* (*I.G.* II² 3151). This was a gentile family. *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* seems to have taken his name from the adoptive family.

³⁵ *ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ* was adopted by his uncle *ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ* and takes his name from him. His brother, *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ*, was also adopted. This was a gentile family and the two brothers served as pythaist *paides* in 106/5 B.C. (*BCH* 32, 1908, p. 332, n. 231: s.v. *ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ*).

³⁶ *ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΥ* was adopted by a *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ* (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 8). Descendants of *ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ* in the deme of Melite alternate the names of *ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ* and *ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ*. Is the adoptive father *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ*? *ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos was adopted into a large family from Oion.

priesthoods or other offices do not seem to have been the principal object of such adoptions,³⁷ it may be assumed that adoptions were somehow connected with property and inheritances.³⁸ Only one adoption might be regarded as political. This was the adoption of *ΑΠΕΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos.³⁹

The governing class could also have been partly renewed, in a third way, by means of the recruitment of new citizens. The events from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14 suggest that social mobility at Athens, or even in all of Greece at this time, was not a peaceful process, probably because of the unequal distribution of wealth and the opportunities for enrichment. If wealth in Athens could not be redistributed peacefully, however, the elite would have had a strong motive to recruit new members from outside Athens rather than from the civic class or the lower classes. New citizens would have been able to afford the liturgies expected of the governing class and, presumably, would have shared the ideology of the Athenian governing class itself. There is, in fact, evidence that a significant part of the the governing class came to be recruited through grants of citizenship to foreigners.⁴⁰ The manner of recruitment and the origin of these new citizens will elucidate Athens' relations with communities beyond her borders.

Only a few foreign Greeks are known to have acquired the Athenian citizenship after 167/6 B.C. Some were prominent politically, such as Julius

³⁷Low-ranking families which held semi-hereditary professional offices such as the heraldship of the *boule* never seem to have employed adoption in order to retain the office.

³⁸A large number of families which employed adoption are attested as members of the Areopagus.

³⁹See Chapter 6.

⁴⁰P1b 30.20.

Nikanor from Hieropolis,⁴¹ others were ephebic instructors,⁴² and a few were wealthy individuals who traded on Delos.⁴³ In addition to these, historians have also assumed that a large number of Roman citizens migrated to Athens and acquired Athenian citizenship.⁴⁴ But if the principal means of acquiring the Athenian citizenship was through service in the *ephebeia*,⁴⁵ proportionally fewer Romans than Greeks acquired the citizenship by this means, as may be seen from the representation of Greek and Roman ephebes in the foreign contingent in

⁴¹Note also ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ and ΑΙΓΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ of Teos. ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ, a new citizen from Pergamum, was also a prominent new citizen (B. Helley, "Grandes dignitaires Attalides en Thessalie à l'époque de la 3e guerre de Macédoine," AAA 13, 1980, pp. 296-301). ΑΡΕΙΟΣ of Alexandria, Augustus' friend, was also a new citizen.

⁴²The Delian *paidotribes* ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ has been identified by Roussel with ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΥΣ. ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ would have acquired the Athenian citizenship late in life. It is possible that a second ephebic instructor received the citizenship. ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΤΗΣ served as *paideutes* in 45/4 B.C. and an ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ as *paidotribes* in 37/6 B.C. For these instructors see Appendix B.

⁴³ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΝΙΚΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ, ΣΗΡΑΜΒΟΣ ΗΡΑΙΠΠΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ and ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΡΗΣΙΜΒΡΟΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ. All three are attested before 167/6 B.C. as Delians (see Chapter 3). ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΣΙΜΑΛΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ, an ephebe in 107/6 B.C., is related to a family of traders from Cyprian Salamis and Tarentum (Cf. Ferguson, HA, p. 408 n. 1 and Roussel, DCA, p. 70).

⁴⁴Cf. Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 30.

⁴⁵Citizenship at Athens in the classical period was acquired by birth or by grant. Reinmuth argues that by 119/8 B.C. foreigners could also obtain the citizenship by attendance in the *ephebeia* (TAPA 79, 1948, p. 223) and Pelekidis stresses the importance of the *ephebeia* as a route to Athenian citizenship (*l'Éphébie attique*, p. 195). But if Reinmuth is correct to assume that foreigners who attended the *ephebeia* obtained the right to acquire Athenian citizenship, most new citizens might have come in through this means. It is possible that after having served as an ephebe the foreigner had to also pay a fee to become a citizen. Decrees recording the granting of citizenship to foreigners disappear about 100 B.C., but the practice did not die out since Nepos reports that the Athenians repeatedly offered Atticus the citizenship (*Atticus*, XXV.3).

Table 1-3: Foreign Ephebes at Athens

Year	Total No. of Ephebes	Greek Ephebes	Roman Ephebes
119/8	141	16 (11%)	1 (0.7%)
117/6	179	10 (5.5)	2 (1.1%)
107/6	140	19 (13.5%)	5 (3.5%)
102/1	141	38 (30%)	2 (1.4%)
38/7	121	63 (52%)	5 (4.0%)

ephebic lists from 119/8 B.C. to 38/7 B.C. (Table 1.3).⁴⁶ The Romans always form a distinct minority of the total number of foreign ephebes. While the number of foreign ephebes increases steadily and dramatically, the number of

⁴⁶Foreign ephebes first appear at Athens in 119/8 B.C. On Delos they first appear in 133/2 B.C. (the first ephebic text from the colony dating from 144/3 B.C.). For discussion of foreigners in the Athenian *ephebeia*, cf. Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, pp. 186-96. Reinmuth, *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebeia*, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1929, does not analyze the foreign names in the same way. He only took into account ephebes whose ethnics are extant. The result is that he finds a relatively strong contingent of Romans which is about equal to the number of ephebes who came from Asia Minor. But I have included all ephebes in this count. If the names are identifiably Greek or Roman, their exact place of provenance is not important information. Note that three Greek ephebes from Italy are included in the left-hand column (I.G. II² 1011: *ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ*, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 6: *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΦΙΛΟΥ ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ*, I.G. II² 1028: *ΣΙΜΑΛΙΟΣ ΣΙΜΑΛΙΟΥ ΤΑΡΕΝΤΕΙΟΣ*). No "Italian" ephebes are listed after 89 B.C. This suggests that Romaioi in the first century B.C. are not necessarily "Romans" as Reinmuth seems to assume.

Romans remains about the same.⁴⁷ This suggests that youths from Greek communities were much more likely than Roman citizens to attend the Athenian *ephebeia*. Strabo in fact reports that in his day leading Romans sent their sons no longer to Athens but rather to Massilia for an education.⁴⁸ Literary sources, in addition, provide no evidence for a prominent Roman having been an ephebe at Athens.⁴⁹ The year when Atticus went to Athens to study and to escape the civil strife of Rome is uncertain. But if he was born in 110 or 109 B.C. and arrived, as seems most likely, after March, 86 B.C., he was already in his early twenties. Cicero's son, Marcus, came to Athens to study philosophy after the battle of Pharsalus in 48 B.C. when he was just about seventeen years of age. Cicero himself was educated in Greek philosophy at Rhodes, although he did also visit Athens in the 70s B.C. when he was in his late twenties. In 43 B.C. Brutus, the tyrannicide, recruited the Roman youths studying in Athens for his Republican army. There must have been a sizeable number of these would-be soldiers, although if 43 B.C. was a typical year, only a handful could have been serving as Athenian ephebes. One of the youths he recruited was Cicero's son Marcus, now twenty-two years of age. The young Horace who, like Marcus Cicero, was born in 65 B.C., was studying in Athens at this time and was also recruited by Brutus.

⁴⁷This has not been observed by those who assert that many Romans or Italians were moving to Athens. (cf. J. Oliver, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia*, 11, 1942 p. 29 and Dow, "Archons of the Period after Sulla," *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 111). E. Kapetanopoulos writes, "That Romans were settling in Attica during the earlier part of the second century before Christ becomes clear from the Rhomaioi ephebes who begin to make their appearance from 119/8 B.C. onward" ("The Early Expansion of Roman Citizenship into Athens During the First Part of the Empire: 200 B.C.-A.D. 70," Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1964, p. 202). Elsewhere Kapetanopoulos makes it clear that he assumes that a large number of such Romans were settling in Athens (*ibid.*, p. 26). M.J. Osborne, "Athenian Grants of Citizenship after 229 B.C.," *Ancient Society* 7 (1976) p. 112, n. 19, writes: "The increasing number of foreign names, especially Roman names, in the lists of *prytaneis* and ephebes from the later second century is well known." Peleikidis summarizes Reinmuth's tables and only concludes that, "La presence de dix-neuf éphèbes romains (parmi vingt-deux italiens) indique que ceux-ci s'intéressaient au mode de vie et à la culture helléniques" (*l'Éphébie attique*, p. 196). See also Ferguson, *HA*, p. 367.

⁴⁸IV.5.18.

⁴⁹L. Shear, "Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town," *Hesperia* 50 (1981) p. 357, lists a number of prominent Romans who studied at Athens.

No prominent Romans, therefore, are known to have attended the *ephebeia*, and those who did attend must have been the sons of relatively unimportant Romans living in Greece.⁵⁰

Athenian citizenship could be acquired through attendance in the *ephebeia* or by means of direct purchase. Because of the complete absence of citizenship decrees from after c. 140 B.C., it is impossible to determine the exact origin or identity of new citizens. Greeks who acquired Athenian citizenship cannot be easily recognized because their names are largely indistinguishable from those of native-born Athenians. But the generalization that many Romans (or Italians with Roman citizenship) were migrating to Athens can be tested by a direct comparison of the use of Roman names among the citizen population of Athens at

⁵⁰This supports Pelekidis' suggestion that the foreigners who attended the *ephebeia* were actively seeking Athenian citizenship (*l'Éphébie attique*, p. 195). I cannot agree with Reinmuth's argument that the *ephebeia* was very popular in the Roman world (*The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebeia*, pp. 20 and 23). Cicero had a poor impression of the *ephebeia* (*Rep.* 44). It is impossible to identify Roman ephebes with historically known figures because of the unspecific nomenclature often employed on the ephebic lists (i.e. *ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΠΟΜΑΙΟΣ* could be anybody's son!). In a few cases the *gens* is indicated, although this too does not help much. But P. Granius P. f. is clearly a member of a trading family from Puteoli (*I.G.* II² 1043, 2463 and *RE* VII.1817ff). He or his father died in Athens and was buried there (*I.G.* II² 11826). L. Valerius A. f. (*I.G.* II² 1009) cannot be identified. M. Terentius (*I.G.* II² 1043) could possibly be the legate of Augustus in 25 B.C. who was of obscure origin (Cf. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1939, p. 330 for his legateship). A. Bassius L. f. (*F.D.* III, 2, n. 26) belongs to a *gens* which does not seem to appear in the Roman fasti (but cf. L. Bassus, a legate in 67 B.C.). In contrast to the obscurity of the Roman ephebes, the crown princes of Cappadocia over several generations served in the *ephebeia* (cf. Ferguson, "Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents," *Klio* 8, 1908, p. 353). But they were Athenian citizens.

this time.⁵¹ The revolution of 88/7 B.C. was a major event in Athenian history, and presumably heralded an increase in Roman influence after the sack of the city by Sulla in March, 88 B.C.; the occurrence of Roman names, including patronymics, may be compared for two specific groups, the ephebes and the *prytaneis*, before and after 88/7 B.C. (Table 1.4).⁵² It is clear from the figures provided in Table 1.4 that there was a dramatic increase in the number of Roman names in use among the citizen body after 88/7 B.C. But these figures have to be examined more closely. The mere presence of a Roman name such as "Gaius", without *nomen* and *cognomen*, does not indicate the citizenship or origin of the individual. Only a few Roman names occur before 88/7 B.C. Four Athenians from the second century B.C. with Roman names may be traced to two Italian fathers who acquired the Athenian citizenship.⁵³ But since the Italian allies of Rome did not generally begin to be enrolled as Roman citizens until after 89 B.C.,

⁵¹ Oliver writes, "Thus the student can trace the gradual growth of Roman citizenship at Athens by an examination of the catalogues, among which the prytany lists are by far the most reliable index" (*Hesperia* 11, 1942, p. 29). Oliver promised a study of the growth of the Roman citizenship at Athens, but he does not seem to have published such a study based on the analysis of the lists. Kapetanopoulos' study of the growth of the Roman citizenship at Athens is unreliable. He included every reference to a Roman name at Athens and not just to Roman names among the citizen population of Athens. He thus mixes up two discrete populations. Also, he tabulates, without distinction, references from all kinds of epigraphical document. The result is that none of the statistical tables are trustworthy. He estimates the population of Athenian citizens with the Roman citizenship in the first century B.C. at 10% (increasing to 30% in the Roman Empire). But he nowhere offers an estimate for the total size of the Athenian population at this time or, better still, a figure for the number of Athenians during the period he is studying who do not have a Roman element in their name. For these reasons, I have confined the following discussion to ephebic and prytany lists, which alone, I believe, provide the basis for a statistical study.

⁵² The number of Roman names and the percentage of the total are given in the right-hand columns of Table 1.4. A Roman name may be considered to be a recognizable *praenomen* or *nomen*. The number of Roman *praenomina* was restricted by tradition, the number of *nomina* by law. The *cognomen* was not restricted in this way. Thus it is easy to detect a naturalized Roman citizen of Greek origin by the use of a Greek *cognomen* (J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki, 1979, p. 182).

⁵³ ΓΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, ephebe in 123/2 B.C., and ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, ephebe in 119/8 B.C., could be brothers. Notice however that the younger brother was named after the father. In the same years we also find ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ and ΠΟΠΛΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ.

Table 1-4: Roman Names Among the Athenian Citizen Population

	Total Names	No. of Roman Names	% of Roman Names
<u>to 88/7 B.C.</u>			
Ephebes	1720	17	0.9%
<i>Prytaneis</i>	339	1	0.3%
Total	2059	18	0.9%
<u>after 88/7 B.C.</u>			
Ephebes	347	42	12.1%
<i>Prytaneis</i>	457	36	7.8%
Total	804	78	9.7%

it is unlikely that these two fathers possessed the Roman citizenship. It is more difficult to determine the origins and citizenship of individuals after 88/7 B.C. when Roman names become more common. Roman names on the Greek model (first name in nominative, second name in the genitive) pose special difficulties. In the last half of the first century B.C., in addition, a number of mixed names occur where a father with a Roman name gave his son a Greek name.⁵⁴ Single Roman names (such as *ΑΡΑΙΟΣ*) are least informative while two Roman names on the Greek model (such as *ΑΡΑΙΟΣ ΑΡΑΙΟΥ*) indicate a family with a Roman identity. Names on the Roman model (such as *ΑΡΑΙΟΣ ΚΟΙΛΑΙΟΣ*) probably indicate a Roman

⁵⁴ Although Kapetanopoulos generally regards mixed names to be a characteristic of Italian families which were Hellenized in Athens, he also accepts that some Athenians would have adopted Roman names. The practice must have become common later on, for Apollonius complained about Greeks who named their children after Romans rather than after Greeks (Philostratos, lxxi).

citizen.⁵⁵ But names on the Roman model are not very common, first appearing in the middle of the first century B.C. in the ephebic or prytany lists. In 38/7 B.C., for example, we encounter []ΙΟΣ ΛΙΚΙΝΙΟΣ ΠΟΠΛΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ as an ephebe (representing the Latin []ius Licinius Publii f.). For a few individuals with a name written on the Roman model, such as ΑΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΕΡΑΤΩΝ (*Agora XV*, n. 278),⁵⁶ ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΟΛΒΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ (*Agora XV*, n. 293) and ΚΟΙΝΤΟΣ ΣΩΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ (*Agora XV*, n. 293), the name is possibly that of a Greek who acquired the Roman citizenship and not the other way around.⁵⁷ When the form of a name with a Roman element is taken into account, only about 4% of the names represented in the lists of ephebes and *prytaneis* after 88/7 B.C. have names written on the Roman model.⁵⁸ Another 4% have a Roman *praenomen* with a Roman patronymic written on the Greek model or a single Roman *praenomen* where the patronymic or the ethnicity of the form of the name are unknown. Only about 1% have mixed names on the Greek model. Less than

⁵⁵The use of the *tria nomina* was confined to Roman citizens by law.

⁵⁶Although "ΑΕΥΚΙΟΣ" is also a Greek name, in this case I regard it as a Roman name because of the way in which the Greek *cognomen* has been written. It is possible that the stone-cutter did not have room for ΕΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ, which would give the name a Greek form. I have generally regarded all "ΑΕΥΚΙΟΙ" as Greeks unless the name appears with a second Roman name or, as here, there is reason to believe the individual so named possessed the Roman citizenship.

⁵⁷Of these three individuals, only ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΟΛΒΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ is certainly a Roman citizen.

⁵⁸The statistics for the form of the name may be given here:

to 88/7 B.C.:

Greek form	(mixed names)	2	0.1%
	(Roman names)	8	0.5%
Form unknown		1	0.06%
Roman form		0	0.0%

after 86/5 B.C.:

Greek form	(mixed names)	7	1.2%
	(Roman names)	13	2.3%
Form unknown		9	1.6%
Roman form		20	3.5%

10% of the population of Athenians who were active in the *ephebeia* or the *prytaneia*, therefore, have names with a Roman element. How many of these possessed the Roman citizenship? As few as 3% of this Athenian population (17 individuals) were of Roman or Italian origin, had names recorded on the Roman model and probably possessed the Roman citizenship.⁵⁹ To these we may add the 9 individuals known by a Roman *praenomen* with a Roman patronymic recorded on the Greek model who might have possessed Roman citizenship. This would give a maximum figure of 5%. It is interesting to note that this figure is almost identical to the representation of Roman ephebes in the foreign contingent of the *ephebeia* of 38/7 B.C.⁶⁰ and suggests that the principal means of acquiring the Athenian citizenship might in fact have been through the *ephebeia*. Less than 0.5% of the attested Athenian-born population, finally, can be shown to have obtained the Roman citizenship down to the reign of Augustus.⁶¹ Since the illustrious family of Herodes Atticus did not obtain Roman citizenship until the reign of Nero, this low figure is not surprising, and it is possible that the Roman citizenship was first acquired by lower-class Athenians rather than by members of the governing class.⁶²

The renewal of the governing class, therefore, was partly facilitated by

⁵⁹These are the 17 individuals with names on the Roman pattern (excluding the three Athenians who acquired Roman citizenship).

⁶⁰See Table 1.3.

⁶¹Cf. Kapetaonopoulos, "Roman Citizenship", p. 26: "... we have an increasing number of Athenians receiving the *civitas*." I cannot see on what basis this conclusion is founded. J.A.O. Larson, "The Policy of Augustus in Greece," *AC* 1 (1958) p. 126, indicates that few members of the Thessalian League became Roman citizens.

⁶²Three freedmen of Augustus were Athenians and, by right of their manumission, acquired Roman citizenship (see P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, Cairo, 1927, p. 169). It might have been easier at first for an Athenian to acquire the Roman citizenship by statutory means in this way. But Pompey had granted citizenship to his ally, *ΘΕΟΦΑΝΗΣ* of Mytilene, and it is possible that some Athenians also acquired the Roman citizenship through political favour (although no prominent Athenians from the first century B.C. are known to have been so favoured). M. Antonius Tertius Paianieus and M. Antonius Aristocrates Anaxionos may both be freedmen of Antony (For these individuals see G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965).

the introduction of new citizens, for the most part Greeks rather than Romans, by adoption within the families of the religious elite and by the replacement of governing families through the birth of new members. Whether an Athenian was born into the governing class, was recruited from below or was admitted as a new citizen when an adult, the governing class was closely regulated as its members progressed through various age groups. These age groups correspond to the public and political life-cycle of an Athenian citizen.⁶³ Boys, mostly between the ages of seven and thirteen, served as *pythaistai paides* and in similar religious offices.⁶⁴ At eighteen years of age a youth could become an ephebe (occasionally serving first as a *mellephebos*). At nineteen, if he resided on Delos, he might continue his athletic training as a *pareutaktos*. An Athenian youth became eligible for the cavalry after he graduated from the *ephebeia*. At thirty years of age he would be eligible to serve as a *prytanis* and for election as archon. After serving in the latter office, he could go on to hold several of the magistracies reserved for the life-long members of the Areopagus. Finally, after turning forty years of age a man could serve as *kosmetes* of the ephebic corps.⁶⁵ In doing so, this hypothetical careerist would have risen through the ranks of virtually all the Athenian elites. But such a career was not possible for every Athenian citizen simply because the elites of the governing class fell into an increasingly exclusive hierarchy. The more numerous lower ranks of the governing class were occupied by the members of the civic or peripheral class and the members of the military or ephebic elite. The recruitment and size of these two groups will provide the key to understanding the nature of the governing class.

Each year, upon graduation, the Athenian assembly passed a decree honouring the ephebic instructors and listing, by tribe, the ephebes who had

⁶³See Chapter 2.

⁶⁴Girls also served in various religious offices.

⁶⁵These age limits are not explicitly attested after the classical period, although the prosopographical evidence does not contradict them.

served in that year. These lists of ephebes, which belong to a category of demographic document known as "military lists", name almost fifteen hundred ephebes (including ephebes on Delos) from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14. In addition to these "military" or ephebic lists, the assembly also passed a decree each year praising the members of a tribal prytany, that is, the members of the probouleutic council of the Athenian *boule*. These prytany decrees, or "civic lists", are a different kind of demographic document which list men who as *prytaneis* only had to be thirty years of age or older. The *ephebeia* and the *prytaneia* differ from other magistracies and elites in two ways: participation in these offices was regulated by being confined to specific age groups, and each year several hundred Athenians served as either ephebes or *prytaneis*. Many Athenians who entered the *ephebeia* at eighteen⁶⁶ would subsequently serve at least once as *prytaneis* after turning thirty years of age. The extent to which the *ephebeia* and the *prytaneia* overlapped in this way is important for determining the size of these two groups and their relation to the entire Athenian population. The lists of ephebes and *prytaneis* are virtually census lists and provide the only quantifiable evidence for the demography of the governing class.⁶⁷

⁶⁶Reinmuth has observed instances where youths not yet eighteen years of age served as ephebes, but most of his examples are from the Roman Empire. His first example, from 107/6 B.C., might not be valid. Only one ephebe is listed here without his demotic. Reinmuth also observes instances where pairs of brothers served together as ephebes, and argues that in such cases a younger brother must have served before he had turned eighteen years of age (*TAPA* 79, 1948, pp. 221 and 229). I find that after 88/7 B.C. pairs of brothers in the *ephebeia* become increasingly common, and it is possible that a relaxation in the age requirement for the *ephebeia* occurred after the revolution (several brothers, for example, are evident in the first extant ephebic list after the revolution, dating to between 80/79-78/7 B.C.: *S.E.G.* XXII.110). If the *ephebeia* had been suspended for a period between 91/0 and 80/79 B.C., youths over eighteen years of age might have served when it was resumed. But the possibility that an ephebe might not have been eighteen years of age does not seriously affect the demographic value of the ephebic lists during the first century B.C.

⁶⁷The ephebic lists will allow us to estimate the actual number of Athenian youths who participated in the *ephebeia*. The prytany lists, on the other hand, provide for each prytany a fixed list of fifty members and will allow us to test whether the ephebic lists are a representative sample of the Athenian population. The ephebic contingent fluctuated from year to year and represents the actual number of Athenian youths who were eligible or capable of attending the *ephebeia*. The size of the deme "quotas" in the prytany lists, on the other hand, roughly reflects the relative sizes of the demes in each tribe.

In the fourth century B.C. an Athenian youth had to serve as an ephebe in order to exercise his rights as a citizen.⁶⁸ At that time there was potentially a one-to-one relationship between the *ephebeia* and the *prytaneia*.⁶⁹ Upon turning thirty years of age an Athenian citizen would have been expected to serve as a *prytanis* for this tribe. This would provide about 300 *prytaneis* serving for the first time and about 200 others who were serving for a second term. Only one iteration was allowed. By the second century B.C., however, participation in the *ephebeia* had fallen by more than seventy-five percent⁷⁰ and yet the Council had grown to 600 members. This gap between the size of the Council and the size of the ephebic corps raises two important questions for the analysis of the governing class at Athens after 167/6 B.C.: (1) What percentage of the Athenian population participated in the *ephebeia* and (2) how was the Council maintained at 600

⁶⁸Aristotle, *AP* 42.

⁶⁹At one time historians thought that the *ephebeia* was confined to the members of the hoplite class (cf. *AP* 42.2-4; P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford, 1981, *ad loc.*). Pelekidis argued that all Athenian males attended because only with this assumption can the size of the ephebic corps in the fourth century agree with the literary testimony for the size of the population of Athenian male citizens (*l'Éphébie attique*, pp. 283-94). See also Ruschenbusch, "Die soziale Herkunft der Epheben um 330," *ZPE* 35 (1979) pp. 173-76. Ruschenbusch develops this idea by showing how it would have been impossible to recruit the Council of 500 if membership in the Council was restricted to members of the hoplite class ("Die soziale Zusammensetzung des Rates der 500 in Athen im 4. Jhdt.", *ZPE* 35, 1979, pp. 177-80). He is followed by M.H. Hansen, "Rhetores and Strategoi in Fourth-Century Athens," *GRBS* 24 (1983) p. 231. The problem of the recruitment of the Council of 600 after 167 B.C. has not received much consideration, although Ferguson noted that a council of this size would have required a fairly large citizen body (*HA*, p. 316 n. 2).

⁷⁰The size of the ephebic corps fluctuates between a high of at least 138 members in 117/6 B.C. to a low of 53 members in 38/7 B.C. The average in the second century B.C. seems to have been about 110 members. Despite the small contingent in 38/7 B.C., the corps seems to have increased to 134 members in 13/2 B.C. (based on a projection from the extant one-half of the list). The ephebic corps after 167 B.C. was much larger than in the preceding century (see Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 185).

members?⁷¹

The first question can be answered from an analysis of the tribal contingents in the lists of ephebes appended to the decrees honouring the ephebes and their instructors. In these lists the names of the ephebes were recorded in order by tribe, and over the period between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14 the relative sizes of each tribal contingent can be compared. Over this period the relative order of the tribes on the basis of the size of the tribal contingents varies considerably (Table 1.5). Two ephebic lists stand out from the others. In 117/6 B.C., the tribal contingents for most tribes, apart from the small contingent of tribe XII (Attalis), are quite large. The ephebic corps in 117/6 B.C., in fact, had increased to at least 138 members, the largest contingent known for this period.⁷² In 38/7 B.C., in contrast, the corps had fallen to only 53 ephebes. In other years some consistent patterns do emerge. Tribe VIII (Kekropis) and X (Aiantis), for

⁷¹In the absence of specific evidence, several assumptions about the Council of 600 at this time must be defended. I assume that *prytaneis* were still required to be thirty years of age or older, that only one iteration was possible and that the Council did in fact number 600 *bouleutai* each year. In the Roman Empire some prosopographical evidence suggests that *prytaneis* could serve when they were twenty-five years of age (Kapetanopoulos, "Some Remarks on the Athenian *Prytaneis*", *Ancient World* 4, 1981, pp. 5-15, and Geagan, *AC*, p. 75. S. Follett *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle, études chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris, 1976, p. 13 accepts thirty as the minimum age in the Roman Empire however). There are no examples of a man known to have served three terms (See Rhodes, "Ephebi, Bouleutai and the Population of Athens," *ZPE* 38, 1980, pp. 197-201 for iterations). Finally, in the Roman Empire the name of the *boule* was changed to reflect a decrease or increase in its numbers (to 500 under Hadrian and to 750 later on). Also, all the extant prytany lists from this period show tribal contingents at a full complement of 50 members (a list with only 49 members is compensated by another with 51, *Agora* XV, nn. 226 and 240; Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, p. 109, indicates a list with 48 members (cf. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica*, *Hesperia* Supplement XVIII, Princeton, 1975, p. 64) although the newest edition, *Agora* XV, n. 286, lists 50 members). Only one other argument could be used to assume a Council less than 600 *bouleutai*, and that is a prytany calendar of less than twelve prytanies. But since a prytany calendar of twelve prytanies per year is still operating at this time, there is no good evidence to change these assumptions.

⁷²I examined this list in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens. The text published in the *I.G.* II² is misleading. Dotted lines are used where *vacat* would be more appropriate (bottom of columns II and IV, line 88ff). Line 85 of column IV is *in rasura* (as is the demotic of the name in line 84 of column III). The result is that the size of the tribal contingent of several tribes is uncertain. The contingents for Pandionis (tribe III) and Akamantis (tribe VI) are uncertain since the text breaks off at the bottom edge.

**Table 1-5: Tribal Contingents of Ephebes between 128/7 B.C.
and 13/2 B.C.**

Year	Number of Ephebes per Tribe																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
128/7		*VII *XII	XI I			*VI	V III	IV	II IX	VIII					X					
119/8				III			IV IX	I VI	XII	II	X	XI VII				VIII				V
117/6					XII		*III XI	V			*VI		I	IV VII X	II VIII		IX			
107/6					VI		I II VII	XII	III	IV VIII IX XI				V					X	
102/1			VIII		II III XII	XI	IV		V VI VII			I IX						X		
38/7	II XI	III IX X	VII		IV VIII	V VI		I												
13/2						V	IV		III				I	II	*VI	(six tribes are not extant)				

*=incompletely recorded contingent

example, tend to have contingents that are on average larger in size than of the other tribes in each year. Similarly, tribe XII (Attalis) is usually represented by a small contingent (unfortunately its representation during the first century B.C. is unrecorded). But for the most part the absolute sizes of the tribal contingents increase and decrease dramatically.⁷³ If the *ephebeia* reflected in close approximation the actual population of available eighteen-year-olds, that is, if nearly every eighteen-year-old or a fixed percentage of that age group attended, such fluctuations in the absolute and relative sizes of the tribal contingents would not occur. The size of the tribal contingents, therefore, cannot reflect the actual number of eighteen-year-olds available for each tribe in these years. This suggests that participation in the *ephebeia* by Athenian youths was not high and was more affected by variable sociological factors such as the distribution of wealth and census classes than by less variable demographic factors such as the birthrate.⁷⁴

If it were possible to compare an extant and complete ephebic list with a prytany list from twelve years later, it would be possible to determine how many

⁷³Tribe I (Erechtheis) grew from a contingent of 3 ephebes in 128/7 B.C. to 8 in 119/8 B.C. Its quota reaches a high of 13 in 117/6 B.C. but falls back to 7 in 107/6 B.C. Yet in each of these years the tribe falls in second or third-last place compared to the other tribes. Most tribes experience an increase from 128/7 to 117/6 B.C., although a few fall in size in 119/8 B.C. Tribe V (Ptolemais), however, went from 7 ephebes in 128/7 B.C. to 20 in 119/8 B.C. The tribe fell back to 8 ephebes in 117/6 B.C. Tribe III (Pandionis), in contrast, had 4 ephebes in 119/8 B.C. and at least 7 in 117/6 B.C. In the first century tribe X (Aiantis) fell from 20 ephebes between 80/79-78/7 B.C., its largest contingent for the entire period, to only 2 ephebes in 38/7 B.C. Unfortunately its representation in 13/2 B.C. is missing, but tribe II (Aigeis) had 8 ephebes between 80/79-78/7 B.C., 1 in 38/7 B.C. and 14 in 13/2 B.C. Tribe I (Erechtheis), which had a relatively small contingent in the second century B.C., with 8 ephebes had the largest contingent in 38/7 B.C.

⁷⁴Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 284, accounts for fluctuations in the relative sizes of the ephebic contingents from the same tribe in the fourth century by the hypothesis that some years in which a large number of men were serving in the army or the fleet were "hollow" years in terms of the birthrate. This is an attractive explanation and Pelekidis can point to known historical events which will account for a drop in the birthrate. But a similar explanation for the period after 167/6 B.C. is not possible. Athens did not outfit large military forces during this period. Pelekidis was also dealing with ephebic lists which reflect the actual population of 18-year-olds from a particular tribe. The lists from the period after 167/6 B.C., on the other hand, since they seem to be unrepresentative of the population as a whole, cannot be used to make generalizations about the birthrate.

former ephebes actually became *prytaneis* upon turning thirty years of age. Unfortunately the epigraphical evidence does not at the present time provide the opportunity for such an investigation. But it is possible, by comparing the size of the deme quotas in the prytany for a particular tribe with the representation of the demes in the *ephebeia*, to infer whether the *prytaneia* was recruited exclusively from ex-ephebes. In fact, there is very little correlation between the size of the demes in the prytany lists and the representation in the ephebic lists after 167/6 B.C. Larger demes, on the basis of their prytany-quotas before c. 200 B.C., still tend to send more *prytaneis* to the Council than smaller demes and tend to have more ephebes than the latter,⁷⁵ but despite these consistent patterns, remarkable differences in the deme sizes also emerge. The deme Steiria, for example, sent only 2 men to the Council in 155/4 B.C. to Paiania's 16. By c. 20 B.C., Steiria sent 12 to Paiania's 26, suggesting that the population of Steiria had grown considerably while that of Paiania had almost doubled in size. But the figures from the the ephebic lists provide contradictory evidence. Paiania's contingent in the *ephebeia* remains low throughout (although she does send 5 ephebes in 128/7 B.C. out of a total tribal contingent of 7 ephebes). Yet the ephebic contingent of Steiria has grown from 1 ephebe in 38/7 B.C. to 7 ephebes in 13/2 B.C. (out of a tribal contingent of 10).⁷⁶ This growth in the ephebic contingent for Steiria, however, is out of proportion to her contribution to the prytany. Similarly, towards the end of the first century B.C., Phyla sent 13 men to the Council and yet, in 13/2 B.C., she had only 1 ephebe. The fortunes of Melite are very intriguing. In c. 20 B.C., this deme had 19 members in the

⁷⁵An example may be drawn from Tribe I (Erechtheis). In c. 40 B.C. the demes Kephisia, Lamprai and Anagyrous sent 22, 13 and 6 *prytaneis* to the Council, in a ratio of 4:2:1. In 13/2 B.C., these demes sent 6, 3 and 1 ephebes to the ephebic corps. The relative order of the demes and the relative sizes of their contingents are about equal. There are no prytany lists extant for Tribe II (Aigeis), but from the ephebic lists we find that the numbers of ephebes remain evenly distributed over all the demes throughout the period.

⁷⁶The contingent from the deme Steiria shows some minor fluctuations. In 117/6 B.C. Steiria sent 1 ephebe out of a tribal contingent of at least 7 ephebes. Ten years later she sent 5 ephebes out of a tribal contingent of 9 ephebes. In 102/1 B.C. she sent only 1 ephebe out of a tribal contingent of 5 ephebes.

prytany although in 38/7 B.C. she had only 1 ephebe. In 102/1 B.C. she sent no youths to the *ephebeia*. But in 117/6 B.C. and in c. 80 B.C., she had 7 and 6 ephebes respectively. One last example may suffice. In 168/7 B.C. Paionidai sent 10 demesmen to the Council compared to Deiradiotai's 1. Yet in all the extant ephebic lists Paionidai has only one or two ephebes (in fact all the demes in this tribe sent only one or two ephebes each throughout this period). The predominance of Paionidai in the prytany list, therefore, is not reflected in its representation in the *ephebeia*.

The evidence from the representation of demes in the *prytaneia* and the *ephebeia* suggests that there was no direct correlation between the membership of the ephebic or military elite and the civic class of *prytaneis*. E. Ruschenbusch has observed that A.H.M. Jones' life-table for Athenian males in the fourth century B.C. corresponds to the life-table for Greece in the 1870s.⁷⁷ For the sake of illustration, a similar life-table may be postulated for the period after 167/6 B.C.⁷⁸ Let us assume that the Council was composed of men in each year category in equal proportion to their representation in the population at large (Table 1.6).⁷⁹ In such a hypothetical Council, we would find 126 men in the 30-34 age-group serving as *prytaneis*.⁸⁰ If the ephebic corps twelve years earlier had numbered 120 ephebes and if male eighteen-year-olds formed 2% of the

⁷⁷ *ZPE* 35 (1979) p. 177.

⁷⁸ In the following sections I have limited myself to defining the total male citizen population of Athens on the basis of the actual number of annual ephebes and the theoretical number of annual *prytaneis*. The demographic principles involved are described in P. Guillaume and J.-P. Poussou, *Démographie historique*, Paris, 1970, pp. 7-66 and T.H. Hollingsworth, *Historical Demography*, Ithaca, New York, 1969.

⁷⁹ The first column of Table 1.6 shows the proportion of men in a five year age group as a percentage of the entire male population. The second column shows this age-group as a percentage of the Council of 600.

⁸⁰ It is of course unlikely that in reality a Council would reflect the actual age curve of the population and Table 1.6 does not take into account iterations. But the number of men iterating on average could never exceed the number of men serving for the first time. Consequently, the figure 126 for the number of men in the 30-34 age group must be considered to be a minimum estimate.

Table 1-6: Age-Distribution in a Hypothetical Council

Age	% of Male Pop.	% of Council	No. of <i>Prytaneis</i>
30-34	7.3%	21%	126
35-39	7.0%	20%	120
40-44	4.5%	13%	78
45-49	4.2%	12%	72
50-54	3.0%	9%	54
55-59	3.1%	9%	54
60-64	2.0%	6%	36
65-69	1.7%	5%	30
70-74	0.9%	3%	18
75-	0.9%	2%	12

citizen population,⁸¹ the entire male population would have amounted to only 6000 individuals. Thirty-five percent of this population, the percentage of males over 30 years of age, amounts to only 2100. This population would supply 438 men in the 30-34 age group, an age group which in our hypothetical Council would have contributed at least 126 *prytaneis* a year. Over four years, all of these 438 men would have served as *prytanis*. This hypothetical Council, as a result, would have included a large number of men who were serving a second time as well. But if every male in the 30-34 age-group served as a *prytaneis*, all males over 34 (1662) would have only been available for one second term. Over a period of forty years this population of ex-ephebes would have barely filled three full Councils. The *ephebeia* alone, therefore, could not have come close to maintaining the recruitment of the Council as it had in the fourth century.

⁸¹I follow Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 289, in adopting 2% as the percentage of 18 year olds. Reinmuth seems to have estimated the figure at 5% while Ruschenbusch adopts 3% (*ZPE* 35, 1979, p. 175). Pelekidis arrived at this figure by a process of elimination. Ruschenbusch bases his figure on tables from B.R. Mitchell, *European Historical Statistics 1750-1970*, New York, 1975. But Mitchell only provides census figures for 5-year intervals and it is unclear how Ruschenbusch derived his estimate for the percentage of 18-year-olds.

The discrepancy between the population of former ephebes and the population demanded by the Council of 600 is very large. This requires us to conclude that there was a sizeable population of Athenian males who did not serve as ephebes but who were full citizens willing to serve as *prytaneis*. These individuals will constitute the civic or peripheral class of Athenian families.⁸² With no iterations in the Council, 27,000 *prytaneis* were required over a 45 year period covering a life-span from 30 to 75 years. With every *prytanis* iterating once, 13,500 would be required over the same extent of time. This last figure would be the minimum number of males who were required in a forty-five year period to maintain the Council at 600 members. If we assume a stable population, the replacement rate over this period would be constant and this figure will also serve as a minimum figure for the population of citizen males over thirty years of age. If the population over thirty years of age was 35 percent of the total population, Athens at this time would have had 38,500 citizen males of all ages. This population would provide 770 eighteen-year-olds. Only about 15% of these youths would have attended the *ephebeia*. This calculation is based on the assumption that every *prytaneis* iterated once. If few *prytaneis* iterated, the population required to maintain the Council at 600 members would have been greater and participation in the *ephebeia* might have involved as little as 10% of

⁸²I disagree with B.D. Meritt and Traill (*The Athenian Agora, Vol. XV; Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton, 1974, p. 24) who write, "These (prytany) lists name the Athenians who ruled the Athenian state." My distinction of a political class or oligarchy from a large civic class is paralleled in a recent analysis of Roman society by C. Nicolet (*The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*, trans. P.S. Falla, Berkeley, 1980, p. 383).

Athenian youths.⁸³

The representation of foreigners in the *ephebeia* suggests that many more Greeks than Romans were attending the *ephebeia* at Athens. Evidence for the acquisition of Athenian citizenship by Greeks cannot be quantified, but on the basis of the presence of Roman names in ephebic and prytany lists, only about 5% of the Athenian citizens who were active in civic life during the first century B.C. might have been in origin Italians with the Roman *civitas* while less than 0.5% of the native Athenian population seem to have acquired Roman citizenship. The ephebic elite was found to constitute a small proportion of the Athenian population. Because the participation in the *ephebeia* seems to have been confined to an elite segment of the Athenian population, unlike in the fourth century, and because demographic factors such as fluctuations in the birthrate cannot account for the large irregularities in the size of the ephebic corps, particularly in 117/6 B.C. and 38/7 B.C., an explanation may be found in the political environment. In the last decades of the second century B.C., as will be described in greater detail in Chapter 5, Athens was the scene of a political conflict which was expressed through the competing claims of an "oligarchic" pro-Roman faction and a "democratic" faction. Similarly, in 38/7 B.C., the arrival of Mark Antony at Athens has been associated with a return to an "oligarchic" constitution. The size of the ephebic corps in 117/6 B.C. and 38/7 B.C. could reflect a change in the census of Athenian citizens. Because the *ephebeia* was not a prerequisite for the exercise of citizenship, as we have seen, an adjustment in

⁸³It is interesting to note that an almost identical figure can be determined for participation in the *ephebeia* at Delos. A. Dumont estimated the free population of Delos from an ephebic list of 119/8 B.C. which named 41 ephebes. He assumed compulsory attendance and a ratio of male 18 year olds to the total population at 1:112, arriving thereby at a population of 5000 for the free residents of the island (*Essai sur l'éphébie attique*, Paris, 1875-6, pp. 59-72). A more recent study has estimated the population to have been between 20,000 and 30,000 with a free population of 19,000 (A. Papageorgiou-Venetas, *Délos: recherches urbaines sur une ville antique*, Paris, 1981, p. 115). On the basis of Delian lists of ephebes, a population of this order means that attendance in the Delian *ephebeia* was not compulsory. Out of a free population of 19,000 with 2% as the percentage of male 18 year olds, we find that only about 10% of male citizens on the island would have been eligible or cared to participate in the *ephebeia*.

the census can only mean that in 117/6 B.C. the census requirement for membership in the second-century B.C. equivalent of the fourth-century hoplite-class, perhaps at this time the ephebic or military elite, was lowered while in 38/7 B.C. it was raised.⁸⁴

The recruitment of the Council of 600, however, far exceeded the numbers which would have been supplied by the ephebic elite and required a much larger civic class. It is this high demand for *prytaneis* which might explain Athens' motive in selling the citizenship in such large numbers that ancient writers would comment on the practice and Augustus would have to strictly forbid it.⁸⁵ Not only was Athens hard-pressed to fill the Council, but the oligarchic faction at Athens might have wanted to strengthen the ephebic or military elite. Both goals would have been served by the selling of the citizenship. The prohibition by Augustus might have been motivated by several factors, but because it has been found that relatively few Romans were purchasing the Athenian citizenship, the prohibition could not have been intended primarily to prevent Romans from acquiring the Athenian citizenship. Augustus was never popular at Athens and one explanation for this could be his prohibition on the selling of the citizenship, a ban which would have limited Athenian revenue, and less obviously, would also have put a greater demand on the population in filling

⁸⁴The formal class divisions of the fifth century which were an integral part of the organization of Athenian political life, such as the *pentakosiomedimnoi*, *hippeis*, *zeugitai* and *thetes* (cf. *AP* 7.4), are not attested during this period. In the fourth century, census reforms at Athens were based on these classes (during periods of oligarchic government the franchise was restricted to *οἱ τὰ ὄπλα παρεχόμενοι*). The census reforms which I have postulated for 117/6 and 38/7 B.C. must have been based on some kind of formal grouping of the citizen body. In the Roman empire there might have been a census requirement for the *boule* (Pleket, *Mnemosyne* 23, 1970, p. 451). Geagan suggests that at that time participation in the *boule* was confined to ex-ephebes (*AC*, pp. 75-6 and "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture: 86 B.C.-A.D. 267," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. II.7.1, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin, 1979, p. 409). A census requirement for the *ephebeia* could have served in place of a census requirement for the *boule*.

⁸⁵Dio Cassius liv.7.2. Cf. M. Cary, *A History of the Greek World from 323-146 B.C.*, London, 1970, p. 280.

the Council of 600.⁸⁶

There is, to conclude, a large amount of implicit and indirect demographic evidence for the Athenian population after 167 B.C. This evidence may be used for the study of individuals and their families and for the study of the governing class as a whole. The governing class sought to maintain and renew itself from within its own ranks but was also through forces beyond its control partly recruited through the admission of new citizens to Athens and through the mechanism of social mobility. It consisted of several partly overlapping elites. These elites are not equal in either rank or size and may be regarded as partly hierarchical. The civic class is the largest segment of the governing class and occupies the lowest level. The military elite is more exclusive and only involved 10% or more of Athenian citizens. The political elite was the pinnacle of the Athenian governing class and its membership might have constituted as little as 1% of the population. The other elites, the religious, cultural and liturgical elites, do not fit as easily into this hierarchy because their membership is less easily defined. But the political elite was both a council of elders and a preserve of the wealthiest families. In order to identify for each generation the composition of the entire governing class, the family stemmas will be analyzed according to the following criteria: (1) the number of family members in each generation who are attested in the offices of the governing class; (2) the type and number of offices held by family members; (3) the success or failure of the family, in each generation, to

⁸⁶The resentment of the Athenians might have been related to Augustus' other measures designed to force citizens of local communities to perform their civic *munera*. Hadrian, a very popular emperor at Athens, reduced the Council to 500 members. This would have made it easier for the tribes to fill their prytany each year.

maintain or improve its position.⁸⁷ But before turning to the history of the governing class from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14, it will first be profitable to consider the way in which magistracies and priesthoods were sought and held by the members of the governing class.

⁸⁷The tenure of a senior magistracy in a critical period is significant because of potential influence on policy and because we may assume a desire on the part of the individual involved to be associated with the policy of the day. This consideration will become more important in the discussion of Athenian families during the first century B.C. The absence of a family in a particular generation is also important evidence (although greater caution is necessary given the fragmentary state of our evidence). It may indicate the desire not to be associated with a particular policy as much as the inability to attain office. Any attempt to generalize in this way from the prosopographical evidence is susceptible to the objection that our fragmentary evidence might be concealing important careers or families. But while it is virtually certain that many of our reconstructed careers and families are distorted in this way, the following chapters will try to show that the available evidence reveals patterns consistent with the theoretical framework presented in this chapter. Generalizations about an individual career or about a family's status may be considered valid if they are consistent with an overall pattern.

Chapter 2

The Offices of the Governing Class

The Athenian magistracies, civic offices of various kinds and the priesthoods, most of which had existed since classical times, were the means by which political power, influence and prestige were shared or distributed within a constitutional structure among members of the governing class. A constitution determines the way in which the society organizes itself for the performance of functions vital to its survival, such as defence, taxation, the administration of justice, foreign relations, the maintenance of cults and religious affairs and the cultural continuity of the community through education. All of these, to varying degrees of immediacy, were essential for the survival of a Greek *polis*, and all are accounted for in the way authority and responsibility were delegated to individuals by the state. The constitution of a community is also inseparably connected to its politics and its history. When we move from the questions about the function of a particular magistracy to how the society selects the men who held the magistracy, we move from legal or administrative matters to broader questions of social history. The offices available to members of the governing class and the way in which incumbents were selected are important for the analysis of the structure of Athenian civic life. The way in which Athenian society selected its public officials, however, is often not made explicit and must be inferred from the identification of the incumbents who are known to us.

The epigraphical evidence for magistracies and their incumbents during this period, as explained in Chapter 1, is plentiful but uneven. For many magistracies, no incumbents are actually attested between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14, although the office is known to still exist at this time. Appendix A quickly

reveals that many of the magistrates and priests for a single year are no longer attested in the epigraphical evidence. Nonetheless some magistracies, such as that of the eponymous archon, are relatively prominent in the epigraphical evidence. The eponymous archon, however, owes his prominence to his *ex officio* role as eponymous magistrate for the city of Athens. The hoplite general, on the other hand, is less well-attested and other senior magistrates, such as the herald of the Areopagus, are mentioned even less. On the other hand, we are reasonably well-informed about the ephebic instructors and some priesthoods. The epigraphical prominence of a magistracy, therefore, bears little relation to the importance of the magistracy itself. Because over five hundred and fifty careers may be reconstructed for this period, it is also clear that a large number of the attested magistrates and priests are known to have held at least two or more offices in their life-time. On the basis of these careers, two problems concerning the magistracies and priesthoods available to members of the governing class may be considered: (1) the average age of incumbency in particular offices; (2) the normal sequence of offices held by an individual during his career.

An initial difficulty in attempting to describe the magistracies of Athens at this time is establishing a typology of offices.¹ Geagan has analysed the epigraphical and literary evidence for the constitution after 88/7 B.C., grouping the magistracies by the corporation (Areopagus, *boule* and *demos*) or board (archons, generals) with which they were principally associated. Due to the lack of information on the finer details about Athenian government and administration, some functions seem to overlap between corporations² or between

¹For previous discussions of the Athenian magistracies at this time, see Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 471-6. Tracy only discusses the magistracies listed on *I.G.* II² 2336.

²Geagan argues convincingly, for example, that the flutist on the archon lists is the same as the flutist named on prytany-lists (*AC*, p. 14). Similarly the public slave named on the archon-lists is the same as the slave named in decrees honouring a prytany (*AC*, p. 15). Other minor magistracies, the *sitonis* for example, share functions with other prominent magistrates, the hoplite general for example. Should these be considered separately or with the magistrate with whom they share certain responsibilities?

boards of magistrates. A related difficulty is determining the rank or importance of a magistracy. On the basis of *cursus honorum*,³ all from the Roman Empire, Geagan argues for the rank of various magistracies on the basis of their sequence in lists of offices held by an individual during his career. A second approach to determining the relative rank of various magistracies has been to rank the offices by the size of the contributions recorded on *I.G. II*² 2336 (the invaluable list of contributions by the important Athenian magistrates and priests towards the enneoteric Delphic Pythaid of 98/7 B.C.). This is an important source of evidence, although the size of the contribution expected from a magistracy sometimes contradicts later evidence for its rank in relation to other magistracies. The hoplite general, for example, contributes 200 drachms to the Pythaid, twice as much as the herald of the Areopagus. But in the first century B.C. the hoplite general is always listed after the herald of the Areopagus. In fact, Geagan argues that the general only rose to surpass the herald in importance in the early empire.⁴ Lists, such as archon-lists or prytany decrees, provide additional evidence for the rank of a particular magistracy in relation to another. One problem with this approach is that it does not allow us to rank in relative order magistracies from different corporations or boards. *Cursus honorum*, on the other hand, escape this objection. But at the same time, the evidence supplied by the list of contributors and the evidence from formal lists of magistracies can also be complementary. The magistrates listed in *I.G. II*² 2336 held the most senior and prominent public offices in Athens. Many of the offices cited in formal lists

³Geagan defines *cursus honorum* as "the careers of notable Athenians" (*AC*, p. 6). Although the term is derived from Roman practice, the widespread recording of a man's magistracies at Athens does not seem to antedate the Roman Empire. Criticism of the term (cf. Tracy, *I.G. II*² 2336, p. 115) has confused the distinction between a constitutionally fixed *cursus* (which Rome had and Athens did not) and an informal *cursus*.

⁴Geagan, *AC*, pp. 18 and 31. It is possible that the generalships were suppressed after the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and that the constitution imposed by Sulla consciously put the hoplite generalship on a lower setting. It might be important to note in this context that *AΘΗΝΙΩΝ*, the leader of the revolution against Rome, was elected hoplite general by the *demos*. The hoplite general could have slowly regained his prestige as a result of his concern for the grain supply and for protocol towards visitors to Athens.

such as prytany lists or ephebic lists, on the other hand, are the less prominent offices in Athens. The careers which can be reconstructed for this period provide the only basis for a chronological sequence which will allow the relative importance and ranking of magistracies to be determined by the point at which they were held in an individual's career.⁵

In addition to grouping and ranking the offices available to the governing class on the basis of formal criteria such as their function within the constitution and the size of contribution made by incumbents to the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C., these offices may also be differentiated by the age at which they were held and by their exclusiveness, that is, their relation to the various elites of the governing class which were set out in Chapter 1. The public life of an Athenian citizen can be described on the principle of "age sets". An age set is a loose grouping of individuals born within a set period of years. All the individuals within a particular age set are initiated together at each stage in the life-cycle of a member of their culture. In African societies age sets comprise the males born within a period of several years.⁶ In those societies the age sets are initiated as a group into the stages through which a male will pass in his life-time, such as the age set of warriors, farmers and family men, those who deal with secular and civil matters, and finally, the age set of elders concerned with religion and ritual. At Athens, where age sets correspond to the year in which a male was born, corresponding stages would be the initiation at the Apaturia at age 3, service as an ephebe at 18, admission into the *ecclesia* and perhaps the cavalry, service in the *boule* after reaching 30 years of age and, finally, election to an office conferring membership in the Areopagus. An important difference between African age sets and those at Athens is that in primitive societies all the males born within one age set passed through all the stages while at Athens other factors affect the success of an

⁵ An important difference between reconstructed careers and formal *cursus honorum* is that inscriptions listing a man's offices do not provide a chronology for the individual's career and often do not list the offices in chronological order.

⁶ B. Orme, *Anthropology for Archaeologists*, New York, 1981, p. 150.

individual in his civic career. Not all citizen males, for example, were able to serve as ephebes and, while all the men who turned sixty years of age became jurors, only the elite Areopagus served as a true council of elders.

The principle of age sets is a useful one for describing the steps in the civic life of an Athenian citizen. The festival of the Apaturia is of central importance in the life-cycle of an Athenian citizen. Children are introduced to the members of their father's phratry during the Apaturia when they become three years of age. Before turning 18 years of age a youth progresses through several age categories known as children of the first, second and third "helikia" or cohort. These groups comprise all youths up to seventeen years of age⁷ and are only attested in the context of athletic games.⁸ Their function seems to have been to group youths by their physical abilities for fairer competition. Apart from athletic training, which probably serves as a prelude to subsequent service as an ephebe and so is confined to youths of the military elite, the children of members of the religious elite also have the opportunity to serve in various religious functions. Relatively few names of youths in childhood functions are actually known. Interestingly, inscriptions provide the names of more girls than boys; for girls we find 56 girl *kanephoroi* (22 on Delos, 32 at Delphi and 2 at Athens), 100 *ergastinai* or girls who wove the *peplos* of Athena for the Panathenaia, and 13 hearth initiates at Eleusis. Apart from the numerous pythaist *paidēs*, we know of only a few boys; several cult assistants at Athens and, on Delos, 7 boy-priests of Hermes, 10 boy-gymnasiarchs and boy-lampadarchs of the

⁷Meritt, *Hesperia* 33 (1964) p. 206.

⁸*I.G.* II² 958.

Hermaia.⁹ In addition, some *pompostoloi* on Delos often seem to have been boys.¹⁰ But the career of a girl was short-lived. After a girl served a second time as a *kanephoros* or, perhaps, managed to serve as an underpriestess of Artemis on Delos, her "public" career was virtually coming to an end.¹¹ Boys of the governing class had less opportunity to fill a public office, but they had a lifetime of service ahead of them. Many of the boys attested as *pythaistai paides* or as participants in the Hermaia on Delos went on to serve as ephebes. This will allow us to determine more precisely the age at which they served in their boyhood offices, something which cannot be done for the girls. It appears that a boy could

⁹These youths associated with the Hermaia are known from only one text (*I.D.* 2595). ΔΩΣΙΩΕΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΧΟΛΜΕΙΔΗΣ was an ephebe in 117/6 B.C., making him 13 years of age in 122/1 B.C. This must be the approximate *terminus ante quem* for the list. He would have been 7 years of age in 128/7 B.C., the approximate *terminus post quem*. ΜΟΥΣΑΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ was a boy-gymnasiarch on the list and served in 119/8 B.C. as an ephebe on Delos. The prosopography of other youths on the list causes some chronological problems. Thus a ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ is named as a boy-priest on the list and ΠΥΘΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ as boy-gymnasiarch. Two youths with the same names were ephebes on Delos in 126/5 B.C., suggesting that the list might date to between 128/7-127/6 B.C. at the latest. Roussel, *DCA*, pp. 58-9 and Dow, *CP* 37, 1942, pp. 311-14 date the list to c. 110 and c. 140 B.C. respectively. The youths associated with the Hermaia were not apparently a regular institution. Several youths in their 20s seem to have fulfilled the same functions in other years. ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, for example, was an ephebe on Delos in 136/5 B.C. and assisted at the Hermaia in 133/2 B.C.

¹⁰*I.D.* 2607-9. The age of the *pompostoloi* is difficult to determine because none of the lists are firmly dated. But those named on *I.D.* 2608, dated to c. 100 B.C., appear to be boys (ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ is named on this list; he was a *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C.).

¹¹This says something about the role of women in Athenian society. Only a religious pretext provided a regular opportunity to be out of the home (C. Vatin, *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris, 1970, p. 263). Aristophanes has a female character recount her "public service" (*Lys.*, 641ff), and she only lists childhood offices (*arrhephoros* at 7 years of age, *alestris* at 10, a "bear" at Brauron and, while yet a maiden, a *kanephoros*). There were a few adult priesthoods for women but none of the known incumbents can be identified.

first serve in a public function as young as 5-7 years of age.¹² In each of the four great Pythais (or religious processions) sent to Delphi between 138/7-98/7 B.C., a large number of boys accompanied the adult participants and are recorded in the lists set up at Delphi to commemorate the events. Seventeen of these *pythaistai paides* also subsequently served as ephebes, which allows us to calculate that their average age was 9 years, with individuals ranging from about 7 to 16 years of age.¹³ Thus a youth named as a *pais* can be assigned to an age-group ranging from 7 to 16 years of age. This observation allows further demographic information to be inferred about the age of tenure in adult offices as well.¹⁴

At the age of eighteen boys ceased to be *paides* and in a ceremony cut

¹²Two *amphithaleis* in 91/0 B.C., $\Phi\text{I}\text{A}\text{I}\text{N}\text{O}\Sigma\ \Phi\text{I}\text{A}\text{I}\text{N}\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{E}\text{T}\text{N}\text{T}\text{M}\text{E}\text{T}\Sigma$ and $\Delta\text{I}\text{O}\text{P}\text{E}\text{I}\text{Θ}\text{H}\Sigma\ \Phi\text{I}\text{A}\text{A}\text{N}\text{Θ}\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{A}\text{A}\text{A}\text{I}\text{E}\text{T}\Sigma$, were ephebes between 80/79-78/7 B.C. (the ephebic list, SEG XXII.110, cannot be dated more precisely than that; H.B. Mattingly, SEG XXIX.124, has recently attempted to rediate the list to c. 65 B.C.). The latter individual appears in a lower portion of the text cut by Hand Z. Since Hand Y cut lines 12-21, it is possible that the lower portion dates to after 91/0 B.C., in which case he would have been older than 5-7 years of age (for the identification of the hands, see Tracy, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 19). Two other *amphithaleis* named in the same text cannot be identified. One, $\text{N}\text{I}\text{K}\text{I}\text{A}\Sigma\ \text{K}\text{A}\text{A}\text{A}\text{I}\text{M}\text{A}\text{X}\text{O}\Sigma\ \Delta\text{E}\text{I}\text{P}\text{A}\Delta\text{I}\text{N}\text{T}\text{H}\Sigma$, is called an *antiamphithaleis* and seems to be related to the other, $\text{K}\text{A}\text{A}\text{A}\text{I}\text{M}\text{A}\text{X}\text{O}\Sigma$, possibly as a father or a brother standing in for a young boy. For the nature of the office, see L. Robert, "Amphithaleis," *HSCP* Supplement 1 (1940) pp. 509-19.

¹³The distribution is as follows: 5x7, 2x8, 6x9, 2x10, 1x12, 3x13, 2x14, 1x15, 1x16. A. Boethius, *Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athens und Delphi*, Upsala, 1918, p. 60, estimates their age to be about 10 years. Censorinus says that a youth is a *pais* until 14 years of age (*de die natali*, 14.8) but this is contradicted by the prosopographical evidence. Adult *pythaistai* are found for all age-groups ranging from the 20s to the 70s or more. Their distribution is as follows: 6x20-29, 1x30-39, 7x40-49, 4x50-59, 1x60-69, 1x80-89 and 1x90-99. In the case of the last two age groups it is possible that the individuals are in fact homonymous grandsons. That so few 30-year olds are attested is tantalizing. This is the age group which predominated in the *boule* and in the civic magistracies, which might explain the apparently low participation rate for this age-group.

¹⁴Dow, *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 123, concluded that Sulla lowered the age limit for the archonship since $\text{I}\text{I}\text{A}\text{M}\text{M}\text{E}\text{N}\text{H}\Sigma\ \text{Z}\text{H}\text{N}\text{Ω}\text{N}\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{M}\text{A}\text{P}\text{A}\text{Θ}\text{Ω}\text{N}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$ was a pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C. and apparently archon in 83/2 B.C. But if he was a pythaist *pais* when he was 16 years of age, he could have been 31 as archon.

their hair at the Apaturia.¹⁵ Some of these youths, perhaps about 10% of the male eighteen year-olds, would then enter the *ephebeia*.¹⁶ This was probably the most important step in the career of an Athenian citizen. Virtually all the other elites of the governing class are subsets of the large military or ephebic elite.

¹⁵A youth was formally enrolled in his father's deme at this time and assumed the demotic. There is some epigraphic evidence that a demotic could be used before a youth was actually enrolled in his hereditary deme. The *amphithaleis* named in *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 19, for example, are named with their demotics. A *mellephebos* from 94/3 B.C., *ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ*, appears on *I.D.* 2608 as a *pompostolos* and is also named with his demotic. The date of this text is uncertain, but dating it to after 94/3 B.C. would cause other prosopographical problems. Finally, on *I.D.* 2595, the list of youths assisting at the Hermaia on Delos, some are named as "Athenians" and some with demotics. Two younger brothers of *ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ*, named *ΗΦΑΙΣΤΙΩΝ* and *ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ*, for example, are given the demotic *ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ*. The younger brother of *ΦΙΛΩΜΝ ΦΙΛΩΜΩΝΟΣ* is also named with the demotic while *ΦΙΛΩΜΝ* is not. This suggests that the use of the demotic and the ethnic did not follow a strict rule. Ferguson, however, argued that the increasing use of *ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ* rather than the demotic on Delos indicated a weakening of civic consciousness and even suggests that Athenian residents never bothered to enrol in their deme (*HA*, pp. 407 and 381, n. 2). I find instead that the same individual is often named in different texts with or without the demotic (see also Roussel, *DCA*, p. 36, n. 2). Magistrates are usually named with the demotic, persons named in a private capacity often only with the ethnic.

¹⁶Some youths, perhaps out of eagerness for the *ephebeia*, would serve as "cadets" or *mellepheboi* before turning 18 years of age. These *mellepheboi* are named in only three private dedications from Athens dating to the first half of the first century B.C. (*Hesperia* 10, 1941, n. 27, p. 62; *I.G.* II² 2991 and 2991a). Only ten Athenians are named on these texts (with one foreigner). Pelekidis has noted that the Athenians are all named with their demotic but does not otherwise explain what these *mellepheboi* were. The name suggests that these are youths who were intending or about to become ephebes. Perhaps they were youths who were already enrolled in the next *ephebeia* or who were permitted to participate in the activities of the *ephebeia* before they were eighteen years of age. That they were younger than the ephebes is suggested by Censorinus' statement that *mellepheboi* are fifteen years of age and ephebes sixteen (*de die natali* 14.8). Whether the *mellephebeia* had official status is unclear and only a handful of names are known to us. But most belong to families which were prominent in the military elite. *ΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΗΓΗΣΙΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΛΟΥΣΙΕΥΣ*, for example, was a *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C. He had a cousin, *ΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΟΥ ΛΟΥΣΙΕΥΣ*, who had been an ephebe in 108/7 B.C. Similarly, a cousin of *ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΥ ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΗΘΕΝ*, a *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C., was also an ephebe (*ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ*, *Hesperia* Supplement 15, n. 7d). Another *mellephebos* from 95/4 B.C., *ΩΝΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΩΝΣΙΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΙΣΙΟΣ*, was the son of an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. Similarly, the father of *ΦΙΛΩΝ ΘΕΟΤΙΜΟΥ ΣΗΜΑΧΙΔΗΣ*, *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C., was an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. In addition to the *mellepheboi*, a second category of youth associated with the *ephebeia* are also attested. *Pareuaktoi* are named in only one text from Delos (*I.D.* 2589). Twenty-six individuals are named; only three are Athenians. Pelekidis has suggested that these are former ephebes who maintained some kind of association with the *ephebeia* (*l'Éphébie attique*, p. 234-5).

Each year upon graduation the corps of ephebes were named after a particular Athenian hero. When these ephebes turned sixty years of age, they became eligible to serve as jurists and their cohort name reverted to the next class of ephebes. In this institution we may see most clearly the principle of age sets in operation, for the ephebes of a particular year would have a group identity to carry with them throughout their civic careers. At nineteen, whether he had served as an ephebe or not, a youth became eligible to vote in the *ecclesia*. At nineteen he also became eligible for military service as a cavalryman¹⁷ or, perhaps, as a *systratiotes*.¹⁸ The junior cavalry officers also tended to be young men. *ΕΡΜΩΝ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ*, for example, was a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. He served as a phylarch in 128/7 B.C. when he was between 19-27 years of age. A hipparch in 128/7 B.C. named *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ* had been an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. and so was just 28 years old.¹⁹ *ΧΑΡΙΚΛΗΣ ΦΑΛΛΗΡΕΤΗΣ* was a phylarch in 138/7 B.C. A son of his was born in 120/19 and served as ephebe in 102/1 B.C., suggesting that *ΧΑΡΙΚΛΗΣ* could have served as phylarch in his 20s. The commanding officer of the light cavalry, the *tarantinarchos*, on the other

¹⁷The average age of cavalrymen was 32 years (with a median of 35). The prosopographical evidence suggests that a youth could become a cavalryman at 19 years. Thus *ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΕΤΙΟΣ*, who had been an ephebe in 107/6 B.C., must be the *ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝ* (tribe XI) who served in the cavalry in 106/5 B.C. Similarly, *ΙΑΣΩΝ ΣΕΛΑΕΤΚΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΗΣ* served in 106/5 B.C. with his son, who must have been just in his 20s. Also, *ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΤΗΣ*, a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C., was a cavalryman in 128/7 B.C. between 19 and 27 years of age.

¹⁸The *systratiotai* are poorly attested but identifiable individuals may be inferred to have served between 29 and 40 years of age. *ΚΤΗΣΑΡΧΟΣ* served in 106/5 B.C. His older brother was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. (and so was born in 137/6 B.C.). *ΚΤΗΣΑΡΧΟΣ*, therefore, was no more than 31 years of age as *systratiotes*. A *ΜΝΗΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΑΓΝΙΟΥ* (tribe V) served as a cavalryman in 128/7 B.C. when he was a *thesmothetes*. A *ΜΝΗΣΙΘΕΟΣ* served in 106/5 B.C. as a *systatiotes*. It was either him in his late 50s (or more) or an otherwise unattested son or relative.

¹⁹Another hipparch, *ΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΤΗΣ*, seems to have been just 19 years of age. In one text concerning the *hippeis*, a secretary of the cavalry is named (*F.D.* III, 2, n. 28). He is probably the same as the secretary for the *hipparchoi*. Nothing more is known about this office.

hand, might have been slightly older.²⁰ A cavalryman, therefore, might have begun service in his early 20s and could serve for several decades;²¹ occasionally a father and a son served together. The twenties are also the decade when young men probably married and started a family. A bridegroom introduced his wife to his phratry at the festival of the Apaturia and, as we have seen, their children would participate in the festival when they turned three years of age. In this way the Apaturia was a focal point of the regeneration of the Athenian population.

In addition to military service a youth in his twenties became eligible for religious and liturgical functions. Although it is common to make a distinction between civic offices and priesthoods,²² for the purposes of analyzing the membership of the governing class the similarities between these two types of office must be emphasized. Both, for example, required the expenditure of personal wealth in the exercise of office.²³ The principle of tribal rotation, a product of the democratization of Athenian society in the fourth century B.C., could be employed for various priesthoods as well as for the prytany-secretaryship. The same men, moreover, often held civic magistracies and a number of the available priesthoods during their careers. But the best argument for including both types of office in the same study is that in the ancient world

²⁰The age for only one incumbent can be inferred; he was 37 years of age. Another *tarantinarchos*, *ΑΥΣΩΝ*, served in 128/7 B.C. His son was born in 124/3 B.C. and served as *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C.

²¹Participation in the cavalry was a long-term prospect. Thus *MENKPATHΣ* (*ephebe* in 138/7 B.C.) served in 128/7 and 106/5 B.C. as did *ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ* (tribe VIII) and *ΚΑΑΜΙΑΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ*.

²²Two separate studies have been written on the magistracies and priesthoods at Athens from 86 B.C. to the late Roman Empire. Geagan, *AC*, discusses the civic magistracies (and their religious duties) while G. Vellek ("The priesthoods of Athens: 86 B.C. to 267 A.D.," Ph.D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1969) presents the epigraphical evidence for most of the attested cults and their priesthoods.

²³In the Hellenistic Period some cities actually sold their offices. This does not seem to be the case in Athens, although liturgical positions such as the *agonothesia* could have been bid for. No magistrates at Athens seem to have received a salary. At Miletus, the priest of Roma was paid a salary (*SIG* 1003, 1006, 1009-15, *Milet* I.7, 203).

there was no clear distinction between secular and sacred functions. The *prytany* magistrates had a number of sacrifices which they were required to make on behalf of the Athenian people. The office of *basileus* or king-archon retained religious duties which were vestiges of its origin in the Aegean Dark Ages as a successor to a hereditary tribal kingship.²⁴ Under Augustus the eponymous archon served *ex officio* as priest of the Consul Drusus and the hoplite general also became priest of Roma and Augustus. The only significant difference is in age of tenure. *Archai* are confined to men over thirty years of age while religious offices could be held by men in their twenties (youths under eighteen, as was shown above, could also serve in subordinate positions). Although many families confined their activities to the offices of the religious elite, it also seems that service as a priest often preceded subsequent service in the civic magistracies.²⁵

The prosopography of many of these priesthoods is severely limited by the absence of documentation for the cults. Many of the attested cults at this time have no known incumbents in their priesthoods. The aristocratic priesthoods are better attested and more incumbents are known than for the non-aristocratic or "public" priesthoods. Our knowledge for some priesthoods and cults derives entirely from dedications by former priests. Since many of these dedications were put up at personal expense, only the wealthier priests, presumably those who served the more important cults, were able to record their priesthood for posterity. In other cases, only one text (often a reserved seat in the Theatre of Dionysus in the Roman Empire) attests to the continuation of a particular cult.

²⁴The king-archon is very prominent in a law concerning sacrifices to Apollo from 129/8 B.C. (*SEG* XXI.469). The text is very fragmentary but it names a number of civic magistracies including the *kosmetes* of the ephebes. Some of these magistracies, the senior ones at any rate, are those which participated in the Delphic Pythaiads. It is possible that the law concerns the Pythaid which would be sent in 128/7 B.C.

²⁵The only formal distinction between priesthoods and civic magistracies is that tenure in two magistracies was forbidden whereas an individual could be a magistrate and a priest at the same time. In addition a priesthood was not, strictly speaking, an *arche*. (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1299a 16-20).

The status of a number of these cults is uncertain for this period.²⁶ The existence of the cult of Artemis Agrotera during this period, for example, is uncertain. The cult is unattested in the Roman period²⁷ but the priesthood is mentioned in a list of magistrates dated after 167/6 B.C.²⁸ This seems to be the last epigraphical testimony for the priesthood. The cult of Apollo Prostaterios, on the other hand, is well attested in prytany lists from *Agora* XV, n. 78 to n. 261. But a priesthood is only attested in n. 260 and the name of the priest is not extant. It is possible that a separate priesthood existed for the cult at this time.²⁹ The priest of the Hero in the City, who is named in only one inscription, seems to be associated in some way with the priesthood of Asclepius.³⁰ Other cults had been amalgamated during this period and were served by only one priesthood. In the time of Hadrian, for example, one priest served the two cults of *Zeus Soter* and *Athena Soteira*.³¹ A dedication from the second century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3483) names a *kanephoros* for both deities. This must indicate that the amalgamation took place sometime earlier than the date of the dedication. The Pyrphoros at Eleusis, furthermore, also served as priest of the Graces and of Artemis Epipyrgidia.³² Similarly, the priest of Zeus Ourios, Athena Ourias, Poseidon

²⁶The priestess of Athena Polias, for example, is usually associated in dedications with Pandrosos, but in one text a separate priestess of Pandrosos seems to be mentioned. (*I.G.* II² 3481).

²⁷Vellek, "The Priesthoods of Athens," p. 89.

²⁸*Hesperia* 6 (1937) n. 7, pp. 457-60.

²⁹The *prytaneis* sacrificed to Apollo Patroos and Apollo Prostaterios. It is possible that *Agora* XV, n. 260 is misleading and that there was not a separate priesthood for the latter deity. For the sacrifices see Geagan, *AC* p. 98. There are other gods to whom the *prytaneis* sacrificed (all non-gentile) which did not have a corresponding priesthood. The cult Apollo Prostaterios is not discussed by Vellek.

³⁰*I.G.* II² 840. The priesthood is not discussed by Vellek, although he does discuss a priest of the *Ἡρώος Ἰατροῦ Ἀμφιλόχου* attested in the later Roman Empire ("The Priesthoods of Athens," p. 113).

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 42.

³²K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia, 1974, p. 94.

Prosbaterios and Poseidon Themiliouchos, who is known from only one text,³³ is, at the same time, the *lithophoros* at Eleusis. The two offices may have been directly connected.³⁴ The priestess of the Syrian Goddess is named in only one text (*I.G.* II² 1337), and there she is a foreigner.

A number of other priesthoods were positions *ex officio* which also restricted their availability to the Athenian population at large. The hoplite general, as noted above, served under Augustus as priest of Roma and Augustus the Saviour,³⁵ and the eponymous archon served simultaneously as priest of the Consul Drusus, following his death in the consulship in 9/8 B.C. Most of the priesthoods associated with Eleusis are confined to several of the aristocratic clans or *gene* of the religious elite at Athens. The *genos* of the Eumolpidae possessed the highest office of *hierophantes* along with the position of *exegetes*. K. Clinton argues that a number of other offices are also filled from within this clan.³⁶ The Ceryces supply the second-ranked priest, the *daidouchos*, the sacred herald, and the priest of the altar. The priestess of Demeter and Kore comes from among the Philaidai.³⁷ The families which held these offices rarely belonged to the governing elite at Athens. These priesthoods were hereditary within a single family and the fact that other gentile families held senior offices cannot be

³³Ibid., p. 51.

³⁴Vellek does not mention this cult. Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 98, briefly discusses the *lithophoros*.

³⁵The priesthood was a separate office for most of the period covered by this study. Often named as the priesthood of the Demos, the Graces and of Roma, this cult became the cult of the Goddess Roma and Augustus the Saviour by the end of the first century B.C. This priesthood was then held *ex officio* by the hoplite general. The temple, on the Acropolis, was dedicated during the reign of Augustus.

³⁶Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 116.

³⁷The man *epi to aporreton* is named in several prytany lists from the second century B.C. among the *aisitai*. He must be associated with the cult at Eleusis in some way. A number of the senior Eleusinian officials were also *aisitai*. Clinton does not mention this official. Eleusinian *aisitai* were the *hierophantes*, the *daidouchos*, the sacred herald, and the priest of the altar.

accounted for by the prestige of the gentile priesthoods. It is possible that tenure in an Eleusinian priesthood generally precluded tenure in civic office.³⁸ Eleusinian priesthoods seem to have been held when an individual was quite elderly. The priesthood of Apollo at Athens was also confined to the aristocratic *gene*.³⁹ Unlike the Eleusinian priests, he seems to have entered office in the 20s or 30s.⁴⁰ It seems that the priesthood became hereditary for a time in the last half of the first century B.C.⁴¹ Other priests at Athens are too poorly attested to allow any reliable inference about the average age of tenure, although two careers suggest that the priests of the Eponymous Heroes of the twelve tribes were also quite young. Thus *AMMONIOS AMMONIOT ANAΦAETIOS* served as priest in

³⁸ Although the eponymous archon in 85/4 B.C. was the *hierophantes*, this might be due to the exceptional circumstances of the time (see Chapter 5). Three families which possessed hereditary priesthoods over several generations, for example, show no members in civic offices. These are the families of *ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ-ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ*, *ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ-ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΑΓΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ*, and *ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ-ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΑΓΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ*. Only under Augustus do men holding gentile priesthoods appear in the Areopagus (*ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ*, for example, was *hierokerux* in 20/19 B.C. and *thesmothetes* between 31/0-15/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1720); *ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΚΛΕΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* was *lithophoros* in 20/19 B.C. and king-archon after 11/0 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1727); *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ* was priest of the Bomos in 20/19 B.C. and was also a member of the Areopagus under Augustus (*I.G.* II² 1721). Under the Roman Empire Eleusinian offices were often combined with civic magistracies. This might be a result of constitutional reforms under Augustus (see Chapter 7).

³⁹ For general discussion of the cult and the Pythais and Dodecades, see G. Colin, *Le culte d'Apollon Pythien à Athènes*, Paris, 1905 and Boethius, *Die Pythais*. See also Vellek, "The Priesthoods of Athens," pp. 74-82.

⁴⁰ Thus *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* is first attested at 32 years of age (42/1 B.C.) and *ΛΕΣΙΑΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ* at 27 years of age (in 98/7 B.C.).

⁴¹ Vellek incorrectly states that the first attested priest in the Roman period was *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΕΤΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* under Tiberius (Vellek, "The Priesthoods of Athens," p. 74). *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, the father, is well-attested as life-long priest of Apollo from as early as 42 B.C. to the end of the century. The grandson of *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* also served as life-long priest (Graindor, *Herode Atticus et sa famille*, Cairo, 1930, pp. 6-12). This one family, therefore, possessed the priesthood for three generations. Before *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ*, the last attested priest is *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΥ* of c. 80 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 55). The priest in the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. was *ΛΕΣΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ*. Between *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ* and *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ*, there is no intervening priest. It is possible, therefore, that *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* himself inherited the priesthood from his father *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ*.

140/39 B.C. He was *epimeletes* of Delos in 128/7 B.C. for the second time. He could have been priest in his 20s. Similarly, *AAEΞION MAPAΘNNIOΣ* was priest in 166/5 B.C. His son was born in 141/0 B.C. and served as ephebe in 123/2 B.C.,⁴² suggesting that he too could have been priest as a young man. Perhaps a distinction may be made between these priesthoods which could be held at a fairly young age and the priesthoods of the more powerful, ancient cult at Eleusis.

In addition to the cults of Apollo at Athens and Demeter and Kore at Eleusis, many priesthoods of less prominent cults were also restricted to specific *gene* of the religious elite, such as the priesthood of Athena Polias (Eteoboutadai), of Zeus in the Palladium (controlled by two *gene*),⁴³ the priesthood of *Boutypos* (Thaulonidai),⁴⁴ and the priesthood of Kekrops (Amyandridai) and the priesthood of Poseidon (Eteoboutadai). These last two priesthoods were hereditary and strictly speaking are not, therefore, public offices. The priesthood of Dionysus Melpomenus was shared between the Euneidai and the Dionysiac Technitai. Tenure in priesthoods such as these is an important indication of membership in the religious elite of the city. The priesthood of the Mother of the Gods was filled annually by lot from the *orgeones* (or members of the cult association).⁴⁵ Many other priesthoods, moreover, were life-long offices which further restricted their availability to a large number of Athenians. The priesthood of Asclepius, formerly an annual office rotated among the tribes,⁴⁶ and possibly the priesthood

⁴²This is a conjectural stemma. The ephebe in 123/2 B.C. is named only as *AAEΞION* of tribe X or XI. But another ephebe is attested in 98/7 B.C. with the name *AAEΞION AAEΞIONOΣ*. It is an attractive hypothesis that we have here three generations attested in the military elite.

⁴³*Hesperia* 49 (1980) pp. 40-3.

⁴⁴Vellek, "The Priesthoods of Athens," pp. 49-50.

⁴⁵Only one text mentions the priestess (*I.G.* II² 1334).

⁴⁶The priest of Asclepius used to be selected on the basis of tribal rotation but under Augustus the priesthood became a life-long office. Associated with the priesthood was the office of *pyrphoros* (Vellek does not discuss this office; cf. *I.G.* II² 1944) and a *zakoros*. In the first century B.C. only one *zakoros* is attested. He is a foreigner (Vellek considers his ethnic a patronymic, "The Priesthoods of Athens, p. 38).

of *Artemis Kalliste*, became life-long some time before the reign of Augustus. In the third century B.C., this latter priesthood was allotted on an annual basis. But by the second century A.D., the priesthood was life-long.⁴⁷ *I.G. II*² 2874 names a life-long priestess of Artemis (with no attribute) in the archonship of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*. If this is the priestess of *Artemis Kalliste*, the office would have become life-long sometime during the first century B.C.⁴⁸ The priesthood of Sarapis at Athens might also have been life-long. Only four priests are named for this relatively minor cult at Athens over 200 years. On Delos, tribal rotation was followed but it is possible the priesthood was life-long at Athens.⁴⁹ D. Feaver has remarked that the rise of Athenian democracy in the fifth century B.C. is first reflected in the creation of annual priesthoods selected by lot from all citizens. The creation of such democratic priesthoods must have preceded other democratic innovations such as the selection of the nine archons by lot.⁵⁰ By the age of Augustus, the priesthoods point in another direction. The decline of the democracy, even if it had long become little more than a name, is indicated by the trend in the priesthoods towards more exclusive restrictions on tenure. There can be no doubt that after A.D. 14, there was less opportunity for an Athenian citizen to attain and serve in a public priesthood.

At Athens the trend between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14 was towards greater restriction of priesthoods within families and towards the substitution of annual

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 93-4.

⁴⁸The text is dated to an undetermined archonship of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*.

⁴⁹On this cult in general see Vellek, "The Priesthoods of Athens, pp. 106-11. The priesthood was elective according to *Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 51, p. 252. A *zakoros* and *krites* are named in only one text (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 13) and both are foreigners. One dedication from Athens (*I.G. II*² 3520) mentions a priestess, according to the restoration, and a *zakoros*. No Athenian priestess is named elsewhere with a *zakoros* and the restoration, *ἱερατεύσας*, is not common on Athenian dedications. This text could concern the cult of Sarapis in which case the restoration would have to read *κατηφορούσας*.

⁵⁰D. Feaver, "Historical Development in the priesthoods of Athens," *YCS* 15 (1957) p. 136.

priesthoods with life-long offices.⁵¹ Although the evidence is less certain, a similar trend can be postulated for Delos where the annual priest of Apollo on the island, for example, became life-long after 88 B.C. The epigraphical evidence for the priesthoods and cults of Delos to the beginning of the first century B.C. is as abundant as it is for the civic magistracies, but the Mithridatic War and the events of 88/7 B.C. had a profound effect on the residents of Delos. The abundance of inscriptions from 167/6 B.C. to 88/7 B.C. is not duplicated for the second half of the period covered by this study. In fact, only a handful of inscriptions date to after 88/7 B.C., and few of these concern a priesthood or a cult. Until 88/7 B.C., at least, all of the public priesthoods on Delos were annual offices held by Athenian citizens. At least three priesthoods followed tribal rotation from 167/6 B.C.⁵² It remains uncertain whether the term of office coincided exactly with the Athenian year. Two priests of Apollo might be attested for 100/99 B.C.⁵³ It is possible one of these died in office or was replaced, but it is also possible that some Delian offices might have straddled the Athenian year.⁵⁴ There is no reason why priests would necessarily take office when the civic magistracies did so, and the festivals of the various deities might

⁵¹G. Plaumann, *RE* VIII, 1417 notes that during the Hellenistic period priesthoods also often became hereditary.

⁵²See Appendix A.2. For a detailed study of the cults of Delos throughout the Hellenistic and Imperial Ages, see P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970.

⁵³Tracy identified one of these priests as a priest of the Cynthian Deities on the basis of find spot (*I.G.* II² 2336}, p. 141). But because the priest in question made a dedication to Apollo, it remains plausible that he was in fact a priest of that deity. Tracy does not explain why a dedication by a former priest of the Cynthian Deities would not have specified that cult if the priest made a dedication to a different deity. Also, why would a dedication by a former priest of the Cynthian Deities to Apollo be set up in the sanctuary of the Cynthian Deities rather than the sanctuary of Apollo? The argument from find spot, therefore, requires much more justification than Tracy provides.

⁵⁴See Appendix A.2.

have been the occasion when the new priest was chosen.⁵⁵ Many of their assistants also served for one year. The professional offices, however, were held for longer periods and were often held by foreigners. An interesting aspect of the cults on Delos is the frequency with which children served as cult assistants in the year their father or a relative was priest.

The evidence from careers suggests that priests on Delos tended to be younger on average than the civic magistrates on the island. The youngest attested priest might be *ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΠΑΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ*, who was an ephebe in 106/5 B.C. and possibly the same individual as *ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ*, the priest of Dionysus in 101/0 B.C. (a second priest of Dionysus, however, might have been in his 50s).⁵⁶ An underpriest of Sarapis, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ*, served when he was 28 years of age (SEG XVI.452). Other young priests can also be identified.⁵⁷ For most priesthoods the prosopographical evidence is too slight to allow an average calculation for the age of incumbency,⁵⁸ although it appears that the priests of Sarapis were on average 37 years of age (with a median age of 41). This is consistent with the observation above that an underpriest for the cult seems to have been only 28 years of age.

⁵⁵If the restoration of *I.D.* 2593 is correct, the priest of the Great Gods seems to have been chosen at the time of the Apollonia. But the priest of Artemis of the Island was elected with the nine archons (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 51, p. 252).

⁵⁶The priest is [] *ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ* (BCH 105, 1981, n. 3), who served towards the end of the second century B.C. Might he be *ΑΡΕΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ*, a gymnasiarch on Delos in 160/59? He could be a grandson, in which case this priest would also have been quite young in office.

⁵⁷A priest of an unknown cult was 31 or more years of age. Note also *ΣΩΤΗΡ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ*, who was *agoranomos* in 148/7 B.C. and a priest in 145/4 B.C. (at 33 or more years of age).

⁵⁸The following figures result: priest of Anios, 44+ and 60 years of age; priest of Apollo, 30s; priest of Artemis, 30s and 43+; priest of Aphrodite, 34 and 36; priest of the Nymphaion, 33+; priest of the Cynthian Deities, 38, 38 and 47+; *kleidouchos* of the Cynthian Deities, 49 and 61 (possibly he was older than the priest); priest of Hestia, the Demos and Roma, 44. In the cult of Aphrodite the *kleidouchos* seems to have always been a boy; in 112/1 B.C., for example, *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ* served as priest at age 34 with his son as *kleidouchos* (112/1 B.C.).

The relative rank of the Delian priesthoods can be determined from two different sources. Early in the Athenian administration of the island, an inscription (*I.D.* 2605) dating to 159/8 B.C. was set up on Delos listing the names of the ten priests of that year for the public cults on the island. The order of the priests on that list seems to follow an official ranking of the priests.⁵⁹ Several Delian priests also contributed to the Delphic Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 2336). The size of their contributions provides an additional indication of the relative rank of the priesthoods, and the size of the contributions to the Pythaid roughly corresponds to the order of the priests on *I.D.* 2605. On the evidence of these two texts the priests may be arranged in the following order:

<i>I.D.</i> 2605	<i>I.G.</i> II ² 2336
1. priest of Apollo	100d
2. priest of Roma	100d
3. priest of the Kynthians	100d
4. priest of Zeus Soter	
5. priest of Artemis	100d
6. priest of the Great Gods	
7. priest of Dionysus	50d
8. priest of Asclepius	
9. priest of Sarapis	50d
10. priest of Anios	50d
priest of Hagne Aphrodite	100d

The priest of Hagne Aphrodite is listed separately because this was a private cult until sometime after 128/7 B.C. when the priesthood became an annual office held by an Athenian. By c. 100 B.C. the priesthood was required to contribute 100 drachms to the Pythaid, twice as much as the priest of Sarapis. Although the priesthoods on Delos may be ranked on the basis of evidence such as this, the evidence from careers shows that fixed sequences in the Delian priesthoods do not

⁵⁹See commentary to *I.D.* 2605 and Bruneau, *Les cultes de Délos*, p. 504, for discussion.

occur.⁶⁰ But some consistent patterns in the careers do occur. Service as cult attendant often preceded subsequent service as priest. Thus a *hoplophoros* of the Cynthian deities became *kleidouchos* of Aphrodite and a second *hoplophoros* became priest of Sarapis later on. A *kleidouchos* of Sarapis also went on to become priest of the cult. In two separate careers a priest of the Great Gods went on to become priest of Sarapis and two other individuals, who had served as priests of Artemis, also became priests of Sarapis. In a third career this sequence is reversed. Two former priests of Sarapis went on to become priests of Asclepius and two others became priests of the Cynthian deities. Although it is possible, as noted above, that a priest of Dionysus was in his early 20s, the evidence from other careers suggests that this priesthood was more senior than the others. A priest of the Great Gods, for example, went on to become priest of Asclepius and then priest of Dionysus. A former priest of the Nymphaion and a priest of Aphrodite also later became priests of Dionysus. This pattern is only contradicted by one instance in which a former priest of Dionysus became priest of Sarapis. The evidence from careers and ages of tenure, therefore, show no pattern which is consistent with the ranking of the priests on *I.D.* 2605 or *I.G.* II² 2336, and the rationale behind those rankings remains unclear.

In addition to religious offices, young men in their 20s were also eligible for liturgical functions, such as participation in a festival *theoria*. A *theoria* was a special kind of religious *presbeia* on behalf of the *polis*. A large number of *theoroi* accompanied the Pythaid processions,⁶¹ and the cleruchy on Lemnos sent *theoroi*

⁶⁰In the early years of the Athenian administration the tribal cycles for the priesthoods on Delos were staggered by equal intervals (See Appendix A.2). Perhaps this was an early attempt to regulate the sequence of tenure. But all the tribal cycles soon broke down.

⁶¹On several texts concerning the Pythaid, liturgical offices such as *hestiator* (*I.G.* II² 1941), an *agonothetes* for equestrian games (*F.D.* III, 2, n. 34) and two *hieropoioi* (*F.D.* III, 2, n. 52) are named. These three offices appear to be special offices and not part of the regular contingent of magistracies usually associated with the Pythaid. The *agonothetes* seems to be the hipparch named in the same text. The date for the two *hieropoioi* is uncertain. I associate them with the Pythaid because of several *hieropoioi* who are named with a Dodecade from the Roman Empire.

to festivals in Athens (*I.G.* II² 1223). Delian *theoroi* were also sent to the Panathenaia under the direction of an *architheoros*. Athens herself sent a *theoria* to Delos every year under the direction of a special *architheoros* called a *Deliastes*.⁶² The Delia involved games hosted by an *agonothetes* and religious processions calling for girls as *kanephoroi*. Positions such as these were usually held by members of families of the religious or the liturgical elite (in cases such as these the distinction between these two elites blurs). Purely liturgical functions would include the overseers who were often appointed to supervise the completion of a building or statue dedicated to a benefactor of Athens. When the Athenian people dedicated statues to Pharnaces and his queen Nysa, for example, *epimeletai* for the erection of the statues were appointed (*I.D.* 1497b). An office such as this probably involved some personal expenditure and perhaps interest on the part of the overseer.⁶³

Members of the liturgical elite were also involved in the athletic life of the city. A large number of individuals, including foreign residents of Delos, contributed to the presentation of the games, as *hieropoioi* of the Apollonia and Hermaia. Often these were young men; the *hieropoioi* for games at the Apollonia, for example, are described as *oi aleiphomenoi*, "those who frequent the gymnasia". These games also involved a girl as a *kanephoros*. The city *agonothesia*, however, seems to have been the most important of the liturgical offices at Athens at this time.⁶⁴ In addition, *lampadarchoi* at Athens seem to have led teams in competitive games. Their exact relationship to members of the

⁶²Before 315 B.C. the Delia were celebrated every four years but then seem to have died out. By the end of the first century B.C., however, they were revived on an annual basis (Roussel, *DCA*, p. 210, points out the parallel with the revival of the Pythaid at the same time).

⁶³Cf. Geagan, *AC*, p. 120.

⁶⁴There might have been a separate *agonothesia* for the ephebic games as well (D. Peppas-Delmouzou, *AJP* 100, 1979, 125-32).

team is unclear.⁶⁵ On Delos, there was also an active athletic life centered on the *palaistrai* and the ephebes. Another liturgical office at both Athens and Delos would be the trierarchy, although its exact nature at this time is unclear.⁶⁶ Two trierarchs are known from Delos, one a foreigner and one *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ* (ID 1841). In both cases these Delian trierarchs are named in dedications to Athena. Since the dedication honouring the trierarchs at Athens mentions sacred ships, the trierarchs seem to have some connection with a festival (perhaps the Panathenaic boat race).⁶⁷ Like priesthoods, liturgical offices were held by men ranging from their 20s to their 60s, and "iteration" is often indicated by the prosopographical evidence.⁶⁸ *Hieropoioi* at Athens named on *I.G. II*² 1938 were in their mid-30s (with an average of 33 and a median of 34). A list of liturgical *epimeletai* from c. 130-120 B.C., on the other hand, shows individuals ranging from the 20s to 60 years of age (with an average of 38 and a median 42).⁶⁹ *Agonothetai* at Athens show an average age of 46 (with a median of 49). This may reflect the greater expense and individual burden of the office. Liturgical offices, to conclude, indicate that while some individuals and families confined themselves to this type of activity, it is possible that young men may have used the liturgies and the priesthoods to support a future candidacy for elective offices.

⁶⁵C. Pelekidis believes that the *lampadarchoi* who led teams of ephebes or former ephebes in the Theseia were members of the group itself (Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 231). But in *I.G. II*² 956 there is a *lampadarchos* for a category of children who reappears in *I.G. II*² 957 as a *hipparchos*. Some of the *lampadarchoi*, therefore, seem to have been coaches rather than participants themselves.

⁶⁶Davies, *APF*, p. xxv, n. 5, indicates that the last attested trierarch is in 306/5 B.C.: "The few scattered Hellenistic references to trierarchs signify little."

⁶⁷Other festivals at this time also had nautical competitions (cf. Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 214).

⁶⁸*Hieropoioi* on Delos are first attested at age 22, 27 and c. 35 years of age. The first two individuals are again attested at age 39. Another *hieropoios* iterated after a seventeen year interval and two others are attested in their 50s.

⁶⁹*I.G. II*² 1939.

Upon turning thirty years of age, every Athenian male became eligible for service as a *prytanis* for his deme and tribe. Most prytaneis serving for the first time probably served immediately upon turning thirty years of age although this cannot be proven in any particular career. Service as a *prytanis* must also have preceded service in the numerous junior civic magistracies such as secretaryships and administrative assistants⁷⁰ as well as the more senior magistracies.⁷¹ An ex-*prytanis* was eligible for one iteration. It is unclear when a citizen normally iterated as *prytanis*, although the interval between iterations seems to have averaged between ten to twenty years. Shorter intervals of iteration are also known. In a number of instances we know of a father and a son serving

⁷⁰The following careers show a sequence in which an individual served as *prytanis* before holding a junior magistracy; ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΦΑΙΕΤΕΣ was a *prytanis* (Agora XV, n. 303) and then secretary of the *epimeletai* of the Dikasterion (I.G. II² 1733); ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. and an *agoranomos* sometime after 29/8 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 18, pp. 289-90 and Agora XV, n. 273; This is an admittedly conjectural collation. In the first text the man is named only as ΔΙΟΝΤΣ[], tribe X; in the second, even worse, as only ΔΙΟ[] ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ! But it is attractive to speculate that we find here one individual who was active in civic office during this turbulent period); ΔΙΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΕΣ served as *proedros* in 37/6 B.C. and might have been the secretary of the *polemarchos* in c. 30 B.C. (Hesperia 15, 1946, n. 45, pp. 217-19; he is named only as ΔΙΩ[NΕ]ΤΕΣ); ΜΕΝΕΚΛΗΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΕΣ was a *prytanis* between 180-60 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 209) and secretary of the *agoranomoi* on Delos in 151/0 B.C.

⁷¹Several conjectural careers might reveal an individual serving as a *prytanis* before holding a senior magistracy. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ served a prytany-secretary in 128/7 B.C. and possibly as gymnasiarch on Delos in 116/5 B.C. (The gymnasiarch in 116/5 B.C. is named only as [.....]ΝΟΣ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ. I suggest that the individual might have been our ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ because we know that he was active on Delos after 116/5 B.C. when he and his brother made a dedication to Mithridates VI, ID 1560); ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΕΣ was *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C. and possibly the archon ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ in 126/5 B.C.; ΕΞΑΚΩΝ ΕΞΑΚΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΕΣ was *prytanis* in 140/39 B.C. and orator in 116/5 B.C.; ΦΙΛΙΩΝ ΦΙΛΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ served as prytany-secretary in 101/0 B.C. and *thesmothetes* in 98/7 B.C.; ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ [.....] was *proedros* in 164/3 and a ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΓΕΝΟΥ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΕΣ *polemarchos* in c. 150 B.C. Note that a ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΕΣ served in 135/4 B.C. as treasurer of the Boule; ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ was *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 18, pp. 289-90) and a ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ archon in c. 30 B.C. He might be the ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ who served as *hymnogogos* in 20/19 B.C.; ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΕΣ was *prytanis* in 47/6 or 43/2 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 278) and perhaps identifiable as the [] ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ who served as king-archon in 44/3 B.C.

together.⁷² This suggests that a member of the peripheral governing class might iterate when his son was serving for the first time.⁷³ Iteration in these cases would mark the retirement of the father from civic life.

A large number of junior magistracies also became available for a man after he turned thirty years of age. These include the magistracies of the *boule* and *demos*, the magistrates who belonged to the tribe in prytany, the magistrates who belonged to the *boule* as a whole, the *aisitai* who served the *boule*,⁷⁴ and other magistrates associated in some way with these two groups.⁷⁵ In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., an *epistates* served for one day and night. Geagan argues that by the Hellenistic Age the *epistates*, who is to be distinguished from the *epistates ton proedron*, served for the complete term of the prytany.⁷⁶ The *proedroi* presided at meetings of the *boule*. There were originally 9 *proedroi* and an *epistates*, or president, who was from the tribe in prytany. The whole board

⁷²The shortest attested iteration might be that of the son of ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, who served with his father in 32/1 B.C. and then iterated in 30/29 B.C. At least eight instances of this practice could be cited here.

⁷³Note that ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ served as *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C. with his younger son ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΟΣ (Agora XV, n. 286). An elder son served as *prytanis* about the same time (Agora XV, n. 285).

⁷⁴The board of *aisitai* gradually evolved during the period covered by this study (S. Dow, *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, Athens, 1937, pp. 13-19 and Geagan, *AC*, pp. 92-115). Geagan has argued that the same flutist served both the board of archons and the prytany (*AC*, p. 109). It seems also that the same flutist participated in the Pythaid celebrations. ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΑΜΙΤΤΡΕΥΣ named in the prytany list *Hesperia* 17, 1948, n. 12, pp. 25-9, seems to be the flutist ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ who served in the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. But the flutist of the Dodecade celebrations at the end of the first century B.C. does not seem to be the same as the flutist serving the *boule* and the board of archons at that time. ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ served the last three Dodecades at a time when several other flutists are named in archon lists and prytany decrees.

⁷⁵A treasurer of the trireme-fund (*trieropoika*) is named during this period. In Aristotle's time the 10 *trieropoioi* were chosen from the *bouleutai* and served for one year (*AP* 46.1). He does not mention a treasurer but the existence of a fund at this time suggests that some vestige of the institution has survived. The treasurer is named in *SIA* 25 (Peek).

⁷⁶Geagan, *AC*, p. 103.

of *proedroi*, therefore, must have changed for each prytany.⁷⁷ *Proedroi*, with a minimum average age of 45 years, were probably iterating as *prytaneis*.⁷⁸ Secretaries (minimum average age of 40 years) and treasurers (minimum average age of 42 years) seem to have been a bit younger.⁷⁹ ΔΙΩΝ, undersecretary of the *demos* in c. 100 B.C., could be ΔΙΩΝ ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ, whose family was active in the late second century B.C. The name is not uncommon, but an ephebe ΔΙΩΝ ΔΙΩΝΟΣ of 106/5 B.C. could plausibly be a son of this ΔΙΩΝ. In this case he was undersecretary when he was about 40 years of age. ΜΝΗΣΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ, undersecretary in 166/5 B.C., might be the same person as ΜΝ/ΜΗ[], who was secretary in 165/4 B.C. This would indicate that the office of undersecretary was a junior position. Although they are not strictly speaking magistrates, I would also include in this category the men who propose motions in the *ecclesia*.⁸⁰ Orators show an minimum average age of 46 years, suggesting that they also were iterating *prytaneis*.

The administration of Delos is characterized by a small board of high-ranking civic magistrates, in addition to the several liturgical offices providing the

⁷⁷For discussion of this board see Geagan, *AC*, p. 113.

⁷⁸ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ served as *proedros* in 95/4 B.C. at 51 years of age (he was an ephebe in 128/7 B.C.), the average age for men iterating in the *prytaneia*.

⁷⁹Several secretaries seem to have been in their 30s although this cannot be precisely determined. ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ, for example, was a prytany-secretary in 52/1 B.C. His son was born between 57-55 B.C. and served as an ephebe (*I.G.* II² 1961). ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΜΠΡΕΤΣ was a prytany-secretary in 145/4 B.C. His son was born in 137/6 B.C. and served as an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. ΗΦΑΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ was an *antigraphus* in 128/7 B.C. A son was born in 137/6 B.C. and served as ephebe in 119/8 B.C. Three other secretaries might have served in the mid-30s; ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ in 20/19 B.C., 36 years of age if he is identifiable as the ΜΗΤΡΟΦ[] who was an ephebe in 38/7 B.C.; ΘΡΑΣΤΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ in 104/3 B.C., 37 years of age if he is identifiable as ΘΡΑΣΤ[] of tribe VI, VII or VIII in the *ephebeia* of 123/2 B.C.; ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΜΙΔΗΣ in 106/5 B.C., 35 years of age. A man of this name was an ephebe 123/2 B.C.

⁸⁰On the importance of oratory in a political career in the fourth century, see M.H. Hansen, "The Athenian Politicians, 403-322 B.C.," *GRBS* 24 (1983) pp. 33-55 and "Rhetores and Strategoi in Fourth-Century Athens," *GRBS* 24 (1983) pp. 151-80.

opportunity for private citizens to contribute to the religious and cultural activities of the island, and, as we have seen, a large corps of priests and attendants to serve the many active cults on the island. Our knowledge of Delian magistracies is limited almost entirely to prosopography, and there is little explicit information about their functions or responsibilities.⁸¹ Few Delian magistrates or priests, however, are known from the period after 88/7 B.C. Our knowledge about the administration of the island after this year is practically non-existent. But all of the civic magistrates, except the secretary of the *agoranomoi*, were elected and, if the evidence for the secretary to the *epimeletes* holds true for all of the magistrates, they were elected by the people of Athens.⁸² The election of the administrators in Athens will also explain the prominence of leading Athenian families in Delian magistracies. When the magistrates were elected remains unclear but unlike Athenian *archai* Delian administrators could iterate.⁸³ The hierarchical rank of the civic magistracies on Delos is also difficult to determine, for unlike Athens, there is no list of magistracies on Delos providing an official order by rank. The magistrates on Delos (except for secretaries and the *epimeletes* of the Tetragonon) were all expected to contribute to the Delphic Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. The magistracies contributing 200 drachms to the Pythaid, headed by the *epimeletes*, are in the first-rank followed by the magistrates contributing 100 drachms. It is impossible to provide a more detailed ranking than this. Tracy has already accounted for the unexpected presence of the Delian

⁸¹Roussel, *DCA*, pp. 28-9.

⁸²There is some controversy about this (Roussel, *DCA* pp. 44 n. 3). The assistants according to Roussel were selected at Delos but we do know that the opposite is true for the secretary of the *epimeletes*. The secretary of the *agoranomoi* was allotted. There might have been a dispute in 142/1 B.C. over the way in which the gymnasiarch would be selected. Roussel argues that until this time the gymnasiarchs were elected by the *epimeletes* and the members of the gymnasium, after which the people of Athens elected the gymnasiarch (see his commentary to *I.D.* 2589). Dinsmoor argues that the dispute arose in 141/0 B.C. and that the gymnasiarch was always elected by the people of Athens except for an irregularity in 141/0 B.C. Consequently he dates two of the gymnasiarchs named on the Delian list to the same year (W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, pp. 229-32).

⁸³*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 51, p. 252, seems to make a distinction between the time of the election of the nine archons and the election of the secretary to the *epimeletes*.

administrators among the contributors by the wealth of the colony and the prominence of its administrators.⁸⁴

In addition to the senior administrators there was also an *ecclesia* on Delos with a *boule*, *prytany* and *proedroi*. Only three *proedroi* are known down to the dissolution of the cleruchy in c. 140 B.C. In the period of the cleruchy, therefore, civic life on such a small island must have been active, although the actual competence of the local *ecclesia* was limited to voting honorary decrees, scrutinizing some magistrates' accounts and possibly electing or appointing some subordinate or assistant magistrates.⁸⁵ The gymnasiarchs on Delos, who seem to correspond to the *agonothetes* at Athens, show a minimum average age of incumbency of 46 years (with a median of 45).⁸⁶ This was an office which probably involved great personal expenditure. Interestingly, the *agoranomoi*, a more junior board of civic magistrates, show a minimum average age of 35 years (with a median of 36).⁸⁷ The career of ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ, who was an *agoranomos* between 166-148/7 B.C. (ID 1836) and possibly gymnasiarch in 144/3 B.C. (ID 2593)⁸⁸, supports these figures. The evidence for average ages in the tenure of other Delian magistracies is less consistent, although two *epimeletai* of the

⁸⁴Tracy, *I.G.* II² 1336}, pp. 159-68. At the same time, although Tracy has shown that the Pythaid was a Delphic and not a Delian celebration, I wonder if the Delian administrators were expected to contribute because Delos was the sacred island of Apollo.

⁸⁵Roussel, *DCA*, p. 44.

⁸⁶Cf. a gymnasiarch law from Beroea of c. 150 B.C. which stipulates that the gymnasiarch is to be between 30 and 60 years of age (J.M.R. Cormack, *Ancient Macedonia*, Vol. II, Thessalonika, 1977, pp. 139-50). The age of tenure for two gymnasiarchs at Athens is known; one served in his mid-30s, the other at 46 years of age.

⁸⁷Thus ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΚΑΕΙΔΑΜΟΥ ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΑΙΕΥΣ served in 103/2 B.C. at age 34. This is conjectural since the *agoranomos* is named as ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣΟ[]. An ephebe in 119/8 B.C. is named as ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΚΑΕΙΔΑΜΟΥ of tribe XI. The demotic ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΑΙΕΥΣ is the only demotic of this tribe which could be restored in the name of the *agoranomos* of 103/2 B.C.

⁸⁸He is only named as ΜΗΝΟ[], but the Delian community was so small during this generation that it might have been ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ.

Emporion are known to have been between 37-43 and 43 or more years of age,⁸⁹ and an ambassador of the cleruchy was 35 years of age or more. Two *proedroi* of the short-lived Athenian *ecclesia* on Delos are attested, and both may have been in their late 30s or 40s.⁹⁰

A number of other magistrates who are attested at this time were responsible for special aspects of Athenian government. These are not known to belong to one of the boards of senior magistrates or to one of the three corporations of the Athenian state, and it is difficult to determine the relative rank of many of these offices. It is surprising to find attested at this late date, for example, the office of *nomophylax*, an office which was associated with Ephialtes in the fifth century and Demetrius of Phalerum in the fourth century B.C.⁹¹ Other magistrates associated with legal matters were the six *eisagogeis*⁹² and the *astynomos*. A citizenship decree dating from 166/5 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 954) calls on the board of at least 501 *dicastai* to approve the grant of citizenship made by the *ecclesia*. There were also market officials or *agoranomoi* with an allotted secretary.⁹³ A special commission assigned to ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΥ in c. 100 B.C. charging him with the review of weights and measures (*I.G.* II² 1013) also belongs in this category as do ambassadors, who were elected on an *ad hoc* basis.

⁸⁹Another individual, ΝΤΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΝΤΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ was *kleidouchos* of Artemis in 159/8 B.C. and *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 145/4 B.C.

⁹⁰ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΑΛΗΣΙΓΕΝΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ was an orator in 147/6 B.C. and a *proedros* in 144/3 B.C. and ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ was a priest of Artemis in 150/49 B.C. before serving in 148/7 B.C. as *proedros*.

⁹¹The *nomophylax* is attested in *Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 28, p. 229. Nomophylactic activity is also mentioned in the important decree restoring the democracy after the revolution of 88/7 B.C. (for the text and date, see Appendix A.2).

⁹²In the fourth century there were five *eisagogeis*, one each for two of the then ten tribes (*AP* 52). The number of *eisagogeis* was clearly increased to accommodate the two new tribes.

⁹³Geagan argues that the *metronomoi* are the same as the *agoranomoi* (*AC*, p. 123). In this case a secretary attested at this time in a fragmentary text as the secretary μετρονόμοις εἰς ἄστυ will be the same as the secretary of the *agoranomoi* (perhaps in *Hesperia* 6, 1937, n. 7, pp. 457-60, μετρονόμοις could be emended to ἀγορο<α>νόμοις)?

The number of ambassadors was never fixed, ranging from as few as one (*I.D.* 1497b) to as many as nine on a single mission. Ambassadorial parties sent from a cleruchy to Athens tended to be larger than parties sent from Athens herself. Ambassadors were usually elected ἐξ πάντων Ἀθηναίων.⁹⁴ In addition to magistrates such as these, there were numerous other officials for the local organizations of Attica. But due to the lack of inscriptions concerning the demes, we know almost nothing about local organizations in Athens during this period.⁹⁵ This is unfortunate because if the names of some demarchs were preserved, their social status could be investigated.⁹⁶ The age of tenure for too few of the separate magistrates in this category can be identified to provide a reliable figure, but as a group their average age was 42.

At thirty years of age a male citizen also became eligible for service in the archonship. It was the archonship which, like the *ephebeia*, most separated the males of a single generation into the various elites, for the archonship conferred admission to the Areopagus.⁹⁷ Historians agree that after 86 B.C., at the latest, the archons were elected rather than selected by lot.⁹⁸ The problem is in determining when this innovation took place. The lot for the archons was first introduced in 487 B.C. but seems to have been discarded during oligarchic regimes. The lot was still used for minor offices as late as the reign of Augustus and the principle was never entirely abandoned. Ferguson, in arguing for a

⁹⁴In *I.G.* II² 1051, a decree which concerns the cleruchy on Lemnos dating to the mid-30s B.C., the three ambassadors were the hoplite general, the herald of the Areopagus and the herald of the *boule* and *demos* (Geagan, *AC*, pp. 106-7). See also *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8. This last office was a professional post.

⁹⁵A. Papalas has argued that in the first century B.C. the rural demes were depopulated. He bases this argument on the absence of deme inscriptions from this century ("Roman Athens," pp. 157-70).

⁹⁶The situation for Athens is virtually the same as for Rome. The administrators of the districts of the city of Rome and of the tribes are virtually unknown.

⁹⁷Geagan has shown that all nine archonships gave admission to the Areopagus (*AC*, pp. 56-7).

⁹⁸For discussion see Geagan, *AC*, p. 3.

oligarchic coup in 103/2 B.C., asserted that election for the archons was introduced at that time.⁹⁹ But it is not plausible that the elite would have consented to the use of the lot in determining who would be admitted to the Areopagus. Because the nine archons were equally distributed among the tribes in each year, with only a few exceptions the election of the archons also seems to have been regulated in some way in order to ensure a fair distribution among the tribes over time.¹⁰⁰ This would be consistent with the role of the archonship as the stepping-stone to the Areopagus.¹⁰¹

It is unlikely, perhaps, that a man would become elected archon before serving at least as *prytanis* and occasionally in other junior magistracies. The average age for archons seems to have been between thirty-five and forty-five

⁹⁹Ferguson, *HA*, p. 456. Tracy has dismissed the coup as a fiction and asserts that the archons were allotted during the years covered by *I.G. II*² 2336 (pp. 113 and 129).

¹⁰⁰The problem is discussed by J. Notopoulos, "On the Method of Selecting Archons in the Roman Empire," *AJP* 65 (1944) pp. 151, although his conclusion that a loose sortition cycle was employed for the second century A.D. is doubtful. Notopoulos is correct to emphasize the need for a fair distribution of the archonships among the tribes although I would explain this need as a result of the archonship providing access to the Areopagus rather than to "tribal consciousness".

¹⁰¹Cf. Geagan, *AC*, p. 3. Tracy argues that the more equal distribution of the city, coastal and inland demes for the archonships in comparison to the other magistracies proves that the archons were selected by lot (Tracy, *I.G. II*² 2336, pp. 143-4). But because the archons had to be distributed over 9 tribes (10 if we include the secretary), something which did not apply to the other magistracies, a difference in the distribution of the demes is not proof that allotment was employed. Tracy also finds the "obscurity" of the archons to be additional proof of the use of sortition. But the archonship was at this time a relatively junior magistracy. The men attested in the office on the list of contributors cannot have been elder statesmen but men, most perhaps in their early 30s and 40s, who were just embarking on a political career. ΣΑΡΑΤΙΩΝ, who figures prominently in the list, might have been archon in 116/5 B.C., over thirteen years before the first year of the list. Even if we accept that the career of ΣΑΡΑΤΙΩΝ was retarded because of his obscurity, the archons named in the list of contributors would not have peaked in their careers until in the late 90s and 80s B.C. These are the most poorly attested years in the epigraphic evidence. The alleged obscurity of the archons, therefore, cannot prove that sortition was used in their selection. J. Notopoulos also insists that the archons from 301/0 to 91/0 are inconspicuous Athenians (*AJP* 65, 1944, p. 150). His evidence for this assertion is the increasing use of the demotic, and often patronymic, with the eponymous archon's name, beginning in the middle of the first century B.C. The absence of demotic and patronymic for archons before this period only makes their identification difficult for the epigrapher and it says nothing about their prosopography.

years. Occasionally, in exceptional circumstances, a individual might have become archon earlier than this.¹⁰² The older an individual became, however, his chances for becoming archon would have diminished as younger men became eligible and competed for the office. The eponymous archons show a minimum average age of 37 years (with a median of 42). The age of tenure for only one king-archon can be determined, and the individual served at 42 or more years of age.¹⁰⁴ Interestingly, the minimum average age of the *polemarchoi* is 50 (with a median of 53), making him the most senior archon in age and putting him in the same age group as the generals. The most junior *thesmothetai* finally, show an average age of 44 (with a median of 43). This seems odd at first glance, but the eponymous archonship was the most coveted of the archonships. Since an individual could only serve once in any one of the archonships, men would presumably compete most for the office of eponymous archon. After several failures, an individual might then settle for a less prestigious archonship. The board of archons was

¹⁰²ΕΤΚΑΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, for example, became archon in his early 30s (see Chapter 6). ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΧΟΛΜΕΙΔΗΣ, ephebe in 117/6 B.C., managed to obtain the office of *thesmothetes* at 32 years of age if he can be identified as the ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ of 103/2 B.C.¹⁰³ ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ, archon in 92/1 B.C., could be ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ, a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. He would have been 16 or 17 in 106/5 B.C. and would have become archon when he was just 30 or 31 years of age (31 if he first held a junior position). ΖΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΔ[] served as ephebe in 128/7 B.C. He could be the *epimeletes* of Delos from 113/2 B.C., known only as ΖΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ, at 33 years of age.

¹⁰³This is conjectural, but no other known ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ during this generation can be so identified and there is a strong presumption that ephebes were more likely than non-ephebes to enter the Areopagus.

¹⁰⁴The king-archon's duties were largely concerned with cult and religion (AP 57). Interestingly, of the ten identifiable king-archons during this period, six are recognizably *gennetai*. One of the king-archon's duties was the supervision of the Eleusinian mysteries as well as the adjudication of disputes involving the hereditary priesthoods.

served by junior magistracies about whom little is known prosopographically.¹⁰⁵ But their average age is 36 (with a median of 43). The evidence of several careers suggests that these offices were often held by individuals aiming for election to the board of archons.¹⁰⁶

Membership in the Areopagus was a prerequisite for election to the more senior magistracies of the governing elite such as the herald of the Areopagus and the hoplite general, among other magistracies. The competition for these offices was reduced since it was the archonship which controlled admission to the ranks of this governing elite. In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the board of generals consisted of ten members. In Aristotle's time, specialized functions had already appeared for four of the generals although six remained without a particular assignment (*AP* 61.1). The emergence of the hoplite general as the senior general of the board is a feature of the board of generals at Athens during the Hellenistic Period.¹⁰⁷ By the time of Augustus, the board of generals seems to have been reduced, although the hoplite general survived the evolution of Athens from an autonomous city-state with her own military forces to a defenceless city

¹⁰⁵Little is known about the secretaries of the archons. (Geagan, *AC*, pp. 15-16). A secretary is thought to have served the *synhedrion* of the archons. Because a secretary is attested for the eponymous archon, the king-archon and the *polemarchos*, it is possible a single secretary served the *thesmothetai*. The *thesmothetai* themselves presided over the *dicastai* (*I.G.* II² 954). A *salpiktes* or trumpeter occurs with the board of archons only once, in the list of magistrates participating in the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7b). We would expect the flutist to appear instead. Geagan (*AC*, p. 126) discusses a trumpeter associated with the *pyloroi* in the Roman Empire. But there does not seem to be any connection with the trumpeter named in the Pythaid list

¹⁰⁶*ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ* served as *paredros* of the *polemarchos* in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 15, 1946, n. 45, pp. 217-19) and was himself *polemarchos* after 11/0 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1727). *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΔΗΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ* was herald of the archon between 38/7-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1718) and *epimeletes* of Delos in c. 1 B.C. (ID 1624). The third example is speculative. *ΘΕΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΕΥΚΑΕΙΔΟΥ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ* served as *proedros* of the boule in 122/1 B.C. and might have been the *thesmothes* in 99/8 B.C. who is only attested as [...]*ΛΗΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ*. I would suggest this collation of references is possible because the deme Thria is very small.

¹⁰⁷Th. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General at Athens: A Prosopography*, Chicago, 1976, pp. 14-15.

of the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁸ Only three generals contribute to the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. (the hoplite general, the general *epi to nautikon* and the general *epi ten paraskeuen*). Because other generals are attested at this time, Tracy argues that the board of generals might have been divided into three sub-committees responsible for the land forces, for naval forces and for logistics.¹⁰⁹ In this case the senior member of each committee would have contributed to the Pythaid. But the evidence seems to contradict this explanation. If all the generals, including the generals who administered the island colonies, are taken into consideration, we find that a board of ten generals still seems to be in existence c. 100 B.C.¹¹⁰ The general for Eleusis and one of the two generals for the harbours at the Peiraeus¹¹¹ and Mounychia accompanied the Pythaid although they did not contribute to the fund. Interestingly, the remaining generals who did not contribute or attend the Pythaid were all responsible for administering territory outside of Athens herself. This might explain their absence from the list of contributors. Rather than having been divided into three categories, it seems that Athens employed her generals, where possible, as island administrators.¹¹² This is consistent with Aristotle's statement that in his day the unassigned six generals

¹⁰⁸Geagan, *AC*, p. 20.

¹⁰⁹Tracy, *I.G.* II² 2336 , p. 109, n. 5.

¹¹⁰For a discussion of the generals at this time see Ferguson, *Klio* 9 (1909) pp. 314-323. Ferguson argues that the board of ten generals still existed in addition to the colonial generals. He postulates a general *epi ten choran ten Paralian* as a parallel to the general at Eleusis.

¹¹¹*F.D.* III, 2, n. 24. In 97/6 B.C. there were three generals for the Peiraeus (*I.G.* II² 2873).

¹¹²On the board of generals see Geagan, *AC*, pp. 21 and 27. There is no explicit evidence that the board of generals at Athens actually consisted of ten members. I wonder if a distinction should be made between the board of *ten* generals and the generals at Athens. It is hard to believe that a full board of ten generals plus several generals on the colonies were elected every year. But Roussel, *DCA*, p. 122 asserts that the colonial generals were separate from the board of ten generals at Athens as does Ferguson, *Klio* 9 (1909) p. 317. Ferguson's discussion is based on the belief that there were three nauarchs in one year.

were sent on expeditions as the need arose (*AP 61.1*).¹¹³

The generals on the islands, unlike the board of generals at Athens, do not all seem to have disappeared over the period of the first century B.C.¹¹⁴ Geagan has shown that the generals at Athens were gradually replaced by the hoplite general although the generals on the island colonies were retained.¹¹⁵ The general on Lemnos, for example, is attested to the end of the first century B.C.¹¹⁶ For Ceos, Eretria and Aegina, which were all under Athenian administration for at least part of the period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14, the inscriptions have not preserved any record of their administration. A general on Salamis is not explicitly attested during this period, although P. Graindor believes that the general named on *I.G. II² 1759* with the hoplite general is a general on Salamis.¹¹⁷ Apart from those on Delos, therefore, the magistrates for the other island colonies

¹¹³It is plausible that when Athens acquired new colonies, a general was sent as interim administrator. In time the generalship on the colony could have become a fixed post. This is a suggestion that could be studied in greater detail. Because Delos was under the administration of an *epimeletes*, does this mean that the remaining six generalships had already been assigned to specialized functions by 167/6 B.C.? I disagree with Tracy's interpretation of the decree of the Roman Senate in c. 165 B.C. concerning the priesthood of Sarapis on Delos (Tracy, "Athens in 100 B.C.," *HSCP* 83, 1979, p. 214; R.K. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*, Baltimore, 1969, n. 5, pp. 37-39). Also the decree for Hyrcanus (Joseph. *A I.* XIV.149) commands the generals to oversee his honours. This suggests that the generals were responsible for foreign affairs.

¹¹⁴For a discussion of the administration of the island colonies, see Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 317-22.

¹¹⁵Geagan, *AC*, pp. 21 and 27. Under Augustus the general for Lemnos and a general *kata polin* are attested.

¹¹⁶In *I.G. XII.8.26*, a text from Lemnos dating from the reign of Augustus, a general *kata polin* is said to have held office for the second time. The text also mentions the general on Lemnos. The general *kata polin* must be the general *epi ten paraskeuen kata polin*. The iteration in this generalship parallels the trend towards iteration in the hoplite generalship during the reign of Augustus. The first iteration in the hoplite generalship, however, was in c. 166 B.C. (*ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΥ*, *I.G. II² 1224*).

¹¹⁷P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, p. 116. See also Geagan, *AC*, p. 27 and Ferguson, *HA*, p. 320.

are very poorly attested.¹¹⁸ All island administrators, however, were elected and iteration was possible. Among the generals, the hoplite general was the most senior in rank and age. The hoplite generals show an average age of 52 (with a median of 56). The other generals, as a group, show an average age of 40 (with a median of 43). An individual might serve in a junior generalship before becoming hoplite general.¹¹⁹ Only the hoplite general might have been a member of the Areopagus.

All ex-archons and the secretary automatically entered the Areopagus.¹²⁰ This is the only mechanism for the recruitment and maintenance of the body of *Areopagitai* which might have numbered up to three hundred members at this time.¹²¹ Elected from among the Areopagites, the herald of the Areopagus rose to prominence as the first magistrate of Athens in the first century B.C. The herald, for example, possessed the state seal. In previous centuries the seal had been in the possession of the *epistates* of the prytany.¹²² No other magistrates are associated directly with the Areopagus, but historians generally agree that the mint magistrates attested on the Athenian New Style tetradrachms are a board of

¹¹⁸The magistrate named on one text as ἄρχων ἐν [] could be the archon on Salamis as well as Imbros, Peparethos or Skyros.

¹¹⁹Service in other junior magistracies might have also preceded the hoplite generalship. Note also the possible career of ΕΣΤΑΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΔΟΣ; an *agoranomos* on Delos in 101/0 B.C. is named as [...]ΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ. It is plausible that this is our ΕΣΤΑΙΟΣ, who became hoplite general the following year.

¹²⁰Geagan, *AC*, pp. 56-7.

¹²¹The actual figure depends on the average age of entry (on page 69 I suggest this was 35-45 years of age) and the life expectancy of Athenian males. During the Roman Empire the Areopagus might have been reduced to about 100 members (Geagan, *AC*, p. 57).

¹²²Geagan, *AC*, p. 57.

magistrates belonging to the Areopagus.¹²³ Two magistrates held office for one full year. A third magistrate served, at least during the middle years of the coinage, for only part of the year, usually for a single prytany, sometimes for several prytanies. In addition to the mint magistrates, it also seems that the senior Delian administrators were elected from the Areopagus.¹²⁴ The *epimeletai* of Delos, for example, show an average age of 44 years (with a median of 44) while the public banker on Delos shows the same average age (but with a median of 50). The herald of the Areopagus, in comparison, shows a minimum average age of 44 (with a median of 47). These ages support the assumption that the *epimeletes* and the public banker on Delos were members of the Areopagus. There is some doubt about the temple administrators. These magistrates show a minimum average age of 40 (but a median of 46) which is slightly below the average age of the board of archons. Also, the evidence from specific careers causes some difficulty for the assumption that the temple administrators were members of the Areopagus. ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΦΑΙΕΤΣ, for example, was ephebe in 119/8 and temple administrator in 106/5 B.C. at 31 years of age (he would have been archon at 30 years of age in 107/6 B.C.). The greatest difficulty involves the career of ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΕΙΟΣ, who was a temple administrator in 103/2

¹²³This has become accepted since Sundwall's study of the mint magistrates. For discussion of the problem and a prosopography of the mint magistrates see Thompson, *The Athenian New Style Silver Coinage*, pp. 546-599. Thompson herself argues against identifying the magistrates as members of the Areopagus (*ibid.*, p. 593). But this is partly a result of the prosopographical difficulties which result from her controversial dating of the coin issues by about thirty years earlier than the dates offered by most other scholars. She identifies one magistrate from 121/0 B.C., for example, as a twenty-one year old (*ibid.*, p. 587). She argues that the mint magistracy was in fact a kind of liturgy (*ibid.*, p. 599). But because the Areopagus had responsibilities involving matters closely related to coinage, such as weights and measures, along with other economic matters, it is likely that the Areopagus also took responsibility for the New Style coinage. A commission from the Areopagus was sent to Delos early in the Athenian administration of the island to investigate the temple accounts (see further Chapter 3). But it is also possible that the Areopagus had general responsibility for the coinage although the mint magistrates themselves were performing a liturgical type of service.

¹²⁴Because until the middle of the first century B.C. archons are rarely named with their demotic or patronymic, it is difficult to identify members of the Areopagus as the same individuals as the known *epimeletai*. Tracy (*I.G. II²* 2336 p. 115) accepts that the Delian administrators were Areopagites, Roussel (*DCA*, p. 119) expresses doubt.

B.C.¹²⁵ A ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΕΙΟΣ was *thesmothetes* in 100/99 B.C. If this is the same individual, his career would prove that temple administrators were not yet necessarily members of the Areopagus when they held office. But other careers provide contrary but still inconclusive evidence.¹²⁶ There is, therefore, a strong presumption that temple administrators were either already member of the Areopagus by necessity, or would likely join the Areopagus sometime after serving in the office. The *epimeletes* of the Peiraeus, however, seems to have been on average 46 years of age (with a median of 47). He contributed 100 drachms to the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C., twice as much as the general *epi to nautikon*, and would have been about the same age as the *epimeletes* of Delos. It is possible that he too was a member of the Areopagus.¹²⁷

Apart from the professional and life-long offices,¹²⁸ most of the annual magistracies seem to have been elected or allotted in the twelfth prytany of each year. This is certainly true for the archons and their assistants and the priest of Asclepius. But we do know that at least one magistrate was elected by the ninth prytany of a year (*I.G.* II² 1069). Graindor restored the magistracy to read the hoplite general and although some doubt has been expressed about this restoration, the fact remains that an office held by a prominent Athenian, in this

¹²⁵Note also ΣΑΤΤΡΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ, gymnasiarch on Delos in 166/5 B.C. and a temple administrator between 165-156 B.C. (between 31+ and 41+ years of age).

¹²⁶ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΤ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ, for example, was a public banker on Delos in 159/8 B.C. (and thus a member, presumably, of the Areopagus). He then served as temple administrator in 157/6 B.C. ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΟΤ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ, however, was herald of the Areopagus in 101/0 B.C. and temple administrator in 99/8 B.C. And ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΤ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ was archon in 98/7 B.C. and temple administrator in 95/4 B.C.

¹²⁷Note that ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ, who served as *epimeletes* of Delos in 110/9 B.C., was *epimeletes* of the Peiraeus in 100/99 B.C.

¹²⁸The ephebic year began in the third month of the Attic year, Boedromion, with the inaugural ceremony called the *eisiteteria* (Pelekidis, *L'Éphébie attique*, p. 215-7). Newly appointed instructors might have taken up their duties at this time.

case Julius Nikanor, was elected during the ninth prytany of the year.¹²⁹ It is clear that the office cannot have been one associated with the board of archons or the *boule*. At the same time the office must have been a prominent one.¹³⁰ Graindor's restoration, although tentative, remains attractive. Aristotle informs us that in the fourth century the generals and the military commanders were elected after the sixth prytany of each year (*AP* 44.4). Their term in office, therefore, approximately corresponded to our Julian year.¹³¹ The election of the generals at this time was clearly strategic, their election coming before the start of the campaigning season. Although by 167/6 B.C. this might have had less importance for Athens, the hoplite general had by then become responsible for ensuring the grain supply. A term of office corresponding to that of the other magistrates, from July to July, would seem to be unlikely. If the general was still elected during the winter, it would have been his responsibility to ensure the grain supply to the end of his term in office. There is another interesting implication to Graindor's restoration. *AΘHNION* arrived in Athens in the 9th or 10th prytany and was immediately elected hoplite general. It is possible that his election took place at the regular time and that he timed his arrival to coincide with the elections.¹³²

Apart from satisfying personal ambitions, many of the magistracies and

¹²⁹For the restoration see Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, p. 115. Geagan, *AC*, p. 19 is cautious.

¹³⁰A chronological footnote to this problem may be added here. *I.G.* II² 1723 names Julius Nikanor as hoplite general in the archonship of *ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ*. If *I.G.* II² 1069 refers to Nikanor's election, it must date to the preceding year. *I.G.* II² 1069 and 1723, therefore, would form an fixed synchronism and the archons *ΛΑΚΩΝ* and *ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ* must have served in that order. See Appendix C for these archons.

¹³¹This assumes that there would not be a long lead time between their election and their entrance into office. But C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford, 1952, pp. 347-48, argues that the generals entered office with the other civic magistrates.

¹³²This will have important implications for our interpretation of the events of 88/7 B.C. For the arrival of *AΘHNION* in Athens see Chapter 6.

priesthoods served a second function as well, for it was through these offices that Athenian society obtained services from well-off individuals without direct taxation. The magistrate paid for expenses incurred in the conduct of his position thereby satisfying a need of the society as a whole. In return for this, the society conferred on the individual indirect honours, such as the prestige of the office or direct honours in the form of a statue or a inscription acknowledging his services and thanking him.¹³³ The system functioned with some efficiency and satisfaction until the end of the Roman Empire, although the expensive offices were often filled with increasing difficulty as magistracies lost their administrative responsibilities and became largely liturgical.¹³⁴ The motivation of individuals in seeking public offices is more difficult to determine. Although no Athenian magistrate ever had the absolute power of Roman counterparts who held magistracies with *imperium*, one goal in seeking office must have been the prestige acquired from some positions. Even in the great days of Athenian democracy, in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the power conferred on a magistrate must have been more of a political and administrative nature.¹³⁵ In general, it is agreed that politics were less important in the Hellenistic Age and virtually came to an end with the Roman conquest and the fall of the Roman Republic.¹³⁶ Despite this generalization, the Athenians had a number of important issues in the period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14, which suggest that political life in the city was not moribund. Many issues involved financial administration, such as the administration of Delos and the treasuries on the island, or the administration and management of the New Style coinage. Money had to be minted in quantities which had to be determined through a political

¹³³M. Cary observes that the elite obtained public offices through their personal largess and calls the system "collective bribery" (*A History of the Greek World from 323-146 B.C.*, London, 1970, p. 278).

¹³⁴Geagan, *AC*, p. 128.

¹³⁵The office gave the opportunity to set the political agenda, for example, was a forum for making his views known or gave a vote in an important committee.

¹³⁶M.I. Finley, *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 1983 p. 52.

process. The festivals had to be conducted efficiently and with a certain amount of splendour. Even with the decline in Athenian sovereignty, foreign relations must have retained an important, and perhaps even more perilous, immediacy. Relations with Mithridates VI and with the successive Roman conquerors, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Antony and finally Augustus himself, called for diplomacy and skill. There must have been differences of opinion in the city, vested interests and, on top of these, the sense that the consequences of an ill-advised decision would bring destruction both to the group which carried the decision and to the city as a whole. In the absence of specific evidence for Athenian political life at this time, we must still conclude that politics was not missing from public life.¹³⁷ Individuals may have been motivated by a desire for power as much as for prestige when they sought public offices.¹³⁸

Tenure in the civic magistracies and priesthoods, to conclude, may be analyzed in three ways: (1) by average age of tenure; (2) the sequence of tenure in different offices or, if the sequence is not known, the association of various magistracies in several careers; and (3) family associations, which can be both lateral (brothers, cousins) and vertical (parents, children). An Athenian youth

¹³⁷Finley accounts for political interest on the part of the elite by pointing to psychological motives such as display and conspicuous consumption. Motives such as this stand in sharp contrast to Roman society where political offices were the means by which an individual enriched himself. There is no evidence that an Athenian magistrate had any immediate prospect of enrichment from his office. Often, a magistrate such as the hoplite general must have spent a considerable amount of his personal wealth in performing the office.

¹³⁸How much prestige was conferred on a low-ranking prytany-magistrate, for example, or some of the less important priesthoods? Yet, there are no extant prytany-lists in which offices such as these went unfilled. Although only a handful of all the magistrates for the period of this study are known from our epigraphical evidence, there are few instances where there is positive evidence that an office went vacant in a particular year. But for the period after 88/7 B.C. two inscriptions, both concerning unknown magistracies, show vacancies (*I.D.* 2632 and *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 117). On both lists, as well, some individuals iterated in the office. On cities having difficulty filling their magistracies during the Hellenistic Age see C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique*, Paris, 1978, p. 443 and A.H.M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford, 1940, p. 337, n. 25. The problem seems to have affected other Greek cities earlier than Athens where vacancies only seem to appear after 88/7 B.C. Senior magistracies at Athens do not go vacant until well into the first century A.D. (see, for example, *I.G.* II² 1723, 1729 and 1734).

had a complicated course of public service facing him when he graduated from the *ephebeia* or, if he did not attend, when he turned 19 years of age. The prosopographical evidence for careers strongly suggests that there was a correlation between service in a lower or junior magistracy (including functions held during childhood) and subsequent tenure in a senior office.¹³⁹ Apart from the function of public offices in satisfying personal and group (including family) ambitions and meeting the needs of the society for various services, the junior offices also served an educational function. This aspect of the junior magistracies is also a natural function of institutions such as the *ephebeia*. Most of the attested careers at this time consist of only two offices, although some careers exhibit considerably more offices than this minimum. It is reasonable to suppose that most careers actually involved more offices than those attested in the available epigraphical evidence and that none of our reconstructed careers are a complete record of the offices or activities of an individual. Few, if any, senior Athenian magistrates would have been serving in a public function for the very first time.

The evidence for ages and sequence of tenure suggests that magistracies tended to be held in a loose sequence of seniority, the actual age of tenure perhaps

¹³⁹The career of $\Phi\text{EPEKA}\text{H}\Sigma\text{ OH}\theta\text{EN}$ is important in this context. He is attested in a junior financial office (*epi tas prosodous*) in 183/2 B.C. In 165/4 B.C. a $\Phi\text{EPEKA}\text{H}\Sigma$ served as a temple administrator. This is an uncommon name and makes the collation plausible. Such a career shows a progression from a low-ranking board of financial magistrates to a position of greater responsibility.

being related to the status of the individual's family.¹⁴⁰ The most important step in a career was election as archon. The older a man became the less his chances of becoming archon. The exact relationship of the generalships to the Areopagus remains unclear, although membership was probably a pre-requisite for election as hoplite general. For members of the peripheral families, service in the junior magistracies might have been the termination of their careers. It is unlikely that a man could become a secretary or hold one of the other junior civic magistracies before he first served as *prytanis*. Elite families may be identified by their participation in the Areopagus while peripheral families must have had difficulty advancing beyond middle-ranking magistracies and priesthoods.¹⁴¹ Fathers often served with their sons, in offices such as the mint magistracy, the prytany, priesthoods and in the military, in fact, wherever this was constitutionally possible. Apart from these opportunities, there are few instances where family members held different offices in the same year. Other families, evidently of some wealth, seem to have confined themselves to liturgical or religious functions. Why these families are not attested in the senior civic magistracies remains unclear. It is possible that some wealthy families (especially those which possessed the

¹⁴⁰ Cicero speaks of distinct grades or ranks of magistracies in the days when Athens was governed under the Areopagus (*Rep.* I.27.43). On Rhodes there is evidence for progression through junior and then senior offices: "... the highest offices, both civil and military, and the more eminent priesthoods were, in practice at least, the monopoly of a aristocracy of birth, wealth and state service (although even the noblest Rhodians began their career as a private soldier in the fleet)" (M.I. Rostovtzeff, "Rhodes, Delos and Hellenistic Commerce," *Cambridge Ancient History*, eds. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock and M.P. Charlesworth, Cambridge, 1965, Vol. VIII, Chap. xx, p. 638). The career of Polycles Samou is listed according to his military and his civil offices in the following sequence: military offices -- private, *hegemon*, light vessel commander, quinquireme commander, senior naval officer, nauarch and general; civic offices -- *prytanis*, advisor to the nauarch and liturgies. It is clear that his service as *prytanis* must precede his service as nauarch and we may compare the Athenian *paredroi* to the archons who themselves later became archon themselves. The liturgies are interesting. It is possible that these offices preceded his election to the senior military ranks.

¹⁴¹ ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΚΤΑΗΘΕΝ served as prytany-secretary in 107/6 B.C. He and his son participated in the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. as allotted pythaists, suggesting that the family was not well-off. ΑΤΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΕ served as secretary of the *boule* and *demos* in 131/0 B.C. He is only otherwise attested as herald of the archon in 106/5 B.C.

hereditary priesthoods) eschewed civic office. In a period of tranquility a young man from a family of the governing elite probably had greater prospects for advancement than a youth from a family of the peripheral governing class. But, as the following chapters will show, the period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14 was not a peaceful one for the Athenian governing class.

Chapter 3

Governing Families and the Cleruchy on Delos

The average age of a father at the birth of a son seems to have been between 25 and 35 years of age.¹ This means that a generation of the governing class may loosely be considered to encompass a period of about 30 years. The generation of the governing class which would have reached maturity and have been holding office by 167/6 B.C. consists of those individuals who were born between 220-190 B.C. and who may have served as ephebes between 200-170 B.C. It was in 167 B.C., after a war with Perseus of Macedon, that the Roman Senate embarked on an interventionist and preemptive policy in dealing with the Greek East, a policy which also affected the city of Athens.² Perseus himself was dethroned, bringing an end to the Macedonian monarchy, and his kingdom was converted into four republics under indirect Roman control. Apart from the vanquished, other Greek communities were affected by the new Roman policy according to the threat they represented to the Roman hegemony. The great trading republic of Rhodes was humiliated along with Eumenes II of Pergamum, and the Achaean League, although it had provided military assistance to Rome in the war, was emasculated by the removal of over one thousand prominent politicians as hostages. Athens had remained loyal to Rome during the Third Macedonian War and in accordance with the Roman policy of cultivating loyal client states, the Senate handed over to Athens at her request the tiny and

¹See Table 1.1.

²E. Gruen, "Rome and Rhodes in the Second Century B.C.," *CQ* 69 (1975) pp. 58-81, argues that the policy of the Senate was designed to prevent a recurrence of the Third Macedonian War. According to this view the disloyalty allegedly displayed by various Roman allies during the war reflects Roman justification for its harsh policies.

otherwise blameless island of Delos.³ The gift was not entirely selfless on the part of the Romans, for the port of Delos was now decreed to be free of all taxes and dues. This status was a limitation on the revenues of the Athenian state,⁴ but a major factor in its rapid expansion as first Athenian and then Roman and other Greek traders flocked to the island in order to compete with the established ports of Rhodes, Corinth and Peiraieus. Members of the first generation would have been serving as Athenian magistrates at the time of the acquisition of Delos,⁵ and some of their careers would extend to c. 130 B.C., after the destruction of Corinth and the establishment of the first Roman province on Greek territory. The increase in Roman power in the east at that time led to the rapid growth of Delos into a major port as well as to the equally rapid decline in the importance of the

³Delos was treated like conquered territory although the independent but friendly island had done nothing to deserve such harsh treatment. Rostovtzeff argues that Rome simply wanted to reward Athens for her loyalty. Th. Homolle ("Les Romains à Délos," *BCH* 8, 1884, p. 76) claims that the Roman merchants on Delos got the Senate to create the free port. But this is contradicted by the minor importance of Delos to Roman trade at this time and it is hard to see how the traders could have carried such a decision in the Senate. Perhaps the Senate was intending to punish Rhodes. Rhodes made its living off maritime trade and the free port of Delos had disastrous consequences on her revenues. Roman traders, never welcome at Rhodes, also indirectly benefited from the new status of Delos.

⁴Ferguson postulates that the Athenian cleruchs were required to contribute to Athenian festivals (*HA*, p. 320) and M.I. Rostovtzeff suggests that some minor harbour dues were not excluded by the exemption (*The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1972, p. 742) but both agree that Delos was a liability for Athenian finances (cf. *HA*, p. 329-30).

⁵The exact date of the beginning of Athenian administration remains uncertain. The Delian *fasti* end in 168 B.C. It is possible that the Athenian administration began in January of 167 B.C. (as suggested by Ferguson, *Klio* 7, 1907, p. 234 and followed by Roussel). We know that the Athenian and Delian civic calendars were out of synchronization for several years, something which could be explained by the start of the Athenian administration in the middle of an Athenian civic year.

Athenian population on the island.⁶ The first generation reached political maturity, therefore, with the Romans' gift of Delos in 167/6 B.C. and governed Athens through the following three decades during which the full ambiguity of Roman policy in the Greek world became manifest.

It was also in 167 B.C. that the Athenians, possibly as a direct result of the acquisition of Delos and the need to provide a uniform currency for the public banking counter on the island, began to issue the New Style silver coinage. This was a massive issue which was circulated widely throughout the reaches of Athenian and Greek traders and even beyond, thereby testifying to the lingering importance of Athenian trade in the Aegean. The silver tetradrachms, marked with the same type of wreath which is found on all the stephanephoric silver coinages in Greece at this time, have been attributed by A. Giovannini to indirect Roman interference in the coinages of the autonomous Greek cities.⁷ Virtually all the important political events at Athens during the three decades following the battle of Pydna in 168 B.C. involve Athenian relations with Rome and focus on diplomatic efforts to reconcile disputes between Athens and several of her neighbours. The new series of Athenian wreathed tetradrachms may also reflect the ambiguity of Athens' relations with Rome from the very beginning of the first generation.⁸ Apart from these events, we know nothing more about the internal politics of the city. None of the external disputes can be analyzed

⁶The economic boom on the island follows the destruction of Corinth and the increasing instability of Asia Minor. As Roman and other traders flocked to Delos, the island was in an ideal situation to capitalize on the trade "interface" between Italy and the Levant. The piracy which preyed on this trade also fed the supply of slaves which became a large part of the Delian trade (see Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW*, pp. 777-8 and 787). Delos seems to have temporarily benefited by being on the periphery of the Roman trading orbit. Once the Roman frontier pushed further eastwards, the need for a transit port in the Aegean disappeared. On the decline of the port after 88/7 B.C. see Chapter 4.

⁷A. Giovannini, *Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, Basel, 1978, p. 101.

⁸It is possible that these events have been recorded only because they involved the Roman Senate and were considered important for that reason by historians such as Polybius and Livy.

prosopographically because the principal actors remain unknown to us. For this reason it is only possible to infer from the prosopographical evidence the behaviour of the governing class during this first generation and how it might have been affected by the deterioration of Athenian relations with Rome.

In order to identify the policies and factions which might have been behind the Athenian effort to recover the island of Delos in 167/6 B.C., it is necessary to examine the composition of the population on the island during the first generation.⁹ The prosopographical evidence suggests that in addition to the inevitable new Athenian residents, the population on Delos after 167/6 B.C. did not differ greatly in its composition from that before the Athenian administration. Although Polybius writes that in c. 165 B.C. the Senate decreed the removal of the indigenous Delian population (Plb 32.7),¹⁰ at least four wealthy Delian

⁹Ferguson implies that the colony consisted of poor cleruchs with equal plots of land (*HA*, p. 348). The implication is that the acquisition of Delos was democratically motivated (cf. *HA*, pp. 754-5).

¹⁰The date is uncertain (*HA*, p. 321-3) but the decree seems to precede the incident involving the sanctuary of Sarapis. $\Delta\text{HMHTPI}\Omega\text{C}$ of Rheneia, the attendant of the private sanctuary, obtained permission from the Senate to serve the sanctuary without Athenian interference (Sherk, *RDGE*, n. 5, pp. 37-9). The incident is usually taken as evidence of conflict between the Delian population and the new Athenian administration. $\Delta\text{HMHTPI}\Omega\text{C}$ is regarded as a descendant of $\text{A}\text{Π}\text{Ο}\text{Λ}\text{Λ}\text{Ω}\text{N}\text{Ι}\text{Ο}\text{C}$ of Memphis, the founder of the cult of Sarapis on Delos.

families received Athenian citizenship and remained on Delos.¹¹ The Delians who acquired Athenian citizenship, however, seem to have been at a disadvantage, for they are each attested in but a single low-ranking magistracy, and their descendants are not known to have held any other offices on Delos or at Athens.¹² In addition to these new Athenian citizens, other former residents of Delos became known officially as Rhenians, after an island which lay off Delos, and continued to conduct their affairs as they had before the arrival of the Athenian settlers.¹³ A few individuals acquired the status of οἰκῶν ἐν Δήλῳ, a kind of proxeny, allowing them to own property.¹⁴ A Siphnian who was granted proxeny by Delos before 167 B.C., for example, is attested as a property owner in a temple account from

¹¹*TIMOΘΕΟΣ ΝΙΚΙΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ* was *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 146/5 B.C. He is well attested in the temple accounts from before and after 167 B.C. (BCH 32, 1908, n. 550, p. 364) and seems to have been well-off. Similarly, *ΣΗΡΑΜΒΟΣ ΗΡΑΙΠΠΙΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ*, *agoranomos* in either 152/1 or 151/0 B.C. (*I.D.* 1500) also seems to have been a naturalized citizen (see Roussel, *DCA*, p. 27, n. 1 and M.-F. Baslez, "Déliens et étrangers domiciliés à Délos (166-155)," *REG* 89, 1976, p. 360 n. 54). He and his father were capitalists on the island. *ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΡΗΕΙΜΒΡΟΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ*, a guarantor of a loan on Delos after 167/6 B.C., is attested as a non-Athenian resident of Delos before the Athenian administration (BCH, 32, 1908, n. 430, p. 353). *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΛΑΝΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ*, a sculptor on Delos, is probably the son of a man who had received the Athenian citizenship in 167 B.C. (*I.D.* 1778). Nomenclature may allow us to identify two other Athenian citizens attested on Delos as possibly new citizens: *ΣΩΤΗΡ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ* was a guarantor of a loan on Delos in 157/6 B.C. (*DCA*, p. 39). This is the first time the name *ΣΩΤΗΡ* appears in Athenian prosopography (and *ΝΕΩΝ* too is rare until after 167/6 B.C.). *ΜΥΙΣΚΟΣ ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ*, who is also named in the temple accounts in a financial transaction (BCH, 32, 1908, n. 423, p. 352), might be another new citizen. The name *ΜΥΙΣΚΟΣ* appears only once before at Athens (in a third century funerary inscription, *I.G.* II² 1834). The prosopographical evidence, therefore, suggests that several former Delians had been granted Athenian citizenship. They also seem to have been men of property. Note that Ferguson had already postulated that the Haliartans were granted Athenian citizenship *en masse* in 166 B.C. (*HA*, p. 317, n. 1).

¹²*DCA*, p. 40.

¹³Baslez (*ibid.*) argues that only Delians residing on Rheneia acquired this status, rather than all Delians as previously argued by F. Durrbach. In view of these exceptions to a general exodos of Delians, it seems that the decree of the Senate might have only granted permission for the Delians to leave if they wished. A hostile Polybius presented this as another outrage engineered by the grasping Athenians (cf. 32.7 and 30.20.8).

¹⁴Baslez (*ibid.*, p. 353). Ferguson, who argued that the original cleruchs were mostly landless Athenian citizens, assumed that they alone would have benefitted from rising real estate prices on the island because only Athenians were permitted to own property (*HA*, pp. 348-9).

the time of the Athenian administration.¹⁵ His Delian proxeny must have been recognized by the Athenians. The population after 167 B.C., therefore, was a heterogeneous mixture of original Delians as new Athenian citizens, Rheneans, and *οἰκούντες ἐν Δήλῳ*, along with foreigners and newly arrived Athenian cleruchs.¹⁶

How many cleruchs were sent, and the effect their dispatch might have had on the urban population of Athens (including the important question of grain supply) cannot be precisely determined, but when the first Athenian administrators took over the island in 167 B.C. the number of free residents must have been far smaller than the 20,000 that has been estimated for c. 100 B.C.¹⁷ The Athenian population could not have been large, for it was quickly overwhelmed in the rapid expansion of the island after c. 140 B.C. by Roman and Syrian traders. At this time the Athenian population lost its status as a civic entity and was quietly absorbed into a tripartite political association. A large Athenian population would not have been so easily displaced. Even when the free population reached a peak of about 20,000 residents, after a period of rapid urbanization in which Athenians as well as Romans and Syrians moved to Delos

¹⁵Roussel, *DCA*, p. 73.

¹⁶J. Cargill suggests that in 365 B.C., when Athenian cleruchs were sent to Samos (including descendants of Samians granted Athenian citizenship in 405 B.C.), residents of Samos at that time were also granted citizenship and incorporated into the cleruchy ("I.G. II² 1 and the Athenian Kleruchy on Samos," *GRBS* 24, 1983, pp. 321-32 and in conversation). In 167/6 B.C., apart from Delos, new Athenian settlers are only attested for Lemnos (Ferguson, *HA*, 317 n. 2). Nothing is known about Scyros. Note that *APIΣΤ[] ΧΟΛΑΡΓΕΤΣ*, *prytanis* between 148/7-135/4 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 6, pp. 204-6), could be related to *ΘΑΕΑΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΧΟΛΑΡΓΕΤΣ*, attested as an orator on Imbros in the second century B.C. (BCH 7, 1883, p. 162). Ferguson suggested that the Haliartans were granted citizenship. But he argues that the cleruchs for the other colonies were allotted from all the tribes. He bases this view on the observation that the prytany at Imbros consisted of two members per tribe. He postulates on this basis tribes of about equal size. But at Athens at this time, the tribe Attalis, although it too had to supply 50 *prytaneis* each year, was much smaller than the other tribes. Its relative size can be determined from ephebic lists and from the relative number of magistrates between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14 who are from this tribe. The Imbrian prytany, therefore, should not be regarded as a system of proportional representation.

¹⁷Papageorgiou-Venetas, *Délös*, p. 55.

to swell the original population,¹⁸ the number of resident Athenians only totaled about one-third.¹⁹ The total population of the island in the first generation could not have numbered more than several thousand residents.²⁰ Such a colony could not have significantly reduced the population or the food consumption of the mother city.

Because of the wealth of prosopographical evidence for the population of Delos, it is possible to identify members of Athenian families who went to Delos as cleruchs.²¹ Nothing explicit is known about the number or the class of the

¹⁸The rapid urbanization of Delos occurred after 146 B.C. when the Roman and Syrian population rapidly increased in size (cf. Roussel, *DCA*, p. 76). The Greek foreigners on Delos were mostly from the east (ibid., p. 87). On the urbanization of the island see Ph. Bruneau, "Contribution à l'histoire urbaine de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale," *BCH* 92 (1968) pp. 633-709.

¹⁹Roussel argued from lists of *hieropoioi*, which show a relatively strong Athenian contingent, that a large Athenian population was encroached upon by a growing foreign population ("La population de Délos à la fin de II^e siècle av. J.-C.," *BCH* 55, 1931, p. 444). In 144/3 B.C. more than 30 *hieropoioi* were Athenian and only 18 were foreigners, while in 119/8 B.C. 12 were Athenian compared to 9 foreigners. But the lists of *hieropoioi* are not reliable documents for estimating the relative size of the population of Athenian citizens on Delos. Roussel argued that most Athenian youths on Delos went to the Athenian rather than to the Delian *ephebeia* (ibid., p. 446), but this can be shown to be only partly true from the prosopographical evidence. From 148/7 B.C. to 94/3 B.C. a total of 163 ephebes are attested on Delos and only 40 are Athenians (with 8 other ephebes whose citizenship remains unknown). Among *pareutaktoi*, who are most certainly residents of Delos, the foreign presence is even stronger (72 are attested, 7 are Athenians, 36 are foreigners and 29 are of unknown origin). In contrast to the list of *hieropoioi*, no trend can be discerned in these figures. The Athenian population of Delos must have always been a minority.

²⁰It is probably impossible to estimate the size of the cleruchy. Roussel speaks of "quelques centaines d'immigrants athéniens" (*DCA*, p. 49). Ferguson puts the number of male citizen cleruchs at about 700 (*HA*, p. 354; cf. *Klio* 7, 1907, p. 220: "The Athenian cleruchy was, in fact, a small settlement....")

²¹Several criteria have been devised for identifying a cleruch family. Roussel argued that ephebes attested on Delos, *hieropoioi*, people named in the temple accounts, orators, *prytaneis* and ambassadors can with some certainty be identified as cleruchs (*DCA*, pp. 36-7). Ferguson identified as Delian cleruchs property-owners, individuals attested in two or more minor offices and *prytaneis* on the island (*HA*, p. 351 n. 1). Since residents of Athens could hold offices or own property on Delos, ambiguous cases also occur. If most members of a family are attested on Delos and the exceptions can be explained, the members of the family can safely be regarded as cleruchs resident on the island. Funerary stelae from Rheneia (Roussel, *DCA*, pp. 71 and 85) have not been used.

Athenians who moved to the island, but it is clear that some, if not all, of the new Delian cleruchs were drawn from the governing class at Athens.²² The identity of the senior administrators, many of whom seem to have been residents of the colony, makes this readily apparent. Twenty-two individuals are known to have been active in the administration of the cleruchy during the first generation. Nine of these held three or more offices and were also members of the Areopagus. Their careers indicate that they were well-off, educated and well-enough connected at Athens to secure election.²³

Few of the identifiable cleruchs on Delos from the first generation held offices at Athens after 167/6 B.C.²⁴ One exception is *MIKION AKPIEIOR EHMACHIDHS*, possibly the eponymous archon of 152/1 B.C., who was priest of the Cynthian deities on Delos in 159/8 B.C. The other two exceptions involve individuals who might have only joined the cleruchy after holding office at Athens. Thus, *MENEKAHE AIEXPIONOS AAAIETE*, who was a *prytanis* at Athens between 180-60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 209), could have joined the cleruchy before serving as secretary of the *agoranomoi* on Delos in 151/0 B.C. *ΠΕΛΟΥ*, perhaps the archon in 165/4 B.C., was an orator on Delos in 148/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 1501). He

²²Unlike some fifth century colonies, which seem to have involved the dispossessed or poorer classes of the Athenian population. Cleruchs for Brea, for example, are known to have been recruited from the lower classes (R. Meiggs and D.M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century*, Oxford, 1969, n. 49). Roussel rejected the notion of an exclusively poor cleruchy and postulated a mercantile presence, although he also concedes, unnecessarily it seems, an admixture of "véritables prolétaires" (*DCA*, p. 35-6).

²³This conclusion is supported by a similar finding by J. Cargill for fifth and fourth-century cleruchies. He has identified cleruchs sent to Samos in 365 B.C. as descendants of Samians who had been given Athenian citizenship *en masse* in 405 B.C. Many of the cleruchs are from the propertied families and can be identified prosopographically. He reports a similar finding for other cleruchies as well (*GRBS* 24, 1983, pp. 321-32).

²⁴Two of these, however, might not have been cleruchs. *ΑΥΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΕΤΣ*, a *prytanis* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 242), may plausibly be identified with a temple administrator known only as [] *ΙΠΠΙΟΤ ΕΠΙΚΕΤΣ* from 159/8 B.C. and 149/8 B.C. It is possible he iterated in this office. *ΘΕΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ ΘΕΑΙΝΕΤΟΤ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΤΣ*, orator after 167/6 B.C. (*I.D.* 1403) on Delos, may be identified with a secretary of the prytany in 164/3 B.C. ([.....] *ΑΙΝΕΤΟΤ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΤΣ*).

might also have joined the cleruchy after his tenure in office at Athens.²⁵ Most cleruchs, however, are only known to have pursued careers on Delos. An orator on Delos in 159/8 B.C., *MENANΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ*, was subsequently *hieropoios* (144/3 B.C.) and then gymnasiarch (143/2 B.C.). His offices testify to his education and his wealth. An orator in 147/6 B.C., *ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΑΛΗΣΙΓΕΝΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΥΣ*, served in 144/3 B.C. as a *proedros* of the Delian prytany. *ΦΕΡΕΚΛΗΣ ΟΗΘΕΝ*, attested at Athens in the junior financial office *epi tas prosodous*²⁶ in 182/1 B.C., served on Delos in 165/4 B.C. as a temple administrator. He might have been one of the original cleruchs. An ambassador elected by the Delian cleruchy in 160/59 B.C., *ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ*, was also elected to oversee the erection of a public monument on Delos. He is probably a Delian cleruch.²⁷ Another probable cleruch is *ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ*, who served as *agoranomos* between c. 166-148/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 1836) and gymnasiarch in an unspecified year (*I.D.* 2593).

A number of cleruchs became members of the Areopagus and so must have served as archons at Athens. In some cases they might have moved back to Athens for their archonship although some might have joined the cleruchy after they entered the Areopagus. Thus *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* held two financial positions on Delos (temple administrator in 157/6 B.C. and public banker in 154/3 B.C.).²⁸ *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ* was a temple

²⁵The status of *ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* is less clear. He served as general *epi ten paraskeuen* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 2866) and in 129/8 B.C. was gymnasiarch on Delos. He could have been an Athenian resident although the gymnasiarchy is an office frequently held by cleruchs.

²⁶For the nature of this office, see Ferguson, *Klio* 9 (1909) p. 313 and Tracy, *Hesperia* 53 (1984) n. 3, p. 374.

²⁷The ambassador and the three overseers were elected "from all the Athenians" (*I.D.* 1497b). But one of the overseers, *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ*, is probably a cleruch and the other, *ΑΕΩΝ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ*, belongs to one of the important pro-Roman families in this period. On the role these families might have played in the acquisition of Delos see below.

²⁸He may be an ancestor of an *arrhephoros* in the first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3496) but is otherwise unknown.

administrator between 155/4-153/2 B.C. (*I.D.* 1429), and in unspecified years, *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 2510) and priest of Apollo (*I.D.* 1864). Another *epimeletes* in c. 150 B.C., *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΜΕΝΑΙΧΜΟΤ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ* (*I.D.* 1832), was elected to oversee the Tetragonon (*I.D.* 1831). Cleruchs who might have moved back to Athens for a few years could include *ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ*, the gymnasiarch on Delos in 166/5 B.C. and clearly one of the very first cleruchs. He subsequently served as temple administrator between 165-156 B.C. (*I.D.* 1838). The gymnasiarch in 164/3 B.C., *ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΤ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ*, served in 159/8 B.C. as public banker, in 157/6 B.C. as a temple administrator and in 145/4 B.C. as an orator. Another identifiable cleruch is *ΞΕΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ*. He was an ephebe at Athens before 166/5 B.C., became an ambassador of the cleruchy to the *polis* in 159/8 B.C. and, when he was at least 31 years old, served as a temple administrator between 153/2-152/1 B.C. (*I.D.* 1426).²⁹ All of these individuals enjoyed high standing in Athenian society, wealth and the most senior civic magistracies on the island.³⁰

In contrast to cleruchs who belonged to the governing elite, other early residents of Delos were less highly placed. Many of these cleruchs are attested in liturgical and priestly offices and low-ranking civic magistracies on the island. An *agoranomos* in 148/7 B.C., *ΣΩΤΗΡ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΕΤΙΟΣ*, for example, is otherwise attested only as a priest in 145/4 B.C. *ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΕΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ*, priest of Artemis in 150/49 B.C., also served as a *proedros* of the Delian prytany in 148/7 B.C. A *kleidouchos* of Artemis in 159/8 B.C., *ΝΤΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΝΤΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, served as *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 145/4 B.C. *ΠΡΩΤΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΣ* was secretary of the *agoranomoi* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 1832). His cousin *ΠΡΩΤΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΑΡΧΟΥ* was a capitalist on Delos at about the same time (*DCA*, p. 39). We may also assign

²⁹The temple administrator is named without patronymic and demotic.

³⁰But despite their status and success, none of these individuals have identifiable relatives who held office in the second generation. For discussion of the transition of power between the first and second generations, see Chapter 4.

TIMOKPATHΣ ΦΑΤΕΤΕ to this category. He was an *agoranomos* between 167/6 B.C.-148/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 1836) and a *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. Finally, *ΔΑΜΩΝ ΚΟΘΩΚΙΔΗΣ* made a dedication on Delos. His son was gymnasiarch in 133/2 B.C. and the family might have been well-off.

Other identifiable cleruchs are mostly attested in liturgical or priestly offices. *ΖΗΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΑΛΑΜΠΤΕΤΕ*, for example, was priest of Sarapis in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2098) and a gymnasiarch of the Apollonia in 144/3 B.C. *ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΕ* was priest of the Great Gods in 163/2 B.C. and then priest of Sarapis in 159/8 B.C. *ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΕ*, a *pompostolos* of Dionysus in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), was a priest on Delos in c. 130 B.C.,³¹ and another *pompostolos* in c. 150 B.C., *ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΣ ΟΑΡΜΠΙΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΤΕ*, was an ephebe on Delos in 148/7 B.C. and then *hieropoios* in both 144/3 B.C. and 127/6 B.C. *ΑΕΟΝΤΙΧΟΣ ΚΡΑ[] ΔΕΚΕΛΕΤΕ*, a *pompostolos* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), was a priest on Delos (perhaps priest of Asclepius on the basis of the tribal cycle) in 150/49 B.C.³² Similarly, *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ*, donator to a sanctuary, had a son named *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ*, who was priest of the Great Gods in 152/1 B.C., and another donator named in the temple accounts, *ΜΥΙΕΚΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΕ*, was the father of *ΕΛΛΗΝ*, priest of Sarapis in 134/3 B.C.³³ These families constitute the religious and liturgical elite of the colony and do not seem to have held high political office. The evidence regarding all the identifiable cleruchs and cleruch families regardless of their rank in the governing class, however, is unanimous. Many are well-off, some appear in senior civic magistracies and the frequency of orators and ambassadors suggests that they

³¹*I.G.* II² XII.8.72; he is named only as *ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΧΑΡ[]*.

³²See Appendix A.2.

³³This family might have been granted Athenian citizenship in 167 B.C. See above, note 11.

were well-educated.³⁴ But whether they served in senior magistracies or only in liturgical or priestly offices, none of the individuals mentioned above who are attested on Delos in the first generation belong to families which survived into the second generation as members of the governing class. This signifies that some families of the governing class which joined the cleruchy on Delos soon after 167/6 B.C. declined after c. 130 B.C.

The prosopographical evidence for the magistrates on Delos in the first generation suggests that for this period the Delian cleruchs constituted a separate community which had little interaction with that of Athens. The population of identifiable cleruchs comprises the ten families and the additional twenty-two individuals with known careers who were discussed above. At Athens during the first generation, on the other hand, an additional thirteen Athenian families and

³⁴Roussel was cautious about identifying senior magistrates on Delos as cleruchs because the elections were held at Athens (*DCA*, p. 41). But most of the senior magistrates in this period can be shown to have had career or family connections with the island. *ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*, who was temple administrator (date unknown; ID 2506), may be an exception. He is attested at Athens as *agonothetes* of the Theseia and *lampadarchos* in 161/0 B.C., hipparch in 157/6 B.C. and *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C., all at Athens (for his family, see Chapter 4). But *ΑΥΚΟΦΡΩΝ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ*, temple administrator between 161/0-160/59 B.C. (*I.D.* 1450), had a son who served on Delos as *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 124/3 B.C. and a grandson who served as priest of the Cynthians in 119/8 B.C. Similarly, *ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ*, temple administrator in 144/3 B.C., had a son who served as priest of the cult of Anios in 110/9 B.C. The gymnasiarch on Delos in 136/5 B.C. could be either *ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝ* or his son. *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΥΚΙΕΚΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΕΥΣ* was an orator on Delos in 149/8 B.C. His son *ΑΥΚΙΕΚΟΣ*, served as a temple administrator. The year is not known although he could have served as early as the 140s B.C. (*I.D.* 2506) depending on his father's age in 149/8 B.C. *ΑΥΚΙΕΚΟΣ* would have served as archon sometime before his term as temple administrator on Delos. A number of senior Delian magistrates in the first generation have relatives in the second who served at both Athens and Delos, making their identification as original cleruchs difficult. But in general, where the evidence is available, it seems that senior Delian magistrates in the first generation tended to have some connection with the cleruchy. Roussel also observed that no *gennetai* can be identified as cleruchs. But the number of *gennetai* who are known to be active in the first generation is not large. The more generations of a family that are attested the greater the likelihood that its status as *gennetes* will be detected. Twenty-two careers and ten families are identifiable as cleruchs in the first generation. None of these are identifiable as *gennetai* and none have known members or relatives in the second generation. Twenty-six careers and thirteen families are identifiable as Athenian families at this time. None of these are identifiable as *gennetai* either, and they also have no known members or relatives in the second generation. The absence of identifiable *gennetai*, therefore, says little about the social status of the cleruchs. See Chapter 4 for further discussion of the survival of families in the second generation.

twenty-six individuals with known careers are attested. These individuals and families are only mentioned in inscriptions at Athens from this period and must represent Athenians who did not join the Delian cleruchy. A number of these families and magistrates may be identified as members of the governing elite.³⁵ Two *prytaneis* at Athens, *ΙΩΝ ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΗΘΕΝ* (140/39 B.C.) and *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ* (135/4 B.C.), moreover, served as *hieropoioi* in 149/8 B.C. Similarly, *ΘΑΛΕΦΑΝΗΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ*, who served as a *prytanis* in 169/8 B.C., was a *hieropoios* of the Athenaia in 156/5 B.C. A *hippeus* from Antiochis (XI) in 128/7 B.C., *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ*, can be identified with any one of three *prytaneis* of this name between c. 150-135/4 B.C. *ΙΩΝ*, *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ*, *ΘΑΛΕΦΑΝΗΣ* and *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ* seem to have possessed wealth, although there is no evidence that they belonged to the governing elite.³⁶ Only two other *prytaneis* from this period held recognizably more senior magistracies: *ΔΕΙΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ*, who was ambassador of the *demos* in c. 150 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 94), might be identified with another *ΔΕΙΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ* who was an unspecified magistrate sometime between 200-150 (*SIA*, n. 25), and *ΔΕΙΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΡΑΙΕΤΣ*, a *prytanis* in 140/39 B.C. and twice a third mint magistrate (*ΔΕΙΝΟΚ*, T158/7 B.C.) and (*ΔΕΙΝΟ*, T155/4 B.C.), and *ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΕΤΣΙΝΙΟΣ*, an orator in 165/4 B.C. and possibly

³⁵The following were archons: *ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ*, *ΑΝΔΡΕΑΣ*, *ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ*, *ΣΠΕΤΣΙΠΠΟΣ*, *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ*, *ΑΓΝΟΘΕΟΣ*, *ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ*, *ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ* and *ΑΡΧΩΝ*. Several of these are discussed in the text. To be noted here are: *ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΣ*, (ambassador in c. 166 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1224), archon in 150/49 B.C.), *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ* (*hieropoios* in 156/5 B.C., archon in 147/6 B.C.), *ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΕΠΗΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ* (orator in 145/4 B.C., archon in 138/7 B.C., orator again before 128/7 B.C. and treasurer of the *boule* in 129/8 B.C.), *ΑΡΧΩΝ (ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΡΧΩΝΟΣ ΕΛΕΤΣΙΝΙΟΣ)*, demarch in 165/4 B.C., could be the father of the archon in 148/7 B.C. But *ΑΡΧΩΝ* could also be the son of *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΡΧΩΝΟΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ*, *epimeletes* of Delos sometime after 167/6 B.C.) and *ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ* (archon in 132/1 B.C. and second mint magistrate [T153/2 B.C.]).

³⁶On the selection of *hieropoioi* see Habicht, "Eine Liste von Hieropoioi aus dem Jahre des Archon Andreas," *AM* 97 (1982) pp. 173-84.

a treasurer of his tribe's prytany in 135/4 B.C. ($\Xi\text{ENOKPATH}\Sigma \Xi\text{ENO}[_]$).³⁷ Apart from the two archons, $\text{A}\Gamma\text{NO}\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$ and $\text{AN}\Delta\text{PEA}\Sigma$,³⁸ who also served as *prytaneis* during this generation, two other *prytaneis* are associated with the *ephebeia*, suggesting that their families were potential recruits into the governing elite.³⁹ One other *prytanis* from this period, $\text{BOTAPXO}\Sigma \text{EIPE}\Sigma\text{IDH}\Sigma$, who served between 148/7-135/4 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 6, pp. 204-6), may have been a third mint magistrate (BOTAP , T158/7 B.C.).⁴⁰ These *prytaneis*, therefore, rose up into the ranks of the liturgical or even the governing elite. In addition to the *prytaneis* who have just been mentioned, five other families and five individual magistrates from the first generation are attested in only the

³⁷The son of $\text{NIKO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma \Phi\text{IAI}\Sigma\text{KOT } \Theta\text{OPAIET}\Sigma$, orator in 160/59 B.C., could also have been a *prytanis* c. 150 B.C. ($[_] \text{PATOT } \Theta\text{OPAIET}\Sigma$). If he was named after his father, he could be the archon $\text{NIKO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma$ from 134/3 B.C. Other candidates, however, are $\text{NIKO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma \text{PAIANIET}\Sigma$, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C. and $\text{NIKO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma \Sigma\Phi\text{HTTIO}\Sigma$, *epimeletes* between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1940). None of these belong to families attested during the second generation.

³⁸ $\text{AN}\Delta\text{PEA}\Sigma \text{PAMHNET}\Sigma$ was *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C., possibly eponymous archon in 154/3 B.C. and *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. His son $\text{ETAPXIDH}\Sigma$ might have been *lampadarchos* for the former ephebes in 150/49 B.C. ($\text{ETAPXIDH}\Sigma \text{AN}\Delta\text{PEOT}$ from Antiochis, tribe XI). $\text{A}\Gamma\text{NO}\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma \text{EAET}\Sigma\text{INIO}\Sigma$ was *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226) and possibly archon in 140/39 B.C.

³⁹ $\text{TIMO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma \text{EPOIADH}\Sigma$, a *prytanis* in 140/39 B.C., may be the ephebe named $\text{TIMO}\Sigma\text{TPATO}\Sigma$, who would have served sometime before 152/1 B.C., and $\text{HGH}\Sigma\text{IIPPO}\Sigma \text{AMA}\Xi\text{ANTE}\Sigma$, who was *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226), had a son $\text{MENE}\Phi\text{PON}$ who was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C.

⁴⁰ $\text{ZONIAO}\Sigma \text{ATPIDH}\Sigma$, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., is possibly third mint magistrate (T148/7 B.C. and T142/1 B.C.) and then first mint magistrate (T142/1 B.C.).

prytany or low-ranking civic offices.⁴¹ Apart from the few *prytaneis* who are attested in senior magistracies, therefore, the majority of *prytaneis* seem to have been confined to low-ranking civic magistracies and would have belonged to the more peripheral families of the governing class.

A more prosperous group of citizens at Athens in the first generation are attested not as *prytaneis* but as *hieropoioi*, priests, liturgists, ambassadors and mint magistrates. These families will constitute the non-political elites of the first generation. Three of these are associated with the *ephebeia*: *ΚΑΙΡΙΟΣ ΤΕΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ* was *lampadarchos* in 161/0 B.C. *ΤΕΛΩΝ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ*, ephebe in 164/3 B.C., might be his son. *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΣ ΑΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ* and *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ* were ephebes in 164/3 B.C. and *hieropoioi* in 149/8 B.C. *ΤΙΜΟΚΛΗΣ*, who was ephebe in c. 185/4 B.C., had a brother who was a *hieropoios* in 154/3 B.C. Similarly, *ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΔΕΚΕΛΕΥΣ* was a liturgist in 182/1 B.C., when he was still a minor, and *hieropoios* in both 154/3 B.C. and 149/8 B.C. *ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ* also served as *hieropoios* in those same years. Two other men in this group, *ΜΕΙΔΩΝ ΧΟΛΑΡΓΕΥΣ*, *hieropoios* in 156/5 B.C.,⁴² and *ΓΟΡΓΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ*, *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C.,⁴³ might also be identified as priests. In addition, *ΔΗΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΗΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ* was *phylarchos* in 157/6 B.C. and *hieropoios* in 154/3 B.C. Another individual,

⁴¹Careers: *ΙΠΠΟΘΩΝ ΕΚ ΚΟΙΛΗΣ*, twice *prytanis* (between 160/59-146/5 and 135/4 B.C.; A15, 226 and 243); *ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ* (idem); *ΤΙΜΩΝ ΤΙΜΟΛΟΧΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ*, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C. and *metronomos* in c. 150 B.C. (I.G. II² 1711); *ΦΙΛΙΣΤΙΔΗΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ*, *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. and again in 135/4 B.C. (Agora XV, nn. 226 and 243). Stemmas: *ΜΝΗΣΑΡΧΟΣ ΕΠΑΜΕΙΝΩΝΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ*, undersecretary in either 167/6 or 165/5 B.C. and secretary in 166/5 B.C. His brother was also secretary of the *boule* and *demos* in 166/5 B.C. *ΑΛΕΞΙΜΕΝΗΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ* and his son *ΑΛΕΞΙΜΕΝΗΣ* were *prytaneis* in c. 165-50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 226). So too *ΑΣΤΥΛΟΧΟΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ* 166/5 B.C. and *ΕΥΒΟΤΑΟΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ* between 160/59-145/4 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 236) with a namesake. *ΠΟΛΥΝΙΚΟΣ* and his brother *ΕΥΘΟΙΝΟΣ*, sons of *ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, were *tarantinarchoi* in 150/49 B.C.

⁴²Perhaps to be identified with *ΜΕΙ[]*, priest of Asclepius (date unknown).

⁴³Perhaps to be identified with *ΓΟΡΓΟΣ*, priest sometime during the second century (I.G. II² 1171).

ΣΜΙΚΤΘΙΩΝ ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ, was treasurer of the stratotic fund between 152-134 B.C. (I.G. Π² 853) and *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ, hoplite general for the second time in about 166/5 B.C. (I.G. Π² 1224), had a relative, ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΣ, who is attested as a liturgist at Athens in about 130-120 B.C. (I.G. Π² 1939). Other individuals belonging to this group could be mentioned.⁴⁴ No individual from this group, unlike the first, is associated with the prytany in any way. The Athenian population at this time, therefore, is a more diverse group than the Delian cleruchy. A few senior magistrates and families of the governing elite can be identified along with a larger group of liturgical and civic or peripheral families. Like the Delian cleruchs discussed above, however, none of these Athenian families, no matter what their status in the first generation, are known to have belonged to the governing class after c. 130 B.C.

In addition to the distinctly Delian or Athenian families, a few families are attested at both Athens and Delos at this time. Some of these "mixed" families may have involved two branches of the same family; in some families one branch might have joined the cleruchy, in other Athenian families an individual may have only temporarily held a Delian magistracy. ΑΝΘΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΙΤΤΗΣ, who may have been archon in 157/6 B.C., for example, must have been one of the first cleruchs. He was twice ambassador of the cleruchy on a mission to Athens (159/8 B.C. and 147/6 B.C.). Perhaps his first embassy helped him attain the archonship two years later. His wealth (he served as a *hieropoios* at Athens in 149/8 B.C.) might also have been an asset. After his archonship he

⁴⁴A man known as [] ΦΑΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ was an orator in 159/8 B.C. If he bore the same name as his father, he could be second mint magistrate (monogram = ΦΑΝΠ, T194/3 B.C. and T184/3 B.C.). Note also two brothers, ΠΟΛΥΝΙΚΟΣ and ΕΥΘΟΙΝΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, who are attested as *tarantinarchoi* in 150/49 B.C. ΖΗΝΩΝ ΑΛΛΙΕΤΣ, a liturgist in 154/3 B.C. is the grandson of a homonymous liturgist in 244/3 B.C. ΤΥΜΟΣ is only known as a second mint magistrate (T189/8 B.C. and T185/4 B.C.). ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ, a *hieropoios* in 154/3 B.C., belongs to a well-known families of sculptors. His brother, ΤΙΜΟΚΛΗΣ, was an ephebe in c. 185/4 B.C. The family seems to have held no civic offices (although Habicht, *AM* 97, 1982, p. 178ff, identifies *TIM* [second mint magistrate, T181/0 B.C.] with the *hieropoios* and ΠΟΛΥ [first mint magistrate in the same year] with a cousin named ΠΟΛΥΚΛΗΣ. I identify *TIM* as ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ ΒΟΤΤΑΔΗΣ).

might have returned permanently to Athens. His brother served as *phylarchos* at Athens in 161/0 B.C. and his son filled a liturgical position there in 130-120 B.C. ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ, orator on Delos in 165/4 B.C., had a brother who was a *prytanis* at Athens in 155/4 B.C. Two other brothers were probably cleruchs. ΑΡΕΥΣ ΑΡΕΩΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ, priest of Apollo in 158/7 B.C., was gymnasiarch in 152/1 B.C. A brother, ΖΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ, had also been gymnasiarch (in 165/4 B.C.). Another brother, ΑΝΤΙΔΩΡΟΣ, was *taxiarchos* at Athens in 161/0 B.C. It is possible that this third brother did not join the cleruchy. Finally, ΠΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΕΥΣ ΕΚ ΚΟΛΩΝΟΥ was *epimeletes* of Delos between 152/1-151/0 B.C. (I.D. 1618). His son, ΜΕΝΕΜΑΧΟΣ, was *architheoros* of the first Pythaid to Delphi in 138/7 B.C. and was probably a resident of Athens.

Apart from the exceptions mentioned above, families are generally not attested at both Athens and Delos during the first generation, although the later history of some families shows interesting cross-overs. ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ, for example, was *paredros* of the king-archon in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia*, 1971, n. 40, n. 6, pp. 256-9) and *hieropoios* on Delos in 144/3 B.C. If he too joined the cleruchy, he nonetheless sent his son to the Athenian *ephebeia*. But his son would return to Delos to serve as gymnasiarch in 112/1 B.C. ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, attested in 144/3 B.C. as a Delian *hieropoios*, was the father of a ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ who would become a very prominent magistrate in the second generation at Athens and Delos. The descendants of ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΕΥΣΙΟΣ, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (I.D. 2609), include a son and grandson who served in the Athenian *ephebeia* as well as another son who became priest of Sarapis and of Apollo on Delos. The family might have been a member of the Delian cleruchy. Another *pompostolos* on Delos, ΕΥΝΟΜΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ (I.D. 2609), might be related to a family from Marathon which produced three ephebes in the second generation, one on Delos, the other two at

Athens, as well as two priests on Delos.⁴⁵ This family can probably be identified as part of the Delian cleruchy. Another cleruch family is descended from two wealthy Athenians attested in a list of subscribers in 183/2 B.C. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ was appointed to oversee the erection of a public monument on Delos for Pharnaces and Nysa in 160/59 B.C. He adopted ΕΡΜΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΦΩΝΤΟΣ whose nephew served as *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (ΑΣΤΥΝΟΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ, ID 2607) and whose sister was underpriestess of Artemis in 146/5 B.C. (ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΗ, ID 1442). This was a wealthy family which held no civic magistracies in either the first or the second generations. ΕΡΜΩΝ himself is attested only as a participant in the Pythais of 138/7 B.C. (as pythaist *pais*) and 128/7 B.C. (as *phylarchos*). Another wealthy family can also be identified as part of the Delian cleruchy. ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ, who served as treasurer of the sitonic fund in 200/150 B.C. (SIA, n. 25), was *hieropoios* on Delos in 144/3 B.C. His son became a *thesmothetes* at Athens in 100/99 B.C. and his grandson was *epimeletes* of Delos in c. 85 B.C. (ΠΡΟΤΙΜΟΣ, ID 1604b). A cleruch family such as this seems to have remained associated with the island for several generations. ΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΑΙΘΑΙΔΗΣ served with his brother as *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (I.D. 2609). Although unattested in any magistracies in this generation, the children of ΧΑΡΙΑΣ went on to spectacular careers in the second generation. ΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ served in several senior magistracies at both Athens and Delos,⁴⁶ as did his cousin.⁴⁷ This cleruch family, therefore, remained associated with Delos although it managed to also join the governing elite at Athens. Another Delian family is descended from a liturgist on Delos in the first generation. ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ was *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. In the second generation the family produced seven

⁴⁵ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, ephebe 103/2 B.C. (I.D. 1927); ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, ephebe 119/8 B.C. (I.G. II² 1008); and an unnamed son of ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, ephebe at Athens in 117/6 B.C. (I.G. II² 1009); A priest of the Cynthian deities, also named ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, might also be related (BCH 71/2, 1947, p. 416).

⁴⁶ ID 2595, 2381, 1878; I.G. II² 2336; *Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 19, pp. 88-91.

⁴⁷ ID 2595; I.G. II² 1009 and 2336.

members who are attested in various offices on Delos.⁴⁸ Since the family is first attested at Athens only in the 50s B.C., the descendants of this cleruch family might have moved from Delos following the decline in economic activity after 86 B.C.

Families attested during the first generation, to summarize, may be identified as either members of the cleruchy on Delos or as residents of Athens. Their offices allow us to infer their rank or status in the governing class, and a number of families during this generation are unattested after c. 130 B.C. In addition to the movement of families between the cleruchy and the *polis*, their rank and their survival after c. 130 B.C., another important distinction among families of this period is their attitude towards Rome. Why the Athenians requested Delos from Rome and what faction in the city initiated the necessary diplomatic effort remains unknown. The argument by M. Baslez that Athens requested her former colonies for the sake of tradition is unconvincing, especially since Athens also requested the territory of Haliartus, which had never before been an Athenian colony.⁴⁹ Perhaps truer motives and some indication of the faction involved in the acquisition of Delos can be inferred from our fragmentary prosopographical evidence for this period. When Athens took over the island, a commission of the Areopagus, headed by a certain *MIKION*, was sent to make an inventory of the holdings of the temple treasuries on Delos.⁵⁰ *MIKION* may plausibly be identified as *MIKION EPTKAEIDOT KHΦIEIETE*, a scion of a once

⁴⁸For the later fortunes of these families see Chapter 4.

⁴⁹Baslez, *REG* 89 (1976) p. 343. Polybius tells us that Athens requested Haliartus, Delos and Lemnos (30.20). Although he does not mention Imbros and Scyros, both former Athenian colonies, most historians date their return to Athens also to 167 B.C.

⁵⁰Interestingly the inventory seems to have been inscribed at both Athens and Delos. Fragments of a Delian temple account discovered in the Athenian Agora (Meritt, *Hesperia* 3, 1934, n. 39, pp. 51-3) have been dated by Roussel to the first years of the Athenian administration ("Remarques sur quelques inscriptions trouvées à l'agora d'Athènes," *BCH* 58, 1934, p. 100). Roussel suggests that two copies were made, one at Delos and one at Athens, and that subsequent inventories were inscribed only on Delos. It seems reasonable to associate this inventory with the commission headed by *MIKION*.

powerful family at Athens. His father was a leading Athenian politician when Athens made her first diplomatic contacts with Rome during the second Macedonian War.⁵¹ *MIKION* himself had been an ambassador to Delphi in the period between 190-150 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 140) when he was probably already in his 50s. The family's association with Delos is not confined to *MIKION*, for a brother or cousin was a *hieropoios* on Delos in 127/6 B.C. and may have served three times as mint magistrate. *MIKION*'s daughter was a priestess of Athena in c. 150 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3477) and a granddaughter was an *ergastina* in 108/7 B.C. and c. 100 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1036 and 1943). Yet this once powerful, noble and pro-Roman family did not enjoy spectacular political success in the first generation, for when *MIKION* was sent to Delos he was already a senior magistrate. The family evidently retained its wealth, but none of *MIKION*'s descendants are attested in civic office.⁵² Although the family is twice associated with Delos, it probably did not join the cleruchy.

A second pro-Roman family did move to Delos. *AEON AIEONNETE*, whose grandfather had addressed the Roman Senate in 189 B.C., is attested on Delos as priest of Sarapis, as elected overseer of the public monument for Pharnaces and Nysa in 160/59 B.C. and, in an unknown year, as *epimeletes* of the island (*I.D.* 2510). *AEON*, therefore, went on to become a prominent member of the Delian cleruchy in the first years of the Athenian administration. Another branch of his family remained at Athens: *AEON KIXHΣIOT AIEONNETE* was *agonothetes* of the Theseia in c. 142/1 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 960) and his son served as a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. Other families descended from politicians who were prominent in the period 220-180, the important decades during which the Athenian governing class made its first major contact with the Roman Senate, are also attested during the first

⁵¹On Athenian politics and families during this period see Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, pp. 140-1 and most recently Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen, 1982.

⁵²Note that *MIKION* is probably not the archon of 152/1 B.C. but rather *MIKION AKPIΣIOT ΣΗΜΑΧΙΔΗΣ*, a priest of the Cynthian deities on Delos in 159/8 B.C.

generation. $\Delta\text{ΙΟΚΑΗΣ}$, son of $\Delta\text{ΡΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΤΣ}$, seems to be a great-grandson of $\Delta\text{ΙΟΚΑΗΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΤΣ}$, a prominent Athenian politician in the period 220-200. But his own father is unattested in any office during the first generation and $\Delta\text{ΙΟΚΑΗΣ}$ himself, despite the abundant documentation for many other careers during the second generation, is known only as a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. $\text{ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ}$, the first gymnasiarch on Delos in 167/6 B.C., had a cousin who is attested as *proedros* and orator at Athens in 166/5 B.C. Evidently this family was prominent in Athens at this time and we may infer a pro-Roman stance. But $\Theta\text{ΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ}$ ' grandson is attested only as an ephebe in 107/6 B.C. This is another family which, although prominent at the beginning of the first generation, evidently failed to maintain its high standing in the governing class.⁵³ The family of $\Delta\text{ΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΕΩΝΕΤΣ}$ was more successful than these families in the second generation. The father was an epic poet and participated in the Pythaid of 128/7 B.C. He is not known to have held any civic offices, although he did contribute to the repair of the theatre in the Peiraieus. But two of his sons would become generals at Athens and a third, $\Delta\text{ΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ}$, seems to have established himself at Delos where he was priest of Roma in 101/1 B.C. and gymnasiarch in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 1929). The origins of this family are uncertain. It could be descended from ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ , a pro-Roman politician from c. 180 B.C., whose deme is unknown. If he is an ancestor of this family, he was a fellow demesman of ΑΙΩΝ and could be related to him.

We do not know the identity of the Athenian ambassadors to Rome in the winter of 167 B.C., but since their families had already had contact with the Roman elite, it is not hard to imagine that a ΜΙΚΙΩΝ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ or a ΑΙΩΝ

⁵³ One other plausibly pro-Roman family may also be mentioned. $\text{ΕΞΕΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΡΚΕΤΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ}$ was a pythaist in 98/7 B.C. His father was temple administrator in 112/1 B.C. and therefore, it seems, already a member of the Areopagus. The family is descended from ΕΞΕΔΗΜΟΣ , another prominent politician from the previous century.

ΑΙΩΝΝΕΤΣ, grandson of the ambassador in 189 B.C., would be sent.⁵⁴ The possibility that they might have been active in acquiring the colony of Delos is suggested by their evident interest in the colony afterwards. Five pro-Roman families, we have already seen, are associated with Delos in some way. Presumably these families would have sought gain in the acquisition of the island. All these pro-Roman families suffered a similar fate after the first generation. Among the five families active at Athens or on Delos during the first generation which were descended from pro-Roman politicians from the time when Athens made her first diplomatic contacts with Rome, three are unattested in the second generation as part of the governing class.⁵⁵ The other two, although prominent in the second generation, also seem to have gone through a period of eclipse. None of the families appear to have been very powerful, which suggests that somehow these families were already in decline during the first generation.

The fact that the several pro-Roman families seem to have died out in the first, or at the latest, in the second generation, requires explanation. For this we may return to the problems of Athenian diplomacy during the first generation. Apart from the first successful embassy to Rome in the winter of 167 B.C., all succeeding diplomatic efforts on the part of the Athenians ended in failure. In a conflict with the Delian residents soon after 167/6 B.C., for example, the Senate might have decreed that the Delians were to be forcibly removed, but as we have

⁵⁴In 168 B.C. Rhodes sent *ΑΓΕΠΟΛΙΣ* and *ΑΓΕΣΙΛΟΧΟΣ* to Rome as ambassadors. They were already experienced in dealing with the Roman Senate (see Gruen, *CQ* 69, 1975, p. 76). *ΑΕΩΝ* had been an ambassador to Rome in c. 187 B.C. In 170 B.C. the Athenians gave *prozenia* to L. Hortensius, a Roman admiral (*I.G.* II² 907). This was the first and last Attic decree in favour of a Roman known from before the empire. The decree was probably made for diplomatic services on the part of Hortensius, perhaps in connection with the Athenian complaints about her heavy-handed treatment at the hands of Roman commanders during the Third Macedonian War (Livy 43.6). The Athenians might have hoped that Hortensius would act on their behalf in the Senate on future occasions. In this they might have misjudged, for Hortensius was not a Scipio. The Athenians also honoured Attalid ambassadors at this time with citizenship, another recognizably diplomatic gesture (see Helley, *AAA* 13, 1980, pp. 296-301.).

⁵⁵Note also that *ΣΠΕΤΣΙΠΠΟΣ*, archon in 153/2 B.C., is descended from *ΑΛΕΞΙΩΝ* *ΑΖΕΝΙΕΤΣ* and another family which was prominent around 200 B.C. Apart from *ΣΠΕΤΣΙΠΠΟΣ*, I have been unable to identify any members of this family after 167/6 B.C.

seen, several remained on the island. This led to a dispute over a private sanctuary of Sarapis on the island in which Athens was ordered to desist in hindering the priest from continuing his trade. The dispute with the Delians did not end there. The exiles went to Achaea and became citizens. The Achaean League then tried, on behalf of its new citizens, to enforce its treaty with Athens providing for the resolution of property disputes. The Athenians claimed that the treaty was not applicable since the confiscations took place before the Delian exiles received Achaean citizenship. Achaea then gave her new citizens right of reprisal against Athenian property. The dispute raged on for several years until, in 157 B.C., the Senate arbitrated in Achaea's favour by enforcing the terms of the treaty.⁵⁶

The Achaeans, having successfully defended the interests of the Delian exiles, next took up the cause of the Oropians. Athens had expropriated the territory of Oropus, a community on her border with Boeotia,⁵⁷ and when the dispute inevitably came before the Roman Senate, the senators decided to ask Sicyon to arbitrate. This must also be regarded as a diplomatic failure for Athens since it is evident that the Senate had not been convinced that the Athenians were justified in claiming the territory of Oropus as their own. Sicyon subsequently levied the surprisingly large fine of 500 talents against Athens.⁵⁸ If the same families which might have been successful in obtaining the island of Delos and other colonies for Athens in the winter of 167 B.C. were involved in these two issues (which all involve territory outside Attica), it is not hard to

⁵⁶Plb 32.7. Ferguson implies that the dispute ended in a draw (*HA*, p. 324) but it is important to note that the Senate recognized the legitimacy of the Achaean case even if it did not condone the more extreme action which seems to have been taken by the disputants.

⁵⁷Haliartus, which Athens claimed in 167 B.C., is also a Boeotian community. Athens would not have seized Oropus if she did not expect the Senate to concur. Perhaps the Athenians had been encouraged by the favourable response she obtained in 167 B.C. I suggest below that the policy regarding Oropus was instigated by anti-Roman sentiments among the *demos*. It may also have had something to do with the Pythaidas (see Chapter 4).

⁵⁸For the size of the fine, see Ferguson, *HA*, p. 325.

imagine that their political influence at Athens would have gone into eclipse. On the next occasion when Athens sent ambassadors to Rome, a different and unconventional tactic was employed. After Sicyon levied the fine against Athens, and after several unremitting diplomatic setbacks, three leading philosophers were sent to Rome in 155 B.C. to induce the Senate to repeal the Sicyonian decision. Why the Athenians resorted to this strategy remains unclear.⁵⁹ Whatever ambitions the Athenians might have had, the philosophers were unable to convince the Senate of anything more than a reduction in the fine to one-fifth its original value. This must also be regarded as a setback for the Athenians. That they had hoped for a vindication of their cause rather than simply a reduction in the fine is demonstrated by their subsequent behaviour. The Athenians refused to pay the fine and in fact sent cleruchs to occupy the territory of Oropus. The determination shown by the Athenians in their attempt to annex Oropus and the extreme disregard for the will of the Roman Senate suggests that the Oropian policy had popular support and may reflect anti-Roman sentiment among the population at large.⁶⁰ The dispatch of the three philosophers betrays a certain showmanship and desperation rather than diplomacy. Evidently in 155 B.C. the Athenian families from the governing elite with Roman contacts either no longer

⁵⁹The event is most frequently discussed as a watershed in Roman intellectual history (i.e. Mahaffy, "It turned out that their official visit was the least important side of their visit," *The Silver Age of Greece*, London, 1887, p. 94 and Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 334-5). I disagree with Ferguson's evaluation: "The crisis was hardly of sufficient magnitude to warrant recourse to the head of the Academy, but such was the action taken"

⁶⁰The dispute eventually led to further conflict with the Achaean League (see Ferguson, *HA*, p. 327). I wonder if the influence of Achaean hostages such as Polybius with the "Scipionic Circle" might have affected the outcome of Athenian appeals to the Roman Senate. It would be ironic if Achaean influence at Rome managed to depose the pro-Roman families at Athens and provoke the Athenian *demos* to reckless behaviour. Between 150-145 B.C. anti-Roman sentiment flared up in Greece with the Roman war in Macedonia against the pretender Andriscus and the following war with the Achaean League (E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique: 323-30 av. J.-C.*, Vol. II, Nancy, 1967, p. 328).

enjoyed credibility with the *demos* or were unwilling to risk further setbacks.⁶¹ Whatever the true explanation, the pro-Roman families from this period which have been identified above were quickly eclipsed by other more prominent families. They would never regain their former stature.

In the decade between 140 and 130 B.C. several changes also took place on the island of Delos. The cleruchy began to lose its autonomy to a growing population of transient and resident foreigners. It was in this period that the Delian temple accounts ceased to be inscribed on stone, something which might testify to the increasing financial burden the colony represented for the Athenian state. The temple accounts were drawn up by the magistrates responsible for the inventories and were long, unattractive and abrupt. They also served a secondary function of recording the name of the donors, but only in the most abbreviated fashion. It is interesting that the discontinuance of the temple accounts coincided with an increase in inscriptions erected by private dedicators recording their dedication, the occasion for the dedication and the name of the incumbent magistrates and priests of the deity. In a way these private dedications performed a function of the former temple accounts in making a public record of an individual's gifts to a deity. But the abandonment of the temple accounts, a function of the *polis*-based administration, and the sudden profusion of the individually recorded dedications is also an important clue to a transition in the nature of the governing class. Since only the wealthiest families could afford to make such dedications, the shift towards private dedications reflects a trend

⁶¹But Greek cities increasingly resorted to men of letters and philosophers to act as ambassadors. See M. Crawford, "Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century B.C.," *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (ed. C.R. Whittaker), Cambridge, 1978, pp. 195-209, and H.D. Jocelyn "The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers", *Bulletin Rylands Library*, 59 (1977) pp. 323-66. The reason why philosophers were employed is quite simple. These men were the most likely to have had Roman students and were in a better position to "pull strings" at Rome. The philosophers, however, are perhaps better regarded not as ambassadors of a *polis* but rather as intermediaries acting on behalf of a *polis*. This is another symptom of the effective degradation of the Greek *polis* during the Roman Republic.

towards competitive display among the governing class.⁶² Together with the abandonment of the temple accounts came the disappearance of decrees issued in the name of the cleruchy.⁶³ It also became common, as the following chapter will show, for residents of Athens to appear as Delian magistrates, or for Delian families to send a youth to the Athenian *ephebeia* and on to an Athenian magistracy. It is the emergence of an integrated Athenian-Delian elite which characterizes the second generation of the governing class.

⁶²Many of the gifts from the first generation pale in comparison to later benefactions. During the period of the "tripartite assembly" on Delos after c. 130 B.C., Athenian magistrates were frequently honoured with statues and other elaborate dedications. The cleruch assembly had only been able to offer crowns and honorary decrees (Roussel, *DCA*, p. 51).

⁶³It is also possible that at this time the cleruchy came into conflict with the Athenian *polis* in a dispute over the selection of Delian magistrates. In 142/1 B.C. the gymnasiarch was elected by the *epimeletes* and the *aleiphomenoi*. In 141/0 B.C. he was elected by the *demos* (with 15 additional letters *in rasura*). It was also in the mid-140s B.C. that the tribal cycle of the priests of Sarapis was interrupted (see Appendix A.2).

Chapter 4

The Governing Class in Transition

The leading families at Athens in c. 100 B.C. were largely unrelated to those which were dominant during the preceding one hundred and fifty years.¹ The abundant prosopographical evidence for the last decades of the second century B.C. indicates that the recruitment and composition of the governing class evolved in the transition from the first generation, which begins in 167 B.C. and ends in c. 130 B.C., to the second generation, which begins in c. 130 B.C. and ends in 88/7 B.C. Several families which flourished during the period of the first generation are unattested after c. 130 B.C., and evidently these families declined. In the case of a few pro-Roman families of the governing elite, their apparent decline was attributed in Chapter 3 to the deterioration of Athenian relations with Rome in the decades following the acquisition of Delos. In this chapter the origins of the families of the second generation of the governing class will be discussed. For the origins of these families, it is necessary to consider the magistracies held by family members during the first generation and to contrast these families which survived with families which did not survive as part of the governing class after c. 130 B.C. Once again it will be convenient to begin by discussing families of the Delian cleruchy separately from families of the governing class at Athens.

Fifty-five individuals and families (47% of the identifiable magistrates during the first generation on Delos) may be identified as members of the Delian

¹Ferguson, *HA* p. 384; Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 143. The failure of cleruch or Athenian families attested in civic office during the first generation to remain part of the governing class in the second generation has already been alluded to in Chapter 3.

cleruchy who have no known relatives in office after c. 130 B.C.² A second group comprising the sixty-five cleruchs and their families (53% of the identifiable magistrates on Delos) are known to have survived into the second generation.³ Orators and ambassadors of the cleruchy on Delos tended to be from the ranks of the important families of the Delian cleruchy in the first generation. These families were less likely to survive into the second generation. The families which did survive into the second generation are represented in significantly fewer offices associated with the governing elite (such as archon, *epimeletes* of Delos or temple administrator); they are distinctly more prominent in junior offices such as gymnasiarchies or market offices. They are more likely to serve in liturgical positions or to be represented in priesthoods on Delos. They are also more likely to be mentioned in the temple accounts in the context of a private financial transaction or personal dedication and tend to appear in the epigraphical documents from Delos towards the end of the first generation rather than in the first decade of the Delian administration. This suggests not a second wave of immigration but a gradual influx or emergence of prosperous families.⁴

This shift in the composition of the governing class from the first to the second generation seems to have been peaceful because we know of no overt conflict at Athens during this time; it was also a wide spread phenomenon that was not confined to only the most powerful families at Athens. This is evident from the prosopographical evidence for families attested in both the first and second generations. Some cleruch families from the first generation, for example,

²These individuals and families have been discussed in Chapter 3. None of these are known to be *gennetai*.

³This group includes 5 *gennetai*.

⁴Ferguson and Roussel saw two stages to the influx of Athenians to the island. In 167, according to Ferguson, poor Athenians were allotted a piece of property on the island. Once the island began to experience a boom in economic activity, land prices rose and many of these original (and nameless) cleruchs were bought out by wealthier businessmen from Athens (*HA*, p. 348). At this time Ferguson, followed by Roussel, postulated a second wave of colonists to the island (*DCA*, p. 56). Roussel only modified Ferguson's outline by arguing that some of the original cleruchs must have been wealthy men already.

did not belong to the governing elite but held magistracies indicating a certain degree of wealth or standing in the cleruchy. These cleruch families managed to survive into the second generation but nonetheless remained in the ranks of the non-political elites.⁵ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΖΩΙΑΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ, for example, was *paredros* to the king-archon in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 40, 1971, n. 6, pp. 257-9) and in 144/3 B.C. was a *hieropoios* on Delos. He might have moved to Delos before this year. His son would serve in the Athenian *ephebeia* in 128/7 B.C. but would later return to Delos to serve as gymnasiarch in 112/1 B.C. This family cannot be considered part of the governing elite in either the first or the second generation. ΕΤΜΕΝΗΣ ΕΤΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ was priest of Dionysus in 159/8 B.C., *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. and priest of Sarapis in 140/39 B.C. His son was priest of Isis in 110/9 B.C. and a granddaughter, ΗΔΗΑ, was a *kanephoros* on Delos in 113/2 B.C. This family belonged to the religious elite in the first and second generations. ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΥΣ was *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. and possibly again in 119/8 B.C. ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ's son was also gymnasiarch on Delos in 120/19 B.C., but is unattested in any other offices. Two other families may be identified as part of the civic class in both the first and second generations. ΜΕΝΕΚΑΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ, for example, served as gymnasiarch on Delos in 162/1 B.C. His son, unattested in any other capacity, held the same office in 114/3 B.C. The gymnasiarch on Delos in 139/8 B.C., [.....] ΓΗΡΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ, had two grandsons, ΚΑΛΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ and ΓΗΡΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΛΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΥ, who served as *pompostoloi* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). Although both of these families remained part of the governing class from the first to the second

⁵Thus ΗΡΑΙΟΣ, priest of the Great Gods in 160/59 B.C., had a brother who made a dedication to a temple treasury (*BCH* 32, 1908, n. 152, p. 322). The son of ΗΡΑΙΟΣ was gymnasiarch on Delos in 130/29 B.C. and *hieropoios* in 127/6 B.C. His own son is only attested as a *kleidouchos* of Aphrodite in 110/9 B.C. Similarly, ΗΧΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ, priest of Asclepius in 159/8 B.C., had a brother ΕΞΕΔΗΜΟΣ who made a temple dedication (*BCH* 32, 1908, n. 263, p. 335). ΗΧΟΣ adopted a son of ΕΥΦΗΜΩΝ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ and named him ΕΞΕΔΗΜΟΣ. The adopted son also served as priest of Asclepius and in c. 100 B.C. as *agoranomos* on Delos (*I.D.* 1834). Similarly ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ made a dedication to the sanctuary of Sarapis and was a priest on Delos in 150/49 B.C. His brother, ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ, was priest of Sarapis (possibly in 167/6 B.C.) and gymnasiarch in 156/5 B.C. His son, ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ, would be priest of Apollo in 103/2 B.C.

generation and continued to reside on Delos, they do not seem to have improved their social status.

In contrast to the cleruch families mentioned above, several prominent cleruch families, some of whose members are attested in the magistracies of the governing elite during the first generation, rapidly declined in the second generation. ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, a *gennetes*, was gymnasiarch in 158/7 B.C., *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 145/4 B.C. and *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. His brother, ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ, was priest of Artemis in 159/8 B.C., priest of Sarapis between 157/6-148/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 2047) and *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. His son, ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ, was himself priest of Sarapis in 126/5 B.C. and another son, ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ, was boy-gymnasiarch in 144/3 B.C. His daughter, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ, is attested as a hearth initiate in c. 125 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3480). The son of ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ, ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, was a *paidotribes* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (Appendix B.2). His cousin, ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ, was a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and *kleidouchos* of the Cynthian deities in the same year. His sister, ΜΗΝΙΑΣ, was a gentile *kanephoros* in 106/5 B.C. and underpriestess of Artemis (no date, *I.D.* 1871). Her sister, ΜΕΓΙΣΤΗ, was *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C. and *kanephoros* in 98/7 B.C. Here is a family which is well-attested in the second generation, but only in liturgical and priestly offices. Similarly, ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝ ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ was temple administrator in 144/3 B.C. and gymnasiarch of Delos in 136/5 B.C. His son, ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝ, is only attested as a priest of Anios in 110/9 B.C. ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ was temple administrator in either 161/0 or 160/59 B.C. His son, ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ, was *epimeletes* of the Emporion in 124/3 B.C. but is otherwise unattested in civic office. Another son, ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ, may be identified as a third mint magistrate (T158/7 B.C.) and a grandson, ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΥ, served at Athens as treasurer of the *boule* in 140/39 B.C. and *proedros* of the prytany in 125/4 B.C. After this year the family is not attested in civic office. ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ's son, ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ, was a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. and a daughter, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΗ, was a *kanephoros* in the Pythaid of 138/7 B.C. Their cousin ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝΟΣ was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. when his brother (?)

MENEKPATHE was ephebe. *ΛΥΚΟΦΩΝ ΜΕΝΕΚΠΑΤΟΣ*, pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., is possibly another cousin and would serve on Delos as priest of the Cynthian deities in 119/8 B.C. These three families were all part of the governing elite during the first generation. Their members are not attested as Areopagites in the second generation although all three families seem to have remained part of the liturgical or religious elites. *ΕΡΜΩΝ ΕΡΜΩΝΟΣ ΕΡ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ*, finally, served as an Athenian ephebe in 164/3 B.C. His father's position as a liturgist in 183/2 B.C. confirms that the family was well off. A granddaughter, *ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΗ*, was underpriestess of Aphrodite in 146/5 B.C. and his grandson *ΕΡΜΩΝ* was pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. and *phylarchos* in 128/7 B.C. He was adopted into the more prominent but related family of *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΕΡ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ*, who was overseer of a public monument on Delos in 160/59 B.C.⁶ His grandson or grandnephew *ΑΣΤΤΝΟΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ* was a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). Again this family, although prominent at Athens and Delos down to the end of first generation, did not remain part of the governing elite during the second generation.

Some of the less prominent cleruch families of the first generation which survived into the second generation replaced these families as leading members of the Athenian governing class. *ΔΙΟΕΚΟΥΠΙΔΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ*, for example, served at Athens as an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. and on Delos as a *kleidouchos* (no date, *I.D.* 2526). He went on to serve as herald of the Areopagus in 106/5 B.C. and returned to Delos in 103/2 B.C. as *epimeletes* of the island.⁷ It is also possible that *ΔΙΟΕΚΟΥΠΙΔΗΣ'* son, *ΕΥΒΟΥΛΙΔΗΣ*, served in the Delian *ephebeia* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2600). The family may be traced to *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ*

⁶See Roussel, *DCA*, p. 40.

⁷This career collation is conjectural but can be justified. The *epimeletes* of Delos is known only by his first name, as is the Herald of the Areopagus in 106/5 B.C. (in fact, his name is heavily restored). But since both offices required membership in the Areopagus and were held by only one individual each year, it seems reasonable to conjecture that both the Herald and the *epimeletes* are the same man. The ephebe of 128/7 B.C., who is known as well by patronymic and demotic, is a plausible candidate given his age in 106/5 and 103/2 B.C.

ΦΑΥΕΤΣ, a gymnasiarch on Delos in 151/0 B.C. and probably a cleruch on the island. Another individual, ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ, was one of the original cleruchs. He held six offices at Delos but did not belong to the Areopagus.⁸ His son, ΚΛΕΙΤΟΦΩΝ, became temple administrator on Delos in 90/89 B.C., when he was in his late 40s or 50s, and must have been elected archon and so entered the Areopagus sometime before this year.⁹ ΔΗΜΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΑΕΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ served as *epimeletes* of the Metroon on Delos in 146/5 B.C. His son, ΚΤΗΣΙΚΑΗΣ, was a *hieromnemon* to the Delphic Amphictyony in 98/7 B.C. and his grandson, ΒΟΥΛΩΝ ΑΕΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ, was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. and at about 40 years of age, was elected *thesmothetes* at Athens. The family seems to have moved to Athens at the beginning of the second generation. A similar history may be postulated for the family of ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΚΥΔΑΝΤΙΔΗΣ. He was priest of Sarapis on Delos, possibly in 166/5 B.C. (see Appendix A.2), and must be considered one of the earliest cleruchs. But his son ΠΥΡΡΙΝΟΣ would be elected general of the Peiraieus in the Pythaid year of 128/7 B.C., and his grandson, ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ, was an ephebe at Athens in the same year. The family did moderately well although the grandson is not attested in any subsequent offices.

Other families which started out on Delos in the first generation also successfully established themselves as senior members the Athenian governing elite in the second. ΔΙΟΓΕΙΤΩΝ ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ was secretary of the *agoranomoi* in 148/7 B.C. His nephew, []ΟΣ (ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΣ?) ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ, would serve in the Athenian *ephebeia* in 128/7 B.C. and after 115/4 B.C., probably in the 90s B.C., would be elected *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 1826). ΕΦΟΡΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ ΠΤΕΛΕΑΣΙΟΣ was also an original cleruch. He served as priest of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira in 159/8 B.C. and held a lease on property on the island in c. 156/5 B.C. (*BCH* 32, 1908, n. 361, p. 335). His

⁸See Chapter 3.

⁹See p. 73 for discussion about whether temple administrators were already members of the Areopagus.

son or grandson would serve as *thesmothetes* at Athens in 98/7 B.C. and thereby enter the Areopagus. Similarly, $\Delta\Omega\Xi\Gamma\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\Gamma \mu\Upsilon\pi\pi\iota\nu\omicron\tau\tau\eta\varsigma$ is only attested as a *hieropoios* on Delos in 144/3 B.C. But his son, $\Delta\Omega\Xi\Gamma\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, was a *thesmothetes* in 100/99 B.C. and his grandson, $\Pi\pi\omicron\tau\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, would also enter the Areopagus. His archonship is unattested but he served as *epimeletes* of Delos in c. 85 B.C. (*I.D.* 1604b) Two brothers named $\Phi\iota\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\chi\alpha\pi\iota\alpha\varsigma \Phi\iota\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \alpha\iota\theta\alpha\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\iota$ served as *pompastoloi* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609). A homonymous son of $\chi\alpha\pi\iota\alpha\varsigma$ was raised on Delos, serving as boy-priest of the Hermaia and gymnasiarch between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). He held several offices at Athens before returning to Delos as *agoranomos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2381). In 98/7 B.C. he was general *epi to nautikon* at Athens. He had already served as archon and in the following year he was temple administrator on Delos. His brother was also a boy-priest and gymnasiarch of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). He went on to the Athenian *ephebeia* in 117/6 B.C. and served as *thesmothetes* at age thirty-two in 103/2 B.C. Both brothers, then, became members of the Areopagus in the second generation.¹⁰ Although they seem to have been raised on Delos, as adults, they pursued offices at Athens.¹¹

Only one prominent second generation magistrate, $\Pi\Upsilon\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma \Pi\Upsilon\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma \Lambda\alpha\mu\iota\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\varsigma$, can be identified as a descendant of a family which also belonged to the governing elite during the first generation. $\beta\Upsilon\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma \beta\Upsilon\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma \Lambda\alpha\mu\iota\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ was an ambassador of the Delian cleruchy in 144/3 B.C. In c. 135/4 B.C. he served as temple administrator (*I.D.* 2041). His son was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. and 106/5 B.C. He would return to Delos to serve as gymnasiarch in 104/3 B.C. and was *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus in 102/1 B.C. A relative $\beta\Upsilon\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma \Pi\Upsilon\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$

¹⁰ A third member of the family in this generation may have also served as archon. Raubitschek identifies $\Delta\eta\mu\omicron\chi\alpha\phi\eta\varsigma \Delta\eta\mu[_] \alpha\iota\theta\alpha\alpha\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ as a member of the family (*AJA* 49, 1945, pp. 43-5). He was *agoranomos* on Delos the same year as $\chi\alpha\pi\iota\alpha\varsigma$. He too had served in the Athenian *ephebeia* (*Hesperia*, 36, 1967, n. 18, pp. 86-88.) and was ambassador in 112/1 B.C. and archon in 108/7 B.C.

¹¹ $\Phi\omicron\kappa\iota\omicron\nu \alpha\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\kappa\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\tau \mu\epsilon\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 155/4 B.C. He might have been a cleruch and could be the father or a relative of $\Phi\omicron\kappa\iota\omicron\nu$, the eponymous archon in 121/0 B.C.

was *epimeletes* of Delos in 150/49 B.C. and *agonothetes* of the Athenian Theseia in c. 140 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 963). It was this man's nephew, ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΠΥΡΡΟΥ, who would be one of the most successful members of the family, serving in 128/7 B.C. as *hippeus*, in 104/3 B.C. as *epimeletes* of Delos, and in 99/8 B.C. as public banker on Delos. In the following year he was Herald of the Areopagus and in 97/6 B.C. he went on to be hoplite general. ΠΥΡΡΟΣ's career is one of the most remarkable of the second generation and firmly places him in the ranks of the governing oligarchy. His family provides the only attested evidence for the continuity of power within a single cleruch family where office holders in both the first and the second generations are attested in the Areopagus.

A more ambiguous example of a family's fortune is drawn from ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ ΦΥΛΑΞΙΟΣ, who was ambassador on Delos in 144/3 B.C. and a member of the *genos* of the Philaidai. His daughter ΓΟΡΓΩ was a *kanephoros* in 138/7 B.C. and a second daughter served as priestess of Demeter and Kore in c. 100 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3220). His son, ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ, was a pythaist in 98/7 B.C. and another son, ΞΕΝΩΝ, was a *theoros* in 128/7 B.C. ΞΕΝΩΝ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ, a nephew of ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ, was *epimeletes* of Delos in 118/7 B.C. His own sons, ΞΑΙΡΙΜΕΝΗΣ and ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ, were pythaist *paides* in 128/7 B.C. The family survived and evidently prospered, despite the fact that it was represented in only one important office during the second generation. The later history of the family, when a descendant, ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ, was elected archon after Sulla stormed the city in March of 86 B.C., is intriguing. The archon may plausibly be identified as a grandson of the ambassador from 144/3 B.C. His unnamed daughter would serve as priestess of Demeter and Kore in c. 68 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3495).

The family origins of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, who together with ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ was one of the most prominent politicians during the second generation, are more obscure. His father was a *hieropoios* on Delos in 144/3 B.C. and may plausibly be identified as a Delian cleruch, but is otherwise unattested in a magistracy or priesthood. In the second generation the family moved into the ranks of the

governing elite with his son ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, whose career is first attested with his archonship in 116/5 B.C. He is known to have been a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. and went on to serve as hoplite general in 102/1 B.C., *epimeletes* of Delos in 100/99 B.C. and hoplite-general for the second time in 98/7 B.C. ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ is not known to have held any other offices before his archonship. Between 100/99 and 97/6 B.C., his civic magistracies were also accompanied by several *agonothesai*. Three daughters served in childhood offices on Delos and at Athens (*I.D.* 1870 and *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7c) and two sons are also attested (*I.D.* 2364 and *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7c; and *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7d). His namesake, ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, served as pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and ephebe in 98/7 B.C. Another son, ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ, was *kleidouchos* of the Cynthian deities on Delos in 100/99 B.C. and a pythaist in 98/7 B.C.¹² ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, therefore, managed to join the governing elite at Athens. His sons, however, are unattested in senior offices and may not have survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C.

All of the families discussed above are descended from cleruchs of the first generation and several seem to have prospered enough to enter the governing elite or even the governing oligarchy during the second generation. A number of other politically low-ranking cleruch families from the first generation seem to have prospered enough to have sent a son to the Athenian *ephebeia*. The size of the Athenian *ephebeia* grew during the second generation until it reached upwards of 140 ephebes each year. Some of these ephebes were the sons of Delian cleruchs from the first generation. Thus, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΕΤΙΟΣ, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), had a son, ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, and a grandson, ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ, who attended the Athenian *ephebeia* in the years 123/2 and between 80/79-78/7 B.C.¹³ The family maintained a connection to the

¹²Like most families which started out on Delos in the first generation and which became part of the Athenian governing class in the second generation, this family is attested at both Athens and Delos. In such cases it is impossible to determine where the family's primary place of residence was located.

¹³Similarly, ΕΡΜΙΑΣ ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΕΙΟΣ, who was also a *pompostolos* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), had a son, ΕΡΜΙΑΣ, who was an Athenian ephebe in 117/6 B.C.

cleruchy, for a second son named ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ served there as priest of Sarapis (111/0 B.C.) and Apollo (100/99 B.C.). Similarly another *pompostolos* from c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΥΣ, had a brother named ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ who was also a member of the cleruchy. ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ served in either 152/1 or 151/0 B.C. as an *agoranomos* and was a *paidotribes* of the Delian ephebes in 133/2 B.C. His son, ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, held two priesthoods on Delos; he was priest of Anios in 102/1 B.C. and priest of the Cynthian deities in 99/8 B.C. The family seems to have remained a member of the cleruchy for two generations, although a grandson named ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ attended the Athenian *ephebeia* in 98/7 B.C.¹⁴ Another individual, ΠΛΕΙΣΤΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ was an ephebe at Athens in 128/7 B.C. and served as temple administrator in 109/8 B.C. when he was 37 years of age. He is related in some way to a Delian *hieropoios* from 144/3 B.C. named ΑΠΟΜΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ. The family is well-attested as part of the cleruchy in the second generation, is represented in several liturgical and priestly offices on the island, and also boasts a Delian ephebe in 119/8 B.C.¹⁵ Similarly, ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝ, who was a public banker on Delos in 146/5 B.C. sent his

¹⁴ Another Delian *paidotribes* is associated with the Athenian *ephebeia*. ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥ served as *paidotribes* in 136/5 B.C. The ephebe at Athens in 106/5 B.C., ΕΥΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ [.....]ΙΟΥ, might have been his son.

¹⁵ The stemma for this family is difficult to sort out.

son *ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΝ* to the Athenian *ephebeia* in 138/7 B.C.¹⁶ These families are all descended from cleruch families of the first generation and share some kind of association with the Athenian *ephebeia* in the second generation (several families are also associated with the Delian *ephebeia*). Insofar as the evidence allows, these families may be said to have maintained their residence on Delos. The most important feature about these families, however, is their rank. However prosperous these families might have become, no family member attested in the second generation is known to have held political office at either Athens or Delos. Their participation in the *ephebeia* indicates that these families were at least part of the military (or ephebic) elite of Athens during the second generation. They are clearly distinguishable from the cleruch families discussed above which can be shown to have risen into the governing elite. Their participation in the Athenian

¹⁶Delian families of the non-political elite which sent a son to the Athenian *ephebeia* often managed to do so during a Pythaid year. But a number of Athenian ephebes from non-Pythaid years can also be identified as sons of Delian cleruchs. *ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ*, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), was the grandfather of two cousins, *ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΣ*, who was ephebe in 128/7 B.C. and *ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, who served in 119/8 B.C. *ΠΟΛΥΦΑΝΗΣ*, an ephebe in 117/6 B.C., might also be related. *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ*, a *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C., sent his son *ΤΙΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ* to the Athenian *ephebeia* in 119/8 B.C. *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ*, another *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C., might be the father of *ΔΙΟΝΗΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ*, ephebe in 102/1 B.C. *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ*, a *pompostolos* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), is possibly a cousin of *ΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ*, a gymnasiarch on Delos in 163/2 B.C. The Athenian ephebe from 102/1 B.C., *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ*, might be related. *ΕΤΝΟΜΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* was also a *pompostolos* in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609). He might well be the grandfather of *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ*, who was ephebe on Delos in 103/2 B.C. A cousin, *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΔΟΥ*, who served in the Athenian *ephebeia* in 119/8 B.C., became a priest on Delos. Another cousin, *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΠΑΤΟΥ*, served as priest of the Cynthian deities on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*BCH* 71, 1947, p. 416). *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*, who was priest of Sarapis in 132/1 B.C. and temple administrator in 128/7 B.C., sent his son to the Athenian *ephebeia* in 117/6 B.C. Finally, *ΖΗΝΩΝ ΕΥΡΗΜΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΣΤΙΟΣ* was *hieropoios* on Delos in 144/3 B.C., gymnasiarch in 138/7 B.C. and priest of Sarapis in 135/4 B.C. His father is attested as a contributor to the temple treasuries on Delos. The family was part of the cleruchy in the first generation, but, although prosperous, was not part of the governing elite. The family is very well-attested in the second generation. *ΖΗΝΩΝ*'s two sons participated in two Pythaid, *ΜΑΡΣΤΑΣ* as pythaid *pais* in 128/7 B.C. and *ΘΗΡΩΝ* as pythaid in 98/7 B.C. Three of *ΖΗΝΩΝ*'s nephews attended the Athenian *ephebeia*: *ΜΑΡΣΤΑΣ ΘΗΡΩΝΟΣ* (117/6 B.C.), *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΘΗΡΩΝΟΣ* (107/6 B.C.) and *ΘΗΡΩΝ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ* (107/6 B.C.).

ephebeia, might indicate either greater prosperity or ambition,¹⁷ for a number of additional cleruch families can be identified, as we will see below, which are associated only with the Delian *ephebeia*. Several other families, identifiable as residents of Delos throughout the first and second generations, produced members who are not attested in civic magistracies. Liturgies and priesthoods mark these families as members only of the liturgical and religious elites.¹⁸ These Delian families, generally well-attested over two generations, appear to have been prosperous but can boast of no attested civic magistrates either on Delos or at Athens.

¹⁷Why such families sent their sons to the Athenian *ephebeia* remains unclear, although the history of one cleruch family might lend a partial explanation. ΘΕΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ was an ambassador of the cleruchy in 147/6 B.C. This suggests that he might himself already have been an ephebe. His son, ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ, was an ephebe at Athens in 123/2 B.C. He was born in 141/0 B.C. If his father had himself been an ephebe, he would have probably served before 167/6 B.C., before the cleruchy even existed. Even if he served soon after 167/6 B.C., it is likely that he served at Athens since the existence of a Delian *ephebeia* at this time is uncertain. This suggests that sons of fathers who were Athenian ephebes might have been sent back to Athens. If this is correct, it might indicate that youths serving in the Delian *ephebeia* could be the first in their family to be an ephebe.

¹⁸Thus, ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ made a dedication to Isis sometime before 142/1 B.C. (DCA, p. 59). His son, also named ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ, served between 128-122 B.C. as boy-priest for the Hermaia (I.D. 2595). ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ, a guarantor of a loan on Delos, also made a dedication on the island (DCA, p. 38). His son ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ was an ephebe on Delos in 133/2 B.C. and another son, ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ, was priest of Sarapis in 131/0 B.C. ΚΡΑΤΗΣ, priest of Sarapis sometime before 146/5 B.C. (I.D. 1453), may be a grandfather or father of another ΚΡΑΤΗΣ who in c. 90 B.C. was a *zakoros* of Aphrodite (I.D. 2266). The son of this second ΚΡΑΤΗΣ, named ΤΙΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ, was a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (I.D. 2607) and a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΙΔΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ[...], a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (I.D. 2609), had a son who served as a pythaist in 98/7 B.C. ΠΑΤΡΩΝ ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ was a *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C. His brother ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ was gymnasiarch on Delos in 126/5 B.C. A daughter of ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ served as an *ergastina* at Athens in 108/7 B.C. ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ, a priest on Delos in 150/49 B.C., had a son ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ who attended the Delian *ephebeia* in 126/5 B.C. (He might also have been a boy-priest of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C.; id 2595). So too Γ[...]*ΝΑ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ*, a *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C., is the father of ΓΛΑΥΚΩΝ, a Delian ephebe in 119/8 B.C. ΠΑΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ, also a *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C., is the father of ΤΙΜΟΔΗΜΟΣ, who was himself a *hieropoios* in 127/6 B.C., and the grandfather of ΔΙΦΙΛΑ, underpriestess of Artemis in c. 126/5 B.C. (I.D. 1867). ΔΡΑΚΩΝ ΦΛΙΤΕΤΣ, priest on Delos in 150/49 B.C. and guarantor of a loan in c. 155 B.C. (I.D. 1417), is the father of ΔΡΑΚΩΝ, a priest of Sarapis in 103/2 B.C. and grandfather of ΚΟΣΜΗΣ, a *kanephoros* on Delos in 103/2 B.C. Finally, ΙΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΙΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΦΛΙΤΕΤΣ, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (I.D. 2609), is the brother of ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ, priest of Dionysus in 149/8 B.C., and the father of a second ΙΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΣ, who was priest of Sarapis in 117/6 B.C.

Although the Delian cleruchy ceased to exist as a separate political community after c. 130 B.C.,¹⁹ a number of Athenian families continued to reside there and constituted a permanent Athenian population on the island. Some of these families, we have seen above, were descended from cleruch families attested in the first generation which seem to have prospered and thereby managed to join the Athenian governing class in the second generation. This group may be contrasted with a large number of cleruch families which are attested only in the second generation. Few of the cleruch families attested only during the second generation are known to have held senior offices at Athens. *BOHΘOΣ*, for example, was an *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 1819) and therefore had already served in the archonship. His uncle was a "friend" of Mithridates VI and he was buried on Rheneia with his brother, *ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ*, and sister, *ΕΝΕΤΡΑΘΗ*. The same *ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ* and *ΕΝΕΤΡΑΘΗ* set up a monument on Delos to another cleruch, named *ΝΙΚΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΓΕΝΟΥ*.²⁰ This family must be considered to be one of the more successful of the "new" cleruch families. Three other families may be identified as cleruch families which managed to join the governing elite at Athens. All three families are associated with the *ephebeia* and two survived into the first century B.C. *ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, a member of the *genos* of the Erysichthonidai, was a Delian ephebe in 136/5 B.C. and gymnasiarch of the Hermaia in 133/2 B.C. He served as *epimeletes* of Delos sometime after 123/2 B.C. (*I.D.* 1663) when he was at least 31 years of age. His son *ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ* was as pythaist *pais* in 106/5 and 98/7 B.C., when he was between about 7 and 13 years of age, and archon in 83/2 B.C. when he was about 30. His sister *ΜΕΓΙΣΤΗ* was an *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C. and *kanephoros* in 98/7 B.C. It seems that the father might have moved to Athens since his two children are only attested at Athens. The family, at any rate, after having started out as a part of the Delian cleruchy, becomes part of the Athenian governing class during the second

¹⁹See Chapter 3.

²⁰Roussel, *DCA*, p. 67.

generation. The family, in fact, is attested throughout the first century B.C.²¹ *ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* was a Delian ephebe in 126/5 B.C., his father being attested on Delos in an uncertain function (*I.D.* 2630). *ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ* also served as boy-*agonothetes* of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). He is attested as a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. and was a temple administrator on Delos in 101/0 B.C. His brother was a boy-gymnasiarch at the same Hermaia, a *hieropoios* in 127/6 B.C. and general *epi to nautikon* in 102/1 B.C. A son or grandson is attested under Augustus. Finally, *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΗΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* was priest of Sarapis in 124/3 B.C. His son attended the Athenian *ephebeia*. A nephew, *ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ*, was priest of the Cynthian deities in 109/8 B.C., priest of Aphrodite in 103/2 B.C., and a relative was priest of the Great Gods (no date; id 1904). The culmination of his career might have been his service in 99/8 B.C. as temple administrator, after he had already served as an archon.

Other families which are attested as part of the governing class only in the second generation can be identified from their participation as *pompostoloi* or priests on Delos as members of the cleruchy. These families, which are attested mainly in priesthoods and liturgical offices or the *ephebeia* and therefore managed to rise as far as the military, religious or liturgical elites, present a strong contrast to the few second-generation cleruch families which joined the governing elite at Athens. Some of these families seem to have confined their activities entirely to the island of Delos. *ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ ΣΤΑΣΕΟΥ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ*, for example, the son of a well-attested Delian ephebic trainer, served as *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. His brother, *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ*, held a series of priestly and liturgical offices in addition to giving long service himself as a Delian *paidotribes*.²² He was boy-priest and boy-gymnasiarch of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595), a priest of

²¹See below.

²²See Appendix B.2.

Artemis in 101/0 B.C. and priest of Sarapis in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2164).²³ This is a clearly identifiable cleruch family and the offices held by its members will allow us to identify other less well-attested families as residents of Delos during the second generation, such as the family of *ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΓΚΥΛΗΘΕΝ*. *ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ* was a priest of Artemis in 103/2 B.C. and his son, *ΛΕΙΜΑΧΟΣ*, was a *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2608). The family is otherwise unattested although it may plausibly be assigned to the Delian cleruchy.²⁴ Other families attested only in the second generation can be identified as the sons of cleruchs from the list of boys who celebrated the Hermaia between 128/7-122/1 B.C. *ΝΙΚΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, for example, was boy-*agonothetes* of the Hermaia. He is known to be from a cleruch family because a dedication was put up in his honour on the island.²⁵ Other cleruch families may also be identified from offices held on Delos, such as that of *ΚΟΝΩΝ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΑΡΑΦΗΝΙΟΣ*, a *hieropoios* of the Romaia in 107/6 B.C., whose daughter was underpriestess of Artemis in c. 130 B.C. (*I.D.* 1963). His grandson was a boy-gymnasiarch of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). Similarly, *ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ* was priest of Aphrodite in 108/7 B.C. His brother *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ* is attested in some capacity on Delos in c. 130 B.C. (*I.D.* 1910). *ΚΑΛΑΙΚΛΗΣ ΤΙΜΩΝΟΣ ΣΥΠΛΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ* was priest of Zeus and Athena in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2608). His son served as *pompostolos* in the same year.

²³He seems to have moved to Athens after 88/7 B.C. and his son *ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ* and his grandson *ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ* continued the family trade as an athletic instructor at Athens (see Appendix B.2).

²⁴*ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* was *hieropoios* in 144/3 and 127/6 B.C. His son *ΚΥΔΑΝΩΡ* was priest of Sarapis in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2093). A *hieropoios* in 119/8 B.C., *ΑΙΣΧΙΝΗΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ*, had a son named *ΑΙΣΧΙΝΗΣ* who served as *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). *ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* was *kleidouchos* of Sarapis before 111/0 B.C. (*I.D.* 2070) and in 107/6 was priest of Aphrodite. His son was also a *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2608). *ΑΣΤΙΑΣ ΑΣΤΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ* was priest of Sarapis in 136/5 B.C. His nephew, *ΑΣΤΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ*, was a *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). A priest of Sarapis in 119/8 B.C., *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ*, was priest of the Cynthian deities in 101/0 B.C. He must have been a cleruch although his family is unknown. Similarly, *ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ* served as priest of Sarapis in 106/5 B.C. and priest of Apollo in 99/8 B.C.

²⁵See Roussel, *DCA*, p. 67.

Another cleruch of the second generation, *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΣ ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ*, was overseer of the reconstruction of the sanctuary for Hadad and Atargatis in 118/7 B.C. and was *kleidouchos* of Sarapis between 101/0-92/1 B.C. (*I.D.* 2157). He may be identified as a patron of the cults of the Syrian and Egyptian deities.²⁶ Another cleruch family consists of *ΠΑΤΡΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΕΣ*, a *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607), and his uncle, *ΣΕΛΑΕΤΚΟΣ ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΕΣ*, was priest of the Syrian deities in c. 98/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 2263-4). They may be descended from *ΣΕΛΑΕΤΚΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΕΣ*, who served as a magistrate *epi tas prosodous* in 182/1 B.C.²⁷ An office such as this would indicate at least that the family was fairly well off and it may have joined the cleruchy in the first generation. But no intervening members are attested. Another cleruch family is descended from *ΤΙΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΪΚΙΟΣ*, who also served as a magistrate *epi tas prosodous* in 182/1 B.C. His son *ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΣ* was an *epimeletes* at Athens in 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939) and his grandson *ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ* was priest of the Cynthian deities in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2419). He might be related to a magistrate on Delos in 49/8 B.C. named *ΣΙΜΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΣ*. If so this seems to be a family which joined the cleruchy only at the beginning of the second generation and evidently survived the massacre of 88/7 B.C.

Several cleruch families attested only during the second generation can later be shown to have moved back to Athens. Three brothers who served as *pompostoloi* in c. 100 B.C., *ΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, *ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ* and *ΑΡΙΣΤΙΔΗΣ* (*I.D.* 2607), sons of *ΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΑΙΘΑΙΔΗΣ*, may be identified as cleruchs during the

²⁶Some of these cleruch families from the second generation sent daughters to Athens to serve as *ergastinaí* at Athens. *ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΕΣ* may be safely identified as a cleruch since he was priest of the Great Gods in 128/7 B.C., priest of Sarapis in 115/4 B.C. and priest of Aphrodite in 97/6 B.C. A son named *ΚΟΙΝΤΟΣ* was also priest of the Great Gods (no date; id 1905) and a daughter *ΝΙΚΟΠΟΛΙΣ* was *kanephoros* on Delos in 97/6 B.C. A second daughter, [...]*Ω*, was *ergastina* at Athens in c. 100 B.C. (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 18). Two brothers, *ΔΙΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ* and *ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, were boy-gymnasiarchs of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). A daughter of the former, [...]*ΚΑ*, was also an *ergastina* in c. 100 B.C. (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 18).

²⁷Tracy so identifies the priest (*Hesperia* 53, 1984, n. 3, p. 373).

second generation. *ΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, possibly a grandson of the first-named, is attested at Athens as *proedros* of the prytany in 52/1 B.C. One branch of this family evidently moved back to Athens and survived the massacres of 88/7-87/6 B.C. Three other brothers also served as boy-gymnasiarchs and *lampadarchoi* of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). The two *prytaneis* from 52/1 B.C., *ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ* and *ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ*, might be related. A *prytanis* from 32/1 B.C., *ΔΙΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΗΣ*, is more certainly a descendant of a cleruch family attested on Delos only during the second generation. A relative, also named *ΔΙΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΗΣ*, was *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607) and his sister was underpriestess of Artemis at about the same time (*I.D.* 1872). The move to Athens can be dated to the following generation, for an ephebe at Athens between 80/79-78/7 B.C., *ΞΕΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΣ*, seems to be the grandfather of *ΔΙΗΣ* the *prytanis*.

Many of the cleruch families attested only in the second generation, in contrast to the Delian families belonging to the religious elite, may also be

assigned to the military (or ephebic) elite.²⁸ Some cleruch families attested only in the second generation, moreover, sent their sons instead to the Athenian *ephebeia*.²⁹ These cleruch families of the second generation present several common features. Their members cannot be traced to known magistrates or priests from the first generation. The majority are associated with the Delian

²⁸Thus, *ΧΑΡΜΙΚΟΣ ΑΙΝΗΣΙΟΥ ΚΙΚΤΝΝΕΤΕ* was an ephebe in 133/2 B.C. and, at 38 years of age, served as priest of the Cynthian deities in 113/2 B.C. His son served with him in the same year as a temple attendant. Similarly, *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ* served as boy-gymnasiarch in 144/3 B.C. and Delian ephebe in 133/2 B.C. His brother was a Delian ephebe also (in 126/5 B.C.). *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΥΚΩΝΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ* was a Delian ephebe in 136/5 B.C. His brother named *ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ* was a *hieropoios* in 127/6 B.C. Two sons of *ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ* were *pompostoloi* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2608). *ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ* was a Delian ephebe in 104/3 B.C. His father was priest of Sarapis in 94/3 B.C. and a brother, *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ*, served as *zakoros* in the same year. Two brothers *ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ* and *ΣΩΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥ* served as *lampadarchoi* and boy-priests of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). The son of *ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ* served as an ephebe at Athens after first serving as *zakoros* of Aphrodite in 106/5 B.C. and *zakoros* of Sarapis in 103/2 B.C. *ΕΥΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ ΕΛΛΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ* was a Delian ephebe in c. 100 (*I.D.* 2600) and served as a *kleidouchos* of the Cynthian deities (*I.D.* 1895). Another cleruch family produced *ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΕ*, who was an ephebe on Delos in 133/2 B.C., and his brother, *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ*, who served as priest of Sarapis in 131/0 B.C. *ΜΟΥΣΑΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΕ* was a gymnasiarch of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595) and an ephebe on Delos in 119/8 B.C. A nephew of his served as *pompostolos* in c. 100 (*I.D.* 2608). Another cleruch family is well attested on Delos at the start of the second generation; *ΙΑΣΩΝ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΕ* was ephebe in 133/2 B.C. and his two cousins were boy-gymnasiarchs of the Hermaia between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595). *ΙΑΣΩΝ* and his son *ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ* are both attested as participants in the Pythaid of 106/5 B.C. A *prytanis* in 19/8 B.C., *ΜΙΑΩΝ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ*, could be related. This family, therefore, might have moved back to Athens during the second generation. *ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΟΥ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΤΕ* was a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). His brother could be *ΔΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΟΥ*, attested as a *hippeus* in the Pythaid of 106/5 B.C. The appearance of Delian cleruchs as participants in the Delphic Pythaid, however, shows that such families did not confine their activities to Delos.

²⁹*ΘΕΟΒΙΟΣ* and *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΙΣ* were ephebes at Athens in 117/6 and 107/6 B.C. *ΘΕΟΒΙΟΣ* served in quick succession as priest of Sarapis in 101/0, priest of Aphrodite between 99/8-98/7 B.C. and priest of the Cynthian deities in 97/6 B.C. He seems to have been a resident of Delos. His brother is unattested in any offices. *ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΕ*, ephebe at Athens in either 138/7 or 128/7 B.C., had two sons who served as *pompostoloi* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). His brother *ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ* was priest of Sarapis in 107/6 and his niece *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΗ* served as *kanephoros* with her father (*I.D.* 2087) and was *ergastina* in c. 100 at Athens (*I.G.* II² 1943). The ephebe *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ* from 80/79-78/7 B.C. could be related to *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ*, *hoplophoros* of the Cynthian deities in 119/8 B.C. and priest of Sarapis in 116/5 B.C. *ΝΤΜΦΩ*, his daughter, was a *kanephoros* on Delos in 100/99 B.C. *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ* himself may plausibly be identified as an allotted pythaist in 98/7 B.C.

ephebeia (although a few Athenian ephebes are attested) and members of the families served in priesthoods or liturgical offices on Delos but never in the civic offices of the island. These families were apparently well-off but unable or unwilling to join the governing elite at Athens. Few of these families participated in the Delphic Pythais. But enough of these families are attested for us to conclude that the Delian cleruchy during the second generation consisted of a fairly large population of permanent Athenian residents. Whether these families were a "new wave" of cleruchs or are in fact descended from unattested cleruchs from the first generation cannot be determined.³⁰ But these families are a recognizably distinct group from the cleruch families attested before c. 130 B.C. Very few of the senior magistrates on Delos after c. 130 B.C., moreover, can be identified as members of families resident on the island during the second generation.³¹ Whereas in the first generation the senior magistrates on Delos were often members of the cleruchy itself, the magistrates who served on Delos after about 130 B.C. tended to be residents of Athens and not members of the cleruchy. But it has also been shown that several Delian families from the first generation, and even a few from the second, managed to join the governing elite at Athens. We may speak with justification of an Athenian-Delian governing elite during the second generation. Families which belonged to the governing elite during this period moved freely between *polis* and cleruchy and have to be carefully distinguished from the resident population of Delos. The resident cleruchs, on the other hand, seem to have confined their activities to the island and are rarely attested at Athens. They are mostly attested in priesthoods and liturgical offices and, as a group, might have resented the Athenian oligarchs who

³⁰Roussel argues that by the second generation the original cleruch families died out to be replaced in the civic and religious offices by newcomers from Athens. He concludes that the original cleruchy virtually disappeared to be replaced by a highly transient population of Athenian traders (*DCA*, pp. 57 and 68).

³¹This is what led Roussel to state that it becomes difficult to distinguish cleruchs from Athenians serving in magistracies on the island (*DCA*, p. 64).

monopolized the Delian offices and continued to enrich themselves on the island.³²

We may now turn to examine in similar ways the Athenian families from the second generation whose members sought and held offices at Athens. Once again it will be useful to distinguish between families attested only in the first generation at Athens and families attested in both the first and the second generations. Athenian families attested only in the first generation partly consist of a peripheral class, made up of families which evidently failed, unlike some of their counterparts on Delos, to enter the governing elite of the second generation.³³ But the majority of families attested only in the first generation may be assigned to the governing elite on the basis of the kinds of offices held by their family members. Forty-nine individuals may be identified as magistrates during the first generation who have no attested relatives in office during the second generation.³⁴ These individuals comprise 24% of identifiable magistrates during the first generation. The Athenian families which are attested during both the first and second generations may be compared with the preceding group of families on the basis of the offices which they held during the first generation. This group of families includes members of the governing elite who did maintain their position over the two generations and a larger group of peripheral families some of which, like the liturgical families on Delos, managed to rise into the governing elite during the second generation. These families comprise 151 individuals and constitute 76% of the identifiable magistrates from the first generation. Families attested only in the first generation, which held 32% of the magistracies, priesthoods and liturgies between 167/6 B.C. and c. 130 B.C., are over-represented in virtually all categories of offices during the first generation. The *prytaneia* and priesthoods are the only two exceptions to this

³²Cf. Ferguson, *HA*, p. 383. For $\Delta I H \Sigma$ see below.

³³The low status of these individuals is indicated by the fact that out of 15 names there are 18 attested *prytaneis*, 5 junior magistrates, 1 *hieropoios* and possibly a mint magistrate. These families have been discussed in Chapter 3.

³⁴These have been discussed in Chapter 3.

generalization.³⁵ The individuals and families from this generation, moreover, are highly represented in offices which involved personal expenditure, such as the mint magistracy, and in senior magistracies, including positions of prominence such as orators. In addition, with a ratio of approximately two offices for each individual, this group comprises a large number of identifiable careers. Nonetheless, these families must have failed to maintain their position in the governing class, and this will explain why they are not attested in magistracies or priesthoods after the first generation.

The families of the first generation which would survive into the second generation offer more individuals attested in just one office than the families of the governing class which are only attested in the first generation. The ratio of attested offices to attested individuals in the first group is almost one-to-one. Many members of this group are known to be the father or grandfather of a man attested in a magistracy or other civic function during the second generation. These families consist of several recognizable sub-groups. A number of *prytaneis* from the first generation, for example, are the fathers or grandfathers of ephebes in the second generation: *ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΕΛΛΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ*, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., is the father of *ΞΕΝΩΝ*, ephebe in 107/6 B.C., and uncle of another *ΞΕΝΩΝ*, ephebe in c. 104/3 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 2985). The ephebe named *ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝ[]* from between 80/79-78/7 B.C. could be his grandson. *ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝΣΗΜΑΧΙΑΔΗΣ*, *prytanis* in 140/39 B.C., had a son *ΘΕΟΤΙΜΟΣ* who was an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. and a grandson *ΦΙΛΩΝ* who was a *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C. A total of twenty-seven other instances could be cited of a father who served between 167/6 B.C. and c. 130 B.C. as a *prytanis* or junior magistrate and whose son, grandson or nephew

³⁵The *prytaneia* was representative of the entire Athenian population rather than confined to the elite or the governing class (see Chapter 1). The percentage in this group for *prytaneis* agrees almost exactly with the actual size of the group involved. The priesthoods present a special category. Most of the priesthoods from this generation are aristocratic offices. Families with hereditary priesthoods are more likely to have attested members in each generation. For this reason the low number of priesthoods at Athens for families attested only during the first generation cannot be a reliable index for comparison with families attested during both generations.

served in the Athenian *ephebeia* during the second generation.³⁶ Other families with a low-ranking magistrate in the first generation can also be assigned to this group. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΕΚΑΛΗΘΕΝ, for example, was a secretary in 165/4 B.C. His granddaughter, ΔΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ, was an *ergastina* in 108/7 B.C. Similarly, ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ, *prytanis* in 166/5 B.C., is the father of

³⁶ ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΚΡΙΝΕΥΣ, *prytanis* 140/39 B.C., his son, ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΗΣ, *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C.; ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΣΗΜΑΧΙΔΗΣ, *prytanis* 140/39 B.C., his son ΕΥΒΟΤΑΙΔΗΣ, *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C.; ΕΥΒΟΤΑΙΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΥ, secretary of prytany in 131/0 B.C., his son possibly ΣΤΡΑΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΕΥΒ[...], *ephebe* in 123/2 B.C.; ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΕΥΒΟΤΑΙΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., and his son, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ, *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C.; ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΜΠΠΡΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 145/4 B.C., and his son ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ, *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C.; ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΥ, flutist in 140/39 B.C., his son ΕΡΥΤΗΜΕΝΗΣ, *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C.; ΑΥΤΟΚΛΗΣ, *proedros* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 231), might be the father of ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΥ, *ephebe* in 128/7 B.C.; ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΗΘΕΝ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., father of ΑΥΤΙΠΟΣ, *ephebe* in 126/5 B.C.; ΕΞΕΣΘΕΝΗΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., father of ΚΑΛΙΣΘΕΝΗΣ, liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939), and grandfather of ΦΑΝΙΑΣ, *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C., and ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ, *theoros* in 98/7 B.C.; ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., his son ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ, *ephebe* in 123/2 B.C.; ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥ, *prytanis* between 165-50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226), father of ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ, *ephebe* in 107/6 B.C.; ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΣ ΘΥΜΑΙΤΑΙΔΗΣ, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., his son ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΣ, *ephebe* in 102/1 B.C.; ΜΕΝΤΑΙΟΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ, *prytanis* in 166/5 B.C., grandfather of ΜΕΝΤΑΙΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ, *ephebe* in 102/1 B.C.; ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., father of ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ, *ephebe* in 128/7 B.C.; ΑΡΧΙΠΠΟΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., father of ΚΑΣΤΩΡ, *ephebe* in 128/7 B.C.; ΧΑΡΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., father of ΧΑΡΗΣ, *ephebe* in 128/7 B.C., and ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ, *ephebe* in 111/0 B.C.; ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., his grandson, ΙΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΛΛΙΟΥ, *pythaist pais* in 106/5 B.C. and *ephebe* in 102/1 B.C.; ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΥ, *prytanis* between 148/7-135/4 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 6, pp. 204-6), uncle of ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, *ephebe* in 98/7 B.C.; ΑΥΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΘΕΩΡΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥ, *ephebe* in 135/4 B.C., is possibly the uncle of ΘΕΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΩΡΟΥ, *ephebe* in 98/7 B.C. from tribe XI; ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., father of ΖΩΠΥΡΟΣ, *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C.; ΦΕΙΔΙΑΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., father of ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ, *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C.; ΝΙΚΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ, *paredros* of the king-archon in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 40, 1971, n. 6, pp. 257-9) and *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. His brother or grandson, Τ[...], ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ, was an *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C. ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., father of ΘΑΡΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ, *ephebe* in 128/7 B.C.; finally, ΗΓΗΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ, *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226), possibly the father of ΜΕΝΕΦΩΝ ΗΓΗΣΙΠΠΟΥ (no demotic), *ephebe* in 138/7 B.C. ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ, *prytanis* in 170/69 B.C. and *gymnasiarch* in 154/3 B.C., had a son, ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ, who was himself a *prytanis*, in 135/4 B.C., and a grandson, ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ, who served as an *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226) and *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C., is the father of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΔΗΣ, *ephebe* in 106/5 B.C. Finally, [...], ΟΚΛΗΣ ([ΔΡ]ΟΚΛΗΣ) ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ, treasurer of the *boule* in 164/3 B.C., could be the father of ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ, *ephebe* in 119/8 B.C.

ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ, a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939).³⁷ ΡΑΔΑΜΑΝΘΡΕΣ, a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. and *theoros* in 128/7 B.C., is the son of ΑΤΤΙΝΑΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΣΤΙΟΣ, *prytanis* in 140/39 B.C. His cousin of the same name served as a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ, *prytanis* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 236), is the father of ΕΤΔΗΜΟΣ, a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. ΑΤΤΑΛΟΣ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΕΤΣ, a *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., is the father of ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ, a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C., ΑΡΤΕΜΙΣΙΑ, a *kanephoros* in the same year, ΑΡΙΑΡΑΘΗΣ a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. and ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ, exegete in 98/7 B.C. The family, a member of the *genos* of the Eumolpidai, belonged to the religious elite. Similarly, ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΥΛΑΞΙΟΣ, a *paidotribes* in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 50, p. 288), is the father of ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ, a *kosmetes* in 123/2 B.C., and ΟΥΛΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ, a *prytanis* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 236), is the father of ΘΡΑΣΩΝ, an *architheoros* in 138/7 B.C., and grandfather of ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ, who was a *kosmetes* in 117/6 B.C.³⁸ All of these families are descended from a member of the civic class during the first generation. While offices such as *proedros* or secretary suggest that the individual was literate (and therefore educated) and may also indicate leadership and civic-mindedness, none of these individuals from the first generation seem to have belonged to the governing elite. The offices held by these families during the second generation, in contrast, indicate that the family might have become more prosperous. Despite this possibility, none of these

³⁷ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΤΣ, another liturgist from between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939), is a grandson of a secretary from 181/0 B.C., ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ.

³⁸ Compare [] ΔΡΟΣ ΠΕΔΙΕΩΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ, *katapaltaphetes* in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 50, pp. 288). His son, ΠΕΔΙΕΤΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ, is himself attested in 128/7 B.C. as a *katapaltaphetes* (Appendix B.2).

families are attested in civic magistracies during the second generation.³⁹

Only a few families can be shown to have risen from the peripheral class during the first generation into the governing elite during the second. ΦΑΝΙΑΣ ΕΛΕΤΣΙΝΙΟΣ, a *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., is the father of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΤΜΟΣ, orator in 106/5 B.C., *thesmothetes* in 102/1 B.C. and in c. 100 B.C. general of the Peiraieus (*Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 19, pp. 88-91). His brother, ΑΡΧΙΝΟΣ, had a statue erected in his honour on the Acropolis. Similarly, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ, a *prytanis* between 160/59-145/4 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226), is the father of ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΣ, *hyperetes* of the ephobic corps in 107/6 B.C. and orator in the same year. Finally, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ served as *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226). His son ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ was a *prytanis* in the same year and again in 140/39 B.C. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ' son, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, was an ephobe in 123/2 B.C. They might be related to ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ, *epimeletes* of Delos in 110/9 B.C., *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus in 100/99 B.C. and a *prytanis* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 840). ΝΙΚΩΝ, the father, was a *hieropoios* on Delos in 119/8 B.C. Three of ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ' children erected a statue to Ser. Cornelius Lentulus on Delos. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ himself erected a statue

³⁹In addition to these families, other families which are attested in civic offices during the second generation seem to have remained on the periphery of the Athenian governing class. For example, ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ ΑΛΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ, a *prytanis* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 236), is the father of ΖΩΠΤΡΟΣ, a *proedros* in 118/7 B.C. ΤΙΜΤΑΜΟΣ ΤΙΜΤΑΜΟΥ ΕΡΧΙΕΤΣ, *proedros* in 145/4 B.C., could be the father of [] ΤΙΜΤΑΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΙΑΔΗΣ, a *proedros* in 108/7 B.C. ΦΑΡΑΔΑΣ ΤΙΜΩΝΟΣ ΕΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ, treasurer of the prytany in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 236), is the father of a priest of Anios on Delos in 103/2 B.C., ΤΙΜΩΝ ΦΑΡΑΔΟΥ. ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ, a prytany magistrate in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 5, pp. 203-4), had a son, also named ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ, who was prytany-secretary in 122/1 B.C. Finally, ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΣΤΕΙΡΠΙΕΤΣ, *prytanis* in 155/4 B.C., had a son, ΝΙΚΙΑΣ, who served as *antigraphus* in 97/6 B.C. A son of ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΝΘΕΟΥΣ ΑΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ, *hierokeruz* on Delos in 159/8 B.C., served as secretary of the *boule* and *demos* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226).⁴⁰ His son served as under-secretary at the same time. His grandson, ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ, was an ephobe in 119/8 B.C. and in 94/3 B.C. is known as an instructor of the *mellepheboi*. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ and ΚΑΕΑΡΕΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, ephobes in 102/1 B.C., might be cousins. Nothing more is known about these families.

⁴⁰This is a conjectural stemma based on the text which reads ΔΗΜΑΝΘΗΣ Δ[.....] ΑΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ.

on the island to Mithridates VI. A son, []ΙΤΟΣ, was ephebe in 102/1 B.C. and a grandson, ΑΓΑΘΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ, was ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. Two other sons, ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ and ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ, were pythaist *paides* in 106/5 B.C. The brother of ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ adopted ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ. Because the family seems to have been gentile, the adoption might have been to preserve a priesthood in the brother's family.⁴¹

A number of families attested in both the first and second generations can be identified from their offices as members of the governing elite during the first generation. But only a few of these managed to maintain their position into the second generation. For example, ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ, was an orator in 137/6 B.C., suggesting at least previous service as an ephebe. His son, ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ, was himself an ephebe in 128/7 B.C., a *hieropoios* on Delos in 119/8 B.C., and priest of Sarapis (date unknown; *I.D.* 2162); in 97/6 B.C., he might have served as *thesmothetes*, thereby entering the Areopagus.⁴² ΔΙΟΧΑΡΗΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΑΔΗΣ, an orator in 166/5 B.C., had a son or grandson named ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ who was a *thesmothetes* in 101/0 B.C. Similarly, ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ, the archon in 155/4 B.C., could be the uncle of ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΓΝΙΟΥ (tribe V), who was a *thesmothetes* and *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. He or a son was a *systratiotes* in 106/5 B.C. ΑΡΚΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΑΙΜΟΡΣΙΟΣ, orator in 163/2 B.C., had a son [.]ΡΕΙΟΣ, who was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 132/1 B.C. A second son, ΒΟΥΚΑΤΤΗΣ, was also *thesmothetes* and *hippeus*, like ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ named above, in 128/7 B.C. ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ, orator in 155/4 B.C., had a grandson ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ, who was a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939), and a great-grandson who was a temple administrator in c. 90/89 B.C. (*I.D.* 2045). Finally, ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ, the archon in 139/8 B.C., was an ambassador in c. 150 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 94) and in 128/7 B.C. served as *agonothetes* and the

⁴¹On the role of adoptions in maintaining the governing class, see Chapter 1.

⁴²This is a conjectural career. In 97/6 B.C. the *thesmothetes* appears as ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ[....] ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ. This might be our ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ, or at least a relative. His daughter ΖΩΙΑΑ was a *kanephoros* on Delos in 107/6 B.C. The family does not seem to be a member of the cleruchy. Perhaps she served when ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ was priest of Sarapis?

magistrate *epi tas aparchas* for the Pythaid. His son, also named ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ, was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C., *hipparchos* in 128/7 B.C. and possibly the eponymous archon in 105/4 B.C. These families are the only evidence for continuity in power over the two generations.

The majority of families attested in both the first and second generations who were recognizably members of the governing elite during the first generation seem to have declined during the second generation. Thus we have ΑΓΣΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ, archon in 149/8 B.C., and *epimeletes* of Delos in 136/5 B.C. His two sons, ΚΑΛΙΘΕΟΣ (who was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. and a liturgist between 130-120 B.C.; *I.G.* II² 1939) and ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ (who was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C.), do not seem to have done as well as their father. ΕΤΜΗΑΟΣ, temple administrator in 154/3 B.C., was the father of ΚΛΕΩΝ, *didaskalos* of the chorus in 138/7 B.C., and the uncle of another ΕΤΜΗΑΟΣ, who was gentile priest of Apollo in 128/7 B.C. The son of the priest, ΝΟΤΜΗΝΙΟΣ, was a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. and a liturgist between 130-115 B.C. (*A.M.* 97, 1982, p. 101). A grandson, ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ, was ephebe in 106/5 B.C. The family is attested in no civic magistracies during the second generation and evidently did not maintain a member in the Areopagus. Similarly, ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ was a temple administrator in 147/6 B.C. His son ΔΗΜΕΑΣ was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. A second son, ΔΗΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ, was a *theoros* in 128/7 B.C. and a grandson, ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ, was an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. ΚΟΝΩΝ ΚΟΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ was an orator in 149/8 B.C. and *theoros* with his father in 138/7 B.C. He is not known to have held a civic magistracy, but his brother, ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ, was a temple administrator between 155/4-153/2 B.C. and also *theoros* in 138/7 B.C.⁴³ ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ, a son of ΚΟΝΩΝ, was gymnasiarch on Delos in 124/3 B.C., but is not known to have held any other offices. ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΥΣ, ephebe in 164/3 B.C. and a general in c. 145 B.C. (*P.A.* 11209), is the father of a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939). In addition, ΕΥΦΑΝΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΕΝΟΥΣ

⁴³ Another brother, ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ, was also *theoros* in 138/7 B.C.

ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕΤΣ, who is attested as a general on Salamis (I.G. II² 2800), had a son, ΑΑΚΙΔΑΜΟΣ, who was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. and *agagon ton tripodas* in the same year. His brother, ΕΥΜΑΡΕΙΔΗΣ, was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. and a liturgist between 152/1-130 B.C. (A.M. 97, 1982, p. 101). ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ was the first gymnasiarch on Delos, in 167/6 B.C., and had been an ephebe at Athens. His cousin, ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ, was a *proedros* and orator at Athens in 166/5 B.C. ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ' grandson, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ, was an ephebe in 107/6 B.C. ΜΙΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ was king-archon in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 40, 1971, n. 6, pp. 257-9), *agonothetes* in 150/49 B.C. and 142/1 B.C., and *epi tois sitonois* in 148/7 B.C. He held an unknown magistracy in 144/3 B.C. (I.G. II² 968). His son, ΜΙΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ, was an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. and a *hieropoios* in 119/8 B.C. A daughter was *kanephoros* in 142/1 B.C. and a granddaughter, ΔΗΜΩ, was *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C. and *kanephoros* in 98/7 B.C.⁴⁴ Similarly, ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ, who was archon in 132/1 B.C., could be the father of a *hippeus* named ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ in 106/5 B.C. ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ, archon in 136/5 B.C., had a son who served in 123/2 B.C. as *paidotribes* and in 102/1 B.C. as *kosmetes*.

The families of other archons may also be mentioned as possible examples of families which were in decline. ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ, for example, was archon in 144/3 B.C. His son, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ, is only attested as pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C.⁴⁵ ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΕΝΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΟΙΛΗΣ served as *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226) and was archon in 164/3 B.C. His son ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ was *hyperetes* of the prytany in 135/4 B.C. and his grandson, also named ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ, was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΓΕΝΟΥ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΣ was *proedros* in 164/3 B.C., *polemarchos* in c. 150 B.C. (*Hesperia* 35, 1966, n. 2, pp. 45-6) and treasurer of the *boule* in 135/4 B.C. His son, ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΓΕΝΗΣ, is only

⁴⁴ ΑΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΙΧΗΣΙΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ, *agonothetes* in c. 142/1 B.C. (I.G. II² 960), had a son named ΚΙΧΗΣΙΑΣ who was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. The son is not otherwise attested.

⁴⁵ A grandson also named ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ was ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C.

attested as gymnasiarch on Delos in 115/4 B.C. *ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΘΡΑΣΙΠΠΟΥ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΥ*, temple administrator in 156/4 B.C., would have served as archon before this year. His son *ΘΡΑΣΙΠΠΟΥ* was priest of the Eponymous Hero of a tribe in 135/4 B.C. and in 124/3 B.C. was also *agoranomos* on Delos. Once again, he is not attested in any other offices. *ΝΙΚΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ*, temple administrator in 148/7 B.C., had a son, *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ*, who is only attested as an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. *ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ*, gymnasiarch after 154/3 B.C. and *epi to apporetan* in 135/4 B.C., became king-archon in 128/7 B.C. His son *ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ* was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C.⁴⁶ Finally, *ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*, is an important first generation magistrate. He was *agonothetes* in 161/0 B.C., *hipparchos* in 157/6 B.C., *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. and, in an unknown year, was temple administrator on Delos (*I.D.* 2506). His grandson, *ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ*, was a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. His daughter, *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑ*, married *ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΥΣ*, who was *epimeletes* of Delos in 141/0 B.C. *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑ* was buried on the Academy Road, however, suggesting that the

⁴⁶The family is descended from *ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, secretary of the prytany in 220/19 B.C., and his two sons, who were ephebes in 237/6 B.C.

family might have resided at Athens and was not part of the cleruchy.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Other magistrates from the first generation, whose families are attested during the second, cannot be as securely identified as members of the governing elite in either generation, although their offices do indicate some degree of wealth. ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ, for example, was a treasurer of his tribe's prytany in 131/0 B.C. and *kosmetes* of the ephebes in 128/7 B.C. His son, ΠΥΘΙΑΣ, is only known as an ephebe from 128/7 B.C., when his father was *kosmetes*. ΑΣΠΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΣΠΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΓΓΥΛΗΘΕΝ was an ephebe in 164/3 B.C., a secretary in 133/2 B.C. and between 130-120 B.C. served as a liturgist. His nephew, ΑΣΠΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΥ served as an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ was an orator in 131/0 B.C. His daughter served as a hearth initiate in c. 100 B.C. (A.E. 1971, n. 24). ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ might be identified as a third mint magistrate (T167/6 B.C.). His son, ΑΜΦΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ, was a magistrate *epi tas aparchas* in 106/5 B.C., was elected in 103/2 B.C. to organize the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C., and in 98/7 B.C. served as conveyer of the sacred tripod to Delphi. His son, ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ, was secretary of the ephebes in 102/1 B.C. An ambassador from c. 150 B.C., [] ΣΙΜΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ (I.G. II² 1053), had a grandson, ΣΙΜΑΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΩΝΟΣ, who served as ephebe in 117/6 B.C. Finally, ΑΜΤΝΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ, orator in 149/8 B.C., was himself a grandson of an ephebe in 258/7 B.C. named ΕΥΚΛΗΣ. The family belongs to the *genos* of the Eumolpidae and although attested in several gentile priesthoods during the second generation and beyond, no family member is known to have held a civic magistracy. ΑΠΟΛΛΗΞΙΣ ΑΓΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, *agonothetes* in c. 140 B.C. (I.G. II² 961), had a homonymous grandson who served as an ephebe in 117/6 B.C. ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΡΑΦΗΝΙΟΣ and his brother, ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ, were ephebes in c. 158 B.C. (I.G. II² 944b). ΕΥΝΟΜΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ, the son of the latter, was also an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΖΩΙΑΟΥ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ, *phylarchos* in c. 140 B.C. (I.G. II² 961) had a son, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ, who was an ephebe in 107/6 B.C., and a granddaughter, ΕΠΑΙΝΕΤΗ, who was an *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C. ΦΕΙΔΥΛΛΟΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ, *hipparchos* in 150/49 B.C., had a homonymous grandson who was an ephebe in 106/5 B.C. ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΚΑΛΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ, liturgist for the Hephaistia after 167/6 B.C., is the father of ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ, a *hippeus* in 128/7 and 106/5 B.C. ΦΙΛΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ, *hieropoios* on Delos between 162/1-160/59 B.C. (I.D. 1413), had two grandsons, ΜΥΡΩΝ, a dramatic contestant at Delphi, and ΦΙΛΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ, a *mellephebos* in 94/3 B.C. ΠΑΥΣΙΑΥΠΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. is the father of ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ, *proedros* in 118/7 B.C. ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΕΛΙΚΩΝΤΟΣ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ, *gymnasiarch* and *lampadarchos* on Delos in 137/6 B.C., is the father of ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ, a secretary in 118/7 B.C. ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ, priest of Theseus in c. 150 B.C. (I.G. II² 2865), is the father of ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ, ephebe in 107/6 B.C. ΑΛΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, priest of the Eponymous Hero of a tribe in 166/5 B.C., had a son, ΑΛΕΞΙΩΝ, who was an ephebe in 123/2 B.C., and a grandson, also named ΑΛΕΞΙΩΝ who was an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ, *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C., is the father of ΑΘΗΝΑΔΗΣ, a *theoros* in 138/7 B.C., and the grandfather of ΚΡΑΤΕΡΜΟΣ, pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., ephebe in 117/6 B.C. and *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, *epimeletes* between 130-120 B.C. (I.G. II² 1940), is the father of ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ, ephebe in 102/1 B.C. Finally, ΚΛΕΙΔΑΜΟΣ, a third mint magistrate (T141/0 B.C., ΚΛΕΙΔΑΜΟΣ; T130/29 B.C., ΚΛΕΙ; T125/4 B.C., ΚΛΕΙΔΑ), might be the father of ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣ, a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., ephebe in 119/8 B.C. and in 103/2 B.C. an *agoranomos* on Delos.

One important category of families has yet to be mentioned. These are families from which members are often attested in the first generation in non-political offices such as liturgies, and who cannot be said to have belonged to the governing elite at that time. During the second generation however, like several Delian families, members of these families joined the governing oligarchy. Many of these families are known to have attained membership in the Areopagus. The family of *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ*, for example, is well-attested, with several identifiable members in the first generation.⁴⁸ A cousin, *ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ*, was a *prytanis* in c. 150 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226) and another relative, *ΑΡΙΒΑΖΟΣ ΣΕΛΑΕΤΚΟΥ*, was a *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C., was honoured by the Dionysiac Technitai in c. 130 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1331) and between 130-120 B.C. served as a liturgist (*I.G.* II² 1939). But while the family held no senior magistracies during the first generation, two members joined the Areopagus in the second generation. Another member of this family, *ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ ΓΛΑΥΚΟΥ*, was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C., and his grandson, *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΛΑΥΚΟΥ*, became *epimeletes* of Delos in 94/3 B.C. Similarly, *ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ*, the son of *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ*, who is not himself attested in any function, also joined the Areopagus. He was a *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C., a *tarantinarchos* in 128/7 B.C. (when his cousin was also a *hippeus*), an *epimeletes* of Delos in 115/4 B.C., and in c. 100 *epimeletes* of the public bank on Delos (*I.D.* 1670). His son was an ephebe in 117/6 B.C. *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, an ambassador of the Dionysiac Technitai in 130/29 B.C., had served in 154/3 B.C. as a *hieropoios*. One son, named *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ*, was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 118/7 B.C. and a grandson, *ΖΗΝΩΝ*, was an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. A second son, *ΖΗΝΩΝ*, became a *thesmothetes* in 97/6 B.C. and in 96/5 B.C., like his brother, also served as gymnasiarch on Delos. Finally, *ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ*, a *taxiarchos* in 161/0 B.C. and possibly herald of the *boule* and *demos* in 135/4 B.C., is the grandfather of *ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ*, *thesmothetes* in 97/6 B.C., and *ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ*, pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and ephebe in 98/7 B.C. *ΘΕΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΙΩΝΝΕΤΣ*, a temple administrator in 103/2 B.C., finally, is the grandson of *ΘΕΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΙΩΝΝΕΤΣ*, a liturgist at Athens in 164/3 B.C.

⁴⁸See Chapter 3.

Other families belonging to the ranks of the governing oligarchy during the second generation can be shown to have their origin in non-political families of the first generation. Thus ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΟΡΝΙΕΥΣ is attested at Athens in c. 150 B.C. as a member of an association of devotees of Syrian deities (*I.G.* II² 2358). It is not surprising to find his son, ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ, serving on Delos as priest of Hadad and Atargatis, both Syrian deities. But in addition, ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ was an orator in 106/5 and 104/3 B.C., and, in 102/1 B.C., priest of Dionysus and *epimeletes* of Delos.⁴⁹ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ contributed to the repair of the Peiraieus theatre in c. 150 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 2334) and, appropriately enough, was a poet-competitor in the Pythaid of 128/7 B.C. His son, ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ, was a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C., an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. (when he too was a poet-competitor) and a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. He then held a series of senior magistracies, possibly serving in 103/2 B.C. as general *epi to nautikon*,⁵⁰ in 101/0 B.C. as *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus and in c. 100 B.C. as general on Imbros (*Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 19, pp. 88-9). His brother, ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ, was himself general *epi ten paraskeuen* in 99/8 B.C.⁵¹ Another relatively successful family at this time also had artistic pretensions. Again the origins of the family in the first generation are obscure. But one member of the family, ΜΟΞΙΝΗ ΔΗΜΕΟΥ, was a priestess of the Thesmophorion on Delos in 141/0 B.C. Her uncle could be ΙΚΕΣΙΟΣ, possibly identifiable as a mint magistrate (T135/4 B.C.). Two sons of ΙΚΕΣΙΟΣ, at least, are well-attested in the second generation. ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ was a poet and a priest of the Dionysiac Technitai in 117/6 B.C. He served as priest of Dionysus on Delos in 101/0 B.C. and in c. 90 B.C. won the drama prize at

⁴⁹He could be the eponymous archon of 95/4 B.C. although this is unlikely since he was already a member of the Areopagus. A more likely candidate is the ephebe from 117/6 B.C.

⁵⁰This is quite conjectural. The name in 103/2 B.C. is only attested with the letters ΚΗΦΙΣ[_]. But given ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ's prominence during this period, he is a plausible candidate for this office.

⁵¹One related branch of the family was part of the Delian cleruchy at this time. ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ was priest of Roma in 101/0 B.C. and in c. 100 B.C. was gymnasiarch (*I.D.* 1929). His son, ΑΕΟΝΤΙΟΣ, was a *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607). They were evidently not a very successful branch. See above for Delian cleruchs.

Tanagra (*SEG* XIX, n. 335). His career exhibits no interest in politics. But his brother, ΔΗΜΕΑΣ was a mint magistrate, like his father, and became *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus, in 103/2 B.C., and, in 90/89(?) B.C., *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 2255). ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ, *theoros* from Tetrapolis in c. 150 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 21), had a son, ΖΗΝΩΝ, who was himself *architheoros* from Tetrapolis in 98/7 B.C. His eldest son, ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ, was a king-archon in 101/0 B.C., a third mint magistrate (T133/2 B.C.) and in 98/7 B.C. was also a pythaist from the Tetrapolis. ΑΥΚΙΣΚΟΣ ΕΤΜΝΗΣΤΟΥ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ, treasurer of the *boule* in 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226), served in 149/8 B.C. as a *hieropoios*. His son, ΑΥΚΙΣΚΟΣ, was archon in 98/7 B.C., and his grandson, ΑΝΔΡΟΚΛΗΣ, is known to have been a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. but is otherwise unattested. These last two families, therefore, both managed to have a member join the Areopagus during the second generation although they do not seem to have acquired much power.

An even more strikingly successful family, on the other hand, is provided by that of ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΥΣΤΙΟΣ. The origins of the family are unknown, but no fewer than four members of the family became *epimeletes* of Delos: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ in 128/7 B.C. and his cousins, ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ in 111/0 B.C. and ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ in 107/6 B.C. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ was archon in 128/7 B.C., the same year that his cousin ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ was *epimeletes* of Delos.⁵² He was priest of Apollo on Delos sometime before 111/0 B.C. (*I.D.* 1656) and in 106/5 B.C. was elected hoplite general. His brother, after serving as *epimeletes* of Delos in 107/6 B.C., was himself elected hoplite general in 103/2 B.C. A third brother, ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ, is only attested as a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939). But a son of ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ, named [] ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ, would also become *epimeletes* of Delos (in the 90s B.C.; *I.D.* 2600)

⁵²This is a rare occurrence in the fasti of Athens at this time (although several instances of brothers of fathers and sons serving in the mint magistracy can be detected).

and his own son would be an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C.⁵³ The son of ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ, ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, was an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. In the period between 128/7-c. 90 B.C., therefore, this family, which is unattested in any civic magistracy from the preceding decades, is known to have held four archonships, four *epimeleiai* of Delos and two hoplite generalships (in addition to the two attested ephebes). A second family is represented by ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ and his brother, ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ, who served in 154/3 B.C. as *hieropoioi*. ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ, the son of the former, served as *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus in 112/1 B.C. and was honoured by the merchants of the port. Appropriately, he was chosen in c. 100 B.C., when he was a fairly senior statesman (*I.G.* II² 1013),⁵⁴ to head a commission of the Areopagus for the reform of standards of weights and measures. He is not known to have held any other offices, although in 98/7 B.C. he was a pythaist together with several of his sons: ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ, ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ and ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ. ΑΡΧΙΠΠΗ, a daughter of the son named ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ, was a *kanephoros* in the same year. The family survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C.,⁵⁵ although none of ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ' sons are attested in any other function. One other family, finally, must be mentioned in this category. ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, was a *hieropoios* in 149/8 B.C. and an exegete of the Eupatridai in 136/5 B.C. His family, although a member of the hereditary priestly aristocracy, does not seem to have been very powerful during the first generation. But one son, ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ, became *polemarchos* in 128/7 B.C. and a second son, ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, enjoyed a remarkable career rivalling, and in fact, exceeding that of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ. ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., a Delias in 121/0 B.C. and, in 106/5 B.C., a *hippeus*. His civic career began between 104/3-96/5 B.C. (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 12), when he was a prytany-magistrate, perhaps as a prelude to his

⁵³He could also be the son of ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ, although this man might have been too young to be the father of a *epimeletes* in the 90s B.C.

⁵⁴ΕΥΡΥΔΙΚΗ, a daughter of ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ, was a *kanephoros* in 138/7 B.C. (indicating that ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ was a senior member of the Areopagus when he headed the commission in c. 100 B.C.).

⁵⁵See Chapter 7 for important members of this family under Augustus.

archonship in 101/0 B.C. In c. 100 B.C. he was a gymnasiarch (*I.G.* II² 2459), in 100/99 B.C. a public banker on Delos, in 99/8 B.C. a hoplite general and an *agonothetes*, in 98/7 B.C. he returned to Delos as *epimeletes* and again served as *agonothetes*. In 91/0 B.C. he iterated as archon, the first time this had happened for several centuries, and held the office until 89/8 B.C., when he was deposed at the beginning of the revolution under *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ*.⁵⁶ *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ* and his elder brother, therefore, did very well during the second generation. Their children also served in various functions. *ΛΑΟΔΑΜΕΙΑ*, the daughter of *ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ*, was twice *kanephoros* on Delos between 120-10 B.C. (*I.D.* 1869). Similarly, *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗ*, the daughter of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*, was a *kanephoros* on Delos and an underpriestess of Artemis on the island (*I.D.* 1869).⁵⁷

Athenian families attested during the first generation, to conclude, fall into two distinct categories. The first group represents the Athenian governing class from 167/6 B.C. to about 130 B.C. These families, despite their wealth and position, were in decline and are the counterpart of the earliest families attested in the Delian cleruchy. The second group comprises a more diverse but still identifiable group, ranging from a few recognizably elite families from the first generation to a large number of families with members attested only as liturgists or junior magistrates during the first generation, but which seem to have become part of the governing class during the second generation. Some other families in this group, such as that of *ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ - ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΣ*, while apparently part of the governing elite during the first generation and attested during the second also seem, in fact, to have been on the decline after 130 B.C. A similar result has been found for the Delian cleruchs, although on Delos the emergence of liturgical families can be better documented.

⁵⁶To *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*'s offices must also be added an undated trierarchy on Delos (*I.D.* 1841).

⁵⁷A son of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*, named after his father, was a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607), an *aleiphomenos* in 94/3 B.C., and went on to become archon; *I.G.* II² 1340 (see Chapter 6).

The prosopographical evidence for the transition of power between the first and second generations presented above shows that the governing class did not remain static between the first and second generations. The first generation, which began in 167/6 B.C. with the acquisition of Delos, drew to a close with the dissolution of the cleruchy as a self-administering community in the 130s B.C. The second generation began with the resumption of the Pythais in 138/7 B.C. and with a dramatic increase in the size of the Athenian *ephebeia*. Both institutions increased the size of the military and religious elites of the governing class. While the Delian cleruchy after 167 B.C. consisted of a core of elite families which were dominant at both Athens and Delos during the first generation, they were gradually replaced by new families which are mostly associated with financial and liturgical positions on Delos rather than civic administration. Similarly, in the transition to the second generation at Athens, the governing families also faced increasing competition from the peripheral class. Consequently, many of the dominant families in the second generation can only be traced to a liturgist or low-ranking magistrate in the first generation. But in addition to the members of these emergent families who are attested after c. 130 B.C., approximately 250 additional careers and 288 new families are attested in the second generation alone.⁵⁸ This suggests that families of the peripheral governing class managed to topple the established families on a large scale. The decline of specific pro-Roman families (and in particular early members of the Delian cleruchy) can be attributed in part to the failure of Athenian diplomacy during the first generation, but the majority of governing families during the first generation may have simply expended their resources in civic administration rather than in financial aggrandizement. In c. 130 B.C., at any rate, several hundred families with newly acquired wealth were ready to take their place in the

⁵⁸This excludes, of course, the additional magistrates from this period who cannot be identified prosopographically.

governing class of the second generation.⁵⁹ The second generation began with the governing class in a state of transition. It would end, as the following chapter will show, in revolution.

⁵⁹The mechanism by which families earned (or lost) their wealth remains obscure: "Where did their wealth come from? Unfortunately we lack the details which would enable us to specify the social condition of the men who now ruled the polis." (Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 145). Ferguson, *HA*, p. 349, partly attributes the wealth of new families to rental income on Delos. The transition of power between the first and the second generations must be regarded as a process which can only be dated in the most general way to the decades between 150 and 130 B.C. Although Will (*Histoire politique*, p. 336) and Rostovtzeff (*SEHWW*, vol. II, p. 741ff) do not regard the Achaean War as an event with any significant impact on Athens, I wonder if Roman behaviour at this time might be responsible for the disappearance of several pro-Roman families (see Chapter 3) and the emergence of obscure families, such as that of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ and ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, which were able to somehow benefit from Roman policy.

Chapter 5

The Revolution of 88/7 B.C.

The second generation cannot be precisely demarcated from the first, but it began with those youths who served as ephebes between c. 140-120 B.C. and who would have been active in politics and administration in the last decades of the second century and first decades of the first century B.C. The end of this generation may be defined more precisely, for it was during this generation that Athens experienced several years of "dictatorship" under the archon ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ (91/0-89/8) which devolved into a year of anarchy culminating in the sack of the city by the Roman general L. Cornelius Sulla in March, 86 B.C. The youths who served as ephebes between c. 140-120 B.C. lived through these events and in all likelihood participated in them. But historians have avoided accounting for the events between 91/0-87/6 B.C. as a product of this generation. W.S. Ferguson came closest when he interpreted the revolution as a result of conflict within the elite between oligarchic and democratic factions.¹ More recently, E. Badian has regarded the revolution as a result of conflict between factions led by ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ

¹Ferguson, *HA*, p. 436, argued for an oligarchic coup in 103/2 B.C. led by Delian families of businessmen. Consequently Ferguson regarded the aristocratic families as the champions of democracy in 88/7 B.C. On the Athenian oligarchy after 146 B.C. see also S. Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*, Rome, 1946, pp. 165-69.

and *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*, although he denies that the factions had any ideological basis.² S. Tracy, in a recent study of *I.G. II² 2336*, has dismissed Ferguson's theory that the period from 103/2-89/8 was one of oligarchic government giving rise to a democratic opposition and has instead argued that *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ* and *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ* were political allies who simply joined their resources, during a period of complete civic stability, to help pay for the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. Rather than as the leaders of rival factions of democrats and oligarchs, Tracy depicts *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ* as *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ*'s younger protege.³ The assumption underlying Tracy's refutation of Ferguson's reconstruction of this period is that the only possible basis for conflict at Athens in c. 100 B.C. was ideology or personal conflict. Elsewhere, Tracy writes that the governing class was not dominated by a, an oligarchy of just a few families: "One hundred and twenty separate individuals are known to have done so (i.e. hold office) from this inscription alone. In other words, the prosperity accruing from the commerce on Delos seems to have been fairly widespread and not limited to only a few very wealthy families." Tracy's picture of Athenian society in c. 100, therefore, is completely devoid of any sense of stress or dynamism in the evolution of the governing class: "... the Athens of 100 B.C. enjoyed peace, prosperity and relative political stability."⁴ These previous accounts of the revolution of 88/7 B.C., however, have focused too narrowly on the governing elite itself. The near future would see a revolution and a reign of

²E. Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," *AJAH* 1 (1976) p. 107. J. Touloumakos also rejects the notion that constitutional reform was an issue at Athens in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. ("Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten des Festlandes und des Inseln im ersten und zweiten Jhdt v. Chr.," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Göttingen, 1967). He regards Athens as a limited democracy governed by a pro-Roman oligarchy. Athens falls into his third category of Greek constitutions under Roman domination, that is, a constitution which essentially remained unchanged but with a few discernable trends towards oligarchy such as an increase in the importance of the Areopagus and the competence of the *Boule* (ibid., pp. 77-101 and 151-2). Another possibly ideological basis for conflict at Athens at this time is in foreign policy. Some have postulated conflict between pro-Pontic and pro-Roman factions (cf. Geagan, *ANRW*, II.7.1, 1979, p. 374 and *JHS* 103, 1983, p. 205).

³For example, Tracy presents evidence that *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*'s sister had married a son of *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ* ("Athens in 100 B.C.," *HSCP* 83, 1979, p. 227).

⁴Ibid., pp. 229-30.

terror of almost unprecedented violence, and this demands a more far-reaching explanation.⁵ The prosopographical evidence presented in Chapter 4 for the membership of the governing class and governing elite in the transition between the first and second generations has suggested that the governing class of the second generation was composed of many "new" families. The consequences of such volatility in the membership of the governing class may be examined prosopographically in greater detail.

The ultimate origins of the revolution of 88/7 B.C. must be sought in the pattern of Athenian history from at least the middle of the third century B.C. At that time, politicians from families of a landed aristocracy were prominent in Athenian magistracies.⁶ It was this aristocracy, in fact, which began to falter in the transition of power from the first to the second generations. Under this aristocracy Athenian foreign policy was dominated by the desire to escape from Macedonian rule. Following a policy of ostensible independence from foreign powers, families of the governing aristocracy initiated the alliance with Rome in 200 B.C. and, as we saw in Chapter 3, were the force behind the acquisition of Delos in 167/6 B.C. At the same time these families must have faced increasing pressure at home from the lower classes, for a consistent thread runs through all the major international conflicts of the second century. In every case a monarch at war with Rome appealed to the masses in Greece for their support. This is true for Philip V, Antiochus III, Ptolemy Philometer, Perseus, Aristonicus and, finally, Mithridates VI.⁷ The consistency with which these Hellenistic kings appealed to the masses in Greece suggests that they believed that there were

⁵The conflict has been regarded as nothing more than a dispute among the governing elite. But an explanation centered on the oligarchy is partly contradicted by the large number of families attested for this period and fails to take into account the attitudes and ambitions of the peripheral class. If Deininger is correct that the anti-Roman movement was only half-hearted in 88/7 B.C. (*Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland: 217-86 v. Chr.*, Berlin, 1971, p. 258), how else may the violence and slaughter of the revolution be explained?

⁶J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*, New York, 1942, p. 48.

⁷Plb 27.8-10; Livy 42.30.1.

citizens in the cities of Greece who would respond to their appeal.⁸ At Athens, however, the elite was generally successful in holding on to its power and remained unwavering in its support of Rome.⁹ Only one incident might have served as a portent of future trouble. In c. 180 an abortive coup by one Apollodorus was inspired by Antiochus III and enjoyed the support of the *demos*.¹⁰ This was a precursor of the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and anticipated the circumstances of that revolution; when the Roman hegemony was thought to be in decline, the masses were ready to rise against the governing class. But while the Athenian population might have been anti-Roman in sentiment, their dissatisfaction with conditions at Athens, however onerous these may have been, may not in itself sufficiently account for the events of 88/7 B.C. Another important factor in explaining the revolution is the source of leadership, and this is an aspect which can be analysed prosopographically. During the period of the second generation, increasing prosperity seems to have swelled the ranks of the peripheral governing class with aspirants to membership in the governing elite. This must have led to greater competition for the same number of offices, especially the archonship and membership in the Areopagus. An inevitable consequence would be alienation from the governing class as some individuals

⁸Cf. G.E.M. de Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London, 1983, p. 349; F.W. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World*, Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1981, p. 169.

⁹Deininger sees two phases to anti-Roman feeling among the Greeks. Until 167/6 B.C., he argues, the elite in Greece were anti-Roman; after this year anti-Roman sentiment was confined to the lower classes (*Der politische Widerstand*, pp. 217-9).

¹⁰Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 140. Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 283ff.

failed to win the status or position they were seeking.¹¹ With the old aristocracy losing ground to a class of *nouveaux riches*, a situation of rising expectations developed as a result of increased prosperity and an enlarged peripheral class. In circumstances such as these, the expectation that Mithridates VI would throw off the Roman yoke was only the spark that fired the tinder.

The prosopographical evidence for careers and families during the second generation has indicated that the governing class was changing in its composition during these years. The emergence of new political families attested in the first generation only in liturgical positions indicates an increase in prosperity. Increased prosperity and the emergence of new families is also indicated by the increase in the size of the *ephebeia* during the second generation. The *ephebeia* constantly grew larger in the period after 167/6 B.C. until in the second generation it reached an average of over one hundred and ten ephebes each year. In the decades before 167/6 B.C., on the other hand, the *ephebeia* fell to as few as thirty ephebes each year.¹² This means that many of the ephebes who served during the second generation would have been the first ephebe in their family for perhaps several generations. A large number of ephebes from families new to the military elite, consequently, are known from the second generation. Significantly, the majority of these ephebes are not attested in any magistracies or offices

¹¹An increase in competitive display of wealth may be seen in the distribution of dedications made by individuals between 167/6 B.C. and 88/7 B.C. For each decade from 167/6 B.C. to c. 100 B.C. the number of dedications increases dramatically. Down to 118/7 B.C. the priests of Sarapis are mentioned alone in dedications to the deity. But after 118/7 B.C. the priests are frequently mentioned in connection with senior civic magistrates such as archons, *epimeletai* of Delos, and temple administrators. A similar pattern may be noticed in texts which mention the name of the gymnasiarch. For the first nineteen years of the Athenian administration only three dedications are dated by gymnasiarch and these provide no other magistrates' names. For the next nineteen years, up to ten such synchronisms may be counted. For the last seventeen years covered by I.D. 2589 eleven synchronisms are counted. These later dedications also provide the names of other magistrates. Although these figures only give a general impression, the infrequency of elaborate dedications in the early decades of the Athenian administration and the high concentration in the last decades of the second century is striking.

¹²Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 165; Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 371-4.

during the second generation.¹³ In 117/6 B.C. the recruitment of the *ephebeia* might have been manipulated for demographic or political purposes.¹⁴ This is consistent with the notion of rising expectations, for as more and more youths were able to afford the *ephebeia*, there would be greater pressure to lower the census requirement from members of the civic class eager to join the corps of ephebes. Opposing pressure to raise the census requirement might have come from members of the elite who felt threatened in their position. It happens that in several years the ephebic corps seems to have been manipulated to accommodate either of these demands. In 102/1 B.C. Melite, the deme of *ΣΑΡΑΜΙΩΝ*, sent no ephebes, and the tribal contingent for Kekrops fell to 3 from an average of 13 ephebes between 128/7 and 39/8-34/3 B.C. Because Melite is one of the largest demes, it is unlikely that there were no 18 year-olds to join the *ephebeia* in this year. In 117/6 B.C., in contrast, the ephebic corps was the largest attested for this period (at least 138 ephebes are recorded) and the tribal contingents are all larger than average. This was the year before *ΣΑΡΑΜΙΩΝ*'s archonship. The ephebes are praised in this year for their *homonoia* (concord) towards one another and their *philia* (friendship) throughout the entire year.¹⁵ This is the only instance where this phrase is used in the formulaic decrees honouring the ephebes.¹⁶ The phrase occurs, at the very end of the motion before the resolution of the *Boule* adopting the motion, in a position of emphasis.

The influx of new citizens at Athens seems to have increased during the

¹³Several of these ephebes held office after 88/7 B.C.

¹⁴See Chapter 1.

¹⁵*I.G.* II² 1009. Aristotle defines *philia* as the force which holds a *polis* community together and contrasts *philia* with "hateful *stasis*" (*NE* VIII.1.4). The *philia* of small groups (such as would be the *ephebeia*) in aggregate serves to preserve peace within the community (*NE* VIII.9.4). Aristotle also defines *homonoia* as political *philia* (*NE* IX.6.3). *Philia* is a quality which is most likely to flourish among equals, for example, among the middle-class of a democracy (*Politics* 1295b 8).

¹⁶The ephebes are often praised for their *homonoia* but always in connection with some specific duty such as guarding the forts (*I.G.* II² 1011).

second century B.C. Individuals who could afford the citizenship must have been well-off, although their status in Athenian society may have been more ambiguous.¹⁷ New citizens would automatically become members of the peripheral governing class by virtue of their wealth but, while a number of new citizens can be identified during the second generation, their failure to obtain offices indicates that they failed to gain admission to the governing elite itself.¹⁸ This might allow us to infer that some of the new citizens would have become dissatisfied and alienated. Rather than seek to join the governing elite, they may have become indifferent to its destruction. It happens, in fact, that much of the radical leadership during the revolution of 88/7 B.C. was composed of newly enrolled citizens. *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ* was sent as an ambassador of the *polis* to the court of Mithridates.¹⁹ He sent back encouraging reports which inflamed the people with the expectation that Mithridates would put an end to the tyranny of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ*. On his return he was greeted enthusiastically, was hosted by a Delian magnate named *ΔΙΗΣ*, and on the next day was elected hoplite general. Once war broke out, *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ* dispatched *ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos to seize the island of Delos and its valuable treasures after the island refused to follow the *polis* in its rebellious folly. Later in the revolution a man named *ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ* turns up as the leader of the mob during a reign of terror and the siege of the city by Sulla. *ΔΙΗΣ*, the Delian magnate who seems to have lent his support to the followers of *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ*, was the

¹⁷ They had to pay for the citizenship and it is possible that attendance in the *ephebeia* might also have been a requirement. See Chapter 1.

¹⁸ Note for example the two sons of *ΜΑΑΡΚΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* who were ephebes in 123/2 and 119/8 and *ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ* who was an ephebe in 107/6 B.C. All three are the sons of new citizens and served as ephebes. Except for *ΜΑΑΡΚΟΣ*, who served as a liturgist, they are not attested in any other function. Similarly *ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ*, an ephebe in 107/6 B.C., is the son of a famous *ΣΙΜΑΛΙΟΣ* of Tarentum (and is to be added to Ferguson, *HA*, p. 408, n. 1). Also, *ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ* and *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ*, both Athenian citizens, are the sons of *ΔΑΜΑΞΕΝΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΣ* (Homolle, *BCH* 8, 1884, p. 143). Neither are attested in any offices. *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ*, an ambassador of Attalus II, and his son, *ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΩΣ*, received Athenian citizenship. In this case, however, their citizenship must be regarded as an honour. It is unlikely that they took up residence at Athens and we do not expect to find them participating in Athenian civic life. On new citizens see Chapter 1.

¹⁹ Athenaeus, V.212a.

son of a Tyrian on Delos who became an Athenian citizen.²⁰ *ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos was adopted into a family which would only become prominent under Julius Caesar.²¹ *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ*, the man who gave his name as the main instigator and leader to the first phase of the revolution, was also a new citizen.²² We do not know the origins of *ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ*, but he could have been a metic. His philosophical pursuits indicate that he was at least a resident of Athens at this time.

It might be valid to postulate that among Athenian citizens there was a certain resentment against the newcomers. In 128/7 B.C. three of the seven ephebic instructors were non-citizens. These would be the last non-Athenian instructors until c. 80 B.C. In 106/5 B.C. several of the ephebic instructors can be identified as former ephebes themselves from 128/7 B.C.²³ It is plausible that at this time the instructors were still hired each year by a vote of the *demos* (*AP* 42.1), and it may be significant that the individuals who served in this year as ephebic instructors are not attested in any other offices during the second generation.²⁴ The odd thing about their appointment in 106/5 B.C. is that none of these instructors served in any other year. Two professional instructors, *ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ Β[] ΕΙΤΕΑΙΟΣ* and *ΚΑΜΜΙΑΣ ΚΡΙ[] ΑΙΓΙΛΙΕΥΣ*, furthermore, served

²⁰ Another Delian cleruch, *ΔΙΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ*, who served as *pompastolos* in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607), would probably have been too young in 88/7 B.C. *ΔΙΗΣ* is attested in no offices during the second generation.

²¹ *PA* 1343, s.v. *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ*. See also Chapter 3.

²² May he be identified as *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΥΡΜΕΙΔΗΣ*, ephebe in 102/1 B.C.? Poseidonius says *ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ* became his father's heir and acquired Athenian citizenship. He then made a fortune as a itinerant sophist and returned to Athens shortly before the revolution. This would make him 32 when he was elected hoplite general. For his acquisition of citizenship see also *PA* 239 and Chapter 1.

²³ *ΣΠΑΡΤΑΚΟΣ ΣΠΑΡΤΑΚΟΥ*, *ΟΝΗΣΙΦΙΛΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ* and *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ*, who can plausibly be identified with one of three ephebes from 128/7 B.C. *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΕΥΒΟΛΑΟΥ* was a *theoros* in 128/7 B.C.

²⁴ It is possible that, because 106/5 B.C. was a Pythaid year, these Athenian citizens wanted to go to Delphi with the ephebes. But this does not take into account the fact that the instructors in this year do not seem to have been professionals. The fact that they are former ephebes but are unattested in other offices squarely places them in the peripheral class.

between 117/6-107/6 B.C. and 102/1-98/7 B.C. (Appendix B.1). For some unknown reason they were not appointed in 106/5 B.C. It was also during the second generation that, after the death of Panaetius (before 110/9 B.C.), the Stoa came into the control of Athenian-born students; in quick succession he was replaced by the Athenians ΜΝΗΣΑΡΧΗΣ ΟΝΗΣΙΜΟΣ,²⁵ ΔΑΡΔΑΝΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΟΣ²⁶ and ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΣ, the last Athenian to head the School. In this context it may be observed that ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ and ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ, both new citizens, were Peripatetics while ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ, the leader of the last phase of the revolution, was an Epicurean. It seems reasonable to detect in the "Athenianization" of the Stoa at this time some kind of conflict or competition with the other schools of philosophy.²⁷ The Stoa, the most popular philosophical school, taught a doctrine of predestination, hardly a philosophy which would attract revolutionaries.²⁸ The Academy at this time was not influential, although it was still popular. The Peripatos, on the other hand, taught a philosophy based on political involvement, which was consistent with Aristotle's practical writings on constitutions and politics. Although recognized by the state in the ephobic curriculum, it had always been a philosophy which attracted democrats and Athenian patriots. Finally, there was the Garden of Epicurus. This was a philosophical school which taught a doctrine of non-involvement in politics and was not recognized at either Athens or Rome as a movement which was compatible with the ideology of city-state government. But the philosophy was nonetheless attractive to those who had wearied of the political struggle, be they

²⁵Perhaps a relative of ΟΝΗΣΙΜΟΣ ΚΡΑΤΙΠΠΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΕΙΟΣ, ephobe in 119/8 B.C.

²⁶Related perhaps to ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΠΟΡΙΟΣ, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2607).

²⁷MacKendrick, *The Athenian Aristocracy*, p. 53, points out that ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ' father contributed to the Romaia and Ptolemaia in c. 150 B.C. with a number of prominent members of the Stoa (*I.G.* II² 1938).

²⁸Polybius, who had a certain sympathy for Stoicism, for example, did not question the rise of Rome to an imperial power over the Greeks and Poseidonius is said to have given Rome her philosophy of empire based on Stoicism.

disaffected Athenians or, during the first century, the occasional Roman optimate.²⁹

The revival of the Athenian procession to Delphi called the Pythaid, beginning in 138/7 B.C. and repeated in 128/7, 106/5 and 98/7 B.C., is the most conspicuous event at Athens during these decades. In its splendour, its traditional flavour and the large number of participants, the Pythaid is also symptomatic of stresses at Athens within the governing class. The first Pythaid was sent in 138/7 B.C., about fifteen years after the Athenian attempt on Oropus. Why the Pythaid was revived after almost a century of neglect has defied explanation. Most historians are content to suggest that greater prosperity and religious fervour are sufficient to explain the resurrection of the institution.³⁰ But the first Pythaid was sent just at a time when the Delian cleruchy was in decline and after the uprising under Andriskos in Macedonia and the Achaean War had aggravated social relations in Greece.³¹ Also, as was shown in Chapter 3, the diplomatic efforts behind the seizure of Oropus suggest the heavy hand of the Athenian *demos* rather than the will of the pro-Roman governing elite. The cult of Apollo at Delphi had a center in the Marathonian Tetrapolis, and the residents of the Tetrapolis sent embassies to Delphi in 217 and 204 B.C.³² In c. 150 *ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΕΙΟΣ* represented the Tetrapolis as a *theoros* at Delphi (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 12). His son, *ΖΗΝΩΝ*, was *architheoros* in 98/7 B.C. Two regions of Attica, moreover, were strongly represented in each Pythaid; demes of the Tetrapolis and demes north of Mount Pentelikon are more strongly represented than other regions of

²⁹C. Memmius, for example (see Chapter 6).

³⁰A. Wilhelm, "Zu einem Beschluss der Athener aus dem Jahre 128 v. Chr.," *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 224 (1947) pp. 49-53, seems to regard the revival of the Pythaid as a last gasp of Hellenism and a symptom of anti-Roman sentiment. The Pythaid was also revived at a time when Delphi was beginning its decline (Cf. G. Daux, *Delphes au IIe et au Ie siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine: 191-31 av. J.C.*, Paris, 1936, p. 368).

³¹Will, *Histoire Politique*, p. 328 and Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand*, pp. 215-41.

³²Boethius, *Die Pythais*, Upsala, 1918, pp. 43-45.

Attica. In addition, in each Pythaid there are representatives from Phyle, a deme which also had a traditional association with the cult of Apollo Pythios. Is it possible that the Athenian attempt on Oropus was inspired by the interests of Athenians who resided in the Tetrapolis? Oropus lay on the north-east border of Attica and on the coastal route from the Tetrropoleis to Delphi and on the important ferry crossing for grain and food from Euboea.³³ The dispute over the territory of Oropus would have involved the important question about the right to collect tolls at the sanctuary.³⁴ Finally, whereas the acquisition of Delos has been attributed to the pro-Roman governing elite, many of the families which participated in the first Pythaid are either unrelated to those which belonged to the governing class during the first generation or cannot be identified. The faction which pushed for the revival of the Pythaid, therefore, might have wanted to reorient Athenian foreign policy away from the increasingly Romanized island of Delos towards the Greek mainland.³⁵ Roman influence on Delos is most perceptible after c. 130 B.C. and coincided with the dissolution of the cleruchy as a political entity.³⁶

³³M. Toepffer, "Die attischen Pythaisten und Deliaisten," *Hermes* 23 (1888) pp. 321-32. Boethius argues that the Athenian Pythaid took a route which ran towards Eleusis and over Mt. Cithaeron and on to Thebes (*Die Pythais*, pp. 50-1).

³⁴Tolls at Oropus usually seem to have been used for the sanctuary of Amphiaraus (see Sherk, *RDGE*, n. 14). As a private festival the source of funding for the Pythaid is unclear. Until 98/7 B.C. we know nothing about the source of funding. In 98/7 B.C. magistrates were expected to contribute from their own pockets. This suggests that earlier Pythaid might have been paid through subscriptions or by the participants themselves. There is no evidence that state coffers were tapped.

³⁵In 122/1 B.C. the ephebes were marched to Oropus and told that it once belonged to Athens (cf. Ferguson, *HA*, p. 418).

³⁶Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 383-4. After c. 130 B.C. the Romaia appear for the first time, a priest of Roma is attested (the cult associated with Hestia, the traditional cult of the *demos*) and the administration of the island is reformed into a system of dual-magistracies possibly modelled on the Roman principle of collegiality. On *I.D.* 1764 the Athenian *epimeletes* of the island is named as eponymous magistrate with the Roman consuls. The true eponymous magistrate for Delos was the Athenian archon, and this text reveals the extent to which Athenian sovereignty on the island was becoming eroded.

The Pythaid's themselves do not present a consistent prosopographical picture, and the size and composition of the procession fluctuated considerably.³⁷ One-quarter of all families attested during the second generation are represented in the ranks of the Pythaistai. When *ex officio* participants such as magistrates, *hippeis* and ephebes are included, no less than one-half of all attested families sent at least one member on a Pythaid. The college of Pythaistai itself was very much a family affair (Table 5.1).³⁸ The personnel of each Pythaid, however, were

Table 5-1: Family Participation in the Pythaid's

	Pythaid			
	138/7	128/7	106/5	98/7
no. of participants	59			
iterating pythaists		1	1	3
relatives	12	17	6	12
no. of participants		51		
iterating pythaists	1			1
relatives	16	10	6	5
no. of participants			81	
iterating pythaists				9
relatives	5	2	30	8
no. of participants				74
iterating pythaists	1	1	6	
relatives	10	9	9	22

usually different, and few individuals served as pythaists on more than one

³⁷Tracy, *BCH* 99 (1975) pp. 185-218. There is probably little significance to variations between Pythaid's. Boethius sees nothing more in the fluctuations in the formal composition of the Pythaid's than evidence of flexibility in the tradition (*Die Pythais*, p. 57).

³⁸In this table the family relations of the pythaistai are analyzed. The number of pythaists who participated in two or more Pythaid's is given along with the number of relatives.

occasion. On the other hand, pythaists tended to be related to one another, and many families are represented by different family members in each Pythaid. Although the leadership and several participants can be identified with members of the governing elite or even the ruling oligarchy during this generation, in general the pythaists belonged to the religious elite.³⁹ A number of families, for example, are known to have sent members to two, three or even four Pythaid, and yet many such families have no attested members in civic office.⁴⁰ Differences can also be discerned between each of the Pythaid. Only seven of the forty-four identifiable pythaists in 128/7 B.C., for example, are known to be *gennetai* (about one-half of the pythaists in other years, in contrast, are gentile). Pythaists in 138/7 and 128/7 B.C., furthermore, are more likely to be related to one another than to pythaists in 106/5 or 98/7 B.C. On the other hand, the Pythaid of 106/5 B.C., the largest of the Pythaid, reveals relatively fewer identifiable individuals and fewer individuals and families which are known to have participated in another Pythaid.⁴¹ The Pythaid of 106/5 B.C. was also the first year in which some Pythaists were chosen by lot.⁴² All of these facts justify considering this to be a Pythaid which was more broadly based in Athenian society. This Pythaid also involved some kind of disruption in the festival timetable. On the basis of a ten-year interval, Pythaid should have been

³⁹Ferguson, *HA*, p. 372, calls the Pythaistai "the elite of the city".

⁴⁰Three families may be cited as examples: The family of *ΛΥΚΟΦΩΝ-MENEKPATHE ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ* provided three pythaist *paides*, two in 138/7 B.C. and one in 128/7 B.C., plus an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. None of these youths are attested in civic offices; Two brothers, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ* and *ΞΕΝΟΔΙΚΟΣ ΑΓΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ* from Hippothontis (IX), were pythaist *paides*, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ* in 138/7 B.C. and his brother in 128/7 B.C. *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ* served as an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. and *ΞΕΝΟΔΙΚΟΣ* in 123/2 B.C. Again neither of these individuals is attested in civic office; Finally, the family of *ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ ΑΥΡΙΔΗΣ* provided three pythaist *paides*, two in 138/7 B.C. and one in 128/7 B.C. This family is gentile but is unattested in civic magistracies. About one-half of the pythaists, in addition, can be identified as members of gentile families.

⁴¹The nine individuals who did serve in both 106/5 and 98/7 B.C. are almost all *gennetai*.

⁴²Perhaps this is reflected in the representation of the demes among the pythaists in this year. Thirty-two demes are represented in 106/5 B.C. compared to twenty-six in 138/7 B.C., twenty-two in 128/7 B.C. and twenty-six in 98/7 B.C.

celebrated in 118/7 and 108/7 B.C. The Pythaid in 106/5 B.C. came two years late. Despite this delay the next Pythaid was celebrated in 98/7 B.C.⁴³ In this fourth Pythaid, many of the pythaists were members of the governing elite and, for the first time, magistrates were expected to contribute a small amount of money. It has been suggested that some of the junior magistrates had trouble meeting their obligation.⁴⁴ It may also be that they resented having to pay for a private festival in which the elite were predominant. The list of contributors, *I.G. II*² 2336, betrays the close association of the governing oligarchy with this Pythaid, and it is legitimate to infer for the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. a timocratic character suggesting that this time the ruling oligarchy was more closely involved. However the details about these four Pythaid are to be interpreted, the fact remains that the Pythaid was the most conspicuous event at Athens in the decades preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C.

The ruling elite at Athens in c. 100 B.C. was becoming increasingly oligarchic.⁴⁵ Consequently, an increase in the prosperity and size of the peripheral classes coincided with the emergence of an increasingly oligarchic faction. Families which were formerly part of the governing elite also found themselves

⁴³This was the last Pythaid until the middle of the first century B.C. when a much less extravagant procession was dispatched to Delphi. Ironically, a Pythaid should have been celebrated in 88/7 B.C.

⁴⁴Tracy presents evidence for late payment by junior magistrates. He attributes this to financial hardship. But none of the contributions to the Pythaid were large. The junior magistrates may simply have felt that they should not be expected to contribute. Sundwall had used gravestones as a criterion of wealth in his study of fourth-century Athens. Davies criticized this criterion because the ability to afford a grave monument does not necessarily indicate that the individual was a member of the liturgical class (*APF*, p. xix). For our purposes it is only important to note that the few references to the costs of a burial which Davies cites range from 300 drachms to several thousand drachms. The largest contribution required of a magistrate to the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C. was 200 drachms and most contributed only 100 or even 50 drachms.

⁴⁵Badian, *AJAH* 1 (1976) p. 106. Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 143-7, attributes the revolution of 88/7 B.C. to a narrowing of the oligarchy and a social revolution of the lower classes. MacKendrick, *The Athenian Aristocracy*, p. 59, postulated an emergence of a narrow elite of gentile families. Deininger presents the conventional picture of a ruling oligarchy which was divided against itself and an oppressed population which rose against the oligarchy when Mithridates offered the prospect of liberation (*Der politische Widerstand*, pp. 246-8).

excluded by the elite from power and office. The nature of the oligarchic faction can be illustrated by comparing the size of the peripheral governing class and the size of the governing elite itself. The governing elite may be defined as those families which managed to place a member in the Areopagus. Only ten men could join the Areopagus each year. All other families which do not have a member known to belong to the Areopagus may be assigned to the peripheral governing class. Table 5.2 compares the number of members attested for these

Table 5-2: A Comparison of Families Based on the Number of Attested Members

no. of family members	Families of the Governing Elite	Families of the Peripheral Class
7	2	1
6	6	3
5	3	2
4	5	14
3	9 21%	44 14%
2	41 35%	159 34%
1	52 44%	242 52%
Total	118 100%	465 100%

two groups of families in a public function during the second generation and shows that on the basis of the number of attested family members, there is little difference between families of the governing elite and families of the peripheral governing class, although there are more families of the governing elite with three or more attested members than the latter. When the number of attested offices for each family member are taken into account, this difference between the two groups becomes magnified (Table 5.3). Members of families which belonged to the Areopagus were much more likely than members of families which belonged only to the peripheral classes to hold two or more public offices (55% as opposed to

Table 5-3: The Monopolization of Offices by the Governing Elite

no. of offices held by family	Families of the Governing Elite	Families of the Peripheral Class
10	2	
7	2	
6	6	1
5	10	1
4	15	9
3	37 30%	29 5%
2	59 25%	160 20%
1	109 45%	584 75%
Total	240 100%	784 100%

25%). The peripheral families constitute a much larger group of families which, while they are as well-attested as the families belonging to the governing elite, can boast far fewer careers of three or more magistracies.

The Areopagus at this time might have numbered 400 members but the governing oligarchy will have been much smaller than this. In fact, only seventeen known families in the last decades of the second generation can be identified as very powerful. These are families which held a number of senior magistracies or which had two or more members in the Areopagus during the second generation. In addition to ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ and ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, only the following individuals and their families may be ranked among the governing oligarchy in the decades preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C.: ΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΙΔΗΣ, ΙΑΣΩΝ and ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ, ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ, ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, ΠΥΘΩΝ and ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΙΣ, ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΤΙΜΟΥ ΔΕΚΕΛΕΤΣ,

ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΛΥΤΕΣ, ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΗΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΣ, ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ and ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΛΥΣΤΙΟΣ, ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΕΣ, ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΣ and ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ, ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ and ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ, ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ, ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΒΥΤΑΚΚΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΣ, and ΑΝΔΡΕΑΣ ΑΝΔΡΕΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΕΣ. These families have been discussed in the preceding chapter.¹ All of these families are "new" in the second generation or are of obscure origin, and they are all virtually unattested in the generation following 86/5 B.C.² These families monopolized the offices of the governing elite. The last family of the governing elite attested before the revolution of 88/7 B.C. is that of ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ. He was *epimeletes* of Delos in 93/2 B.C., having served previously as *ephebe* (123/2 B.C.) and *hippeus* (106/5 B.C.). His brother (or cousin?) is probably the ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ who served as temple administrator on Delos in 92/1 or 91/0 B.C.³ A daughter of ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ was *kanephoros* in 98/7 B.C., and ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ himself had been a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. This family joined the ranks of the governing elite at a precarious time; no members of the family are attested after 88/7 B.C. During the second generation, then, more and more individuals from the civic and peripheral class were financially capable of a political career and sufficiently educated, as their liturgies and their participation in the *ephebeia* show. But since only ten individuals each year could become archon (or secretary) and thereby enter the Areopagus, it may have been frustrated members of the peripheral governing class who thronged

¹Chapter 4.

²ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ's family produced an *ephebe* between 80/79-78/7 B.C. Several of the families re-emerge in the period following 60 B.C. ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ has a son or grandson attested in the 30s B.C. (ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝΟΣ, A15, n. 287). ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ, a treasurer of the Heroistai in 57/6 B.C., ΑΡΔΗΑΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ, *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 267; in this text could ΑΡΙ[Α]ΙΟΥ be restored as ΑΡΙ[Ε]ΙΟΥ with dotted gamma?), and ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ, a prominent figure under Augustus, descendants of Areopagite families during the second generation. In addition, there is ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ, archon in 39/8 B.C., a grandson of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ and the first member of the family to be attested after 86/5 B.C. and ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, the son of ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, who was archon in the 60s B.C. (His daughter ΤΙΜΟΘΕΑ served as a hearth initiate in c. 50 B.C.; *I.G.* II² 3491).

³On the date, see Appendix A.2

around *AΘHNION* just before the election of the generals and other magistrates "to look good before the *demos*".⁴

The revolution of 88/7 B.C. progressed in several stages.⁵ First, the

⁴Poseidonios (Athenaeus V.212bff.). This event occurred in the Theatre of Dionysus (the regular place for assemblies during the Hellenistic period) and seems to have taken place at the time of the regular elections of the generals in the spring (see Chapter 2). The election of other magistrates at this time should not be regarded as unconstitutional. If elections for 89/8 B.C. had not been held, these elections could have been retroactive. The archon for 87/6 B.C. was only elected in March of 86 B.C.

⁵C. Brinton in *The Anatomy of Revolution*, New York, 1952, conducted a comparative study of the four major revolutions in the western world (the English, American, French, and Russian revolutions). He attempted to devise criteria for the comparative study of revolutions, including *coups d'état*, from other periods and places. Athenian society before 88/7 B.C. exhibits many of the features Brinton ascribes to a pre-revolutionary period (ibid., pp. 28-70): (1) The government was inefficient or ineffectual (indicated by the inability or unwillingness of the governing elite to assert Athenian autonomy on Delos in the face of a Roman population; also, Polybius mentions that embezzlement was common among the governing classes during the second century B.C.); (2) the society was experiencing rising prosperity through trade on Delos while the administration or government was becoming impoverished (the acquisition of Delos brought the Athenian state no increase in revenue). In ancient times a *polis* relied on the expenditure of wealthy citizens to meet its expenses. The members of the liturgical class, however, were reluctant to contribute to the Pythaid of 98/7 B.C., as has been documented by Tracy. Also, there were no public works undertaken at Athens during the period of the second generation, although several private citizens initiated works of their own (the Agora of Theophrastus on Delos is a notable example); (3) there was an economically aggrieved group (perhaps the junior magistrates who were most likely to shirk their obligation to contribute to the Pythaid; also, individuals who were excluded from the *ephebeia* or from magistracies); (4) the transfer of the allegiance of the intellectuals (this was a phenomenon which was widespread throughout the Greek world. Polybius and Poseidonius both espoused the Roman cause. In addition, we have already seen that several of the leaders of the revolution at Athens were members of the philosophical schools); (5) the existence of pressure groups (this is a difficult feature to document, but groups such as associations for the worship of foreign deities, Dionysiac actors, merchant associations and athletic clubs are all attested at this time. The philosophical schools might be regarded as the equivalent of the French *sociétés de pensée*); (6) interruption of the circulation of elites; (7) the failure of the governing class to win the loyalty of the masses and the intellectuals. There is one important difference between the societies where Brinton's four revolutions occurred and that of Athens in 88/7 B.C. The four modern revolutions which Brinton analyzed all took place in societies governed by a monarchy unlike Athens with her democratic institutions and heritage.

ruling oligarchy, having become narrower and more exclusive during the preceding decades, blocked the continuous process of social mobility, the "circulation of elites", which in other periods must have satisfied the ambitions of members of the peripheral families.⁵¹ This process is reflected in *MHΔEIOΣ*' three-year dictatorship in 91/0-89/8 B.C., for which years no other magistrates or priests are attested at Athens (in contrast to the abundance of epigraphical documents for the preceding four decades). Some disturbance in the functioning of the governing class (perhaps violence or bribery during elections) might have preceded his dictatorship.⁵² This would account for the appeal to the Roman Senate which seems to have coincided with *MHΔEIOΣ*'s dictatorship. The dictatorship was followed by *AΘHNION*'s sudden but moderate revolution in which frustrated members of the peripheral governing class joined in overthrowing the oligarchy.⁵³ It is significant that this took place in the context of the election of the generals.⁵⁴ With the approach of Mithridates' army, the revolution went into its violent final stage when the anti-Roman sentiment of the masses erupted into

⁵¹The distribution of the epigraphical evidence supplies the following facts: Only one inscription dates from the three years *MHΔEIOΣ* was archon (91/0-89/8 B.C.) and no decree is extant from 94/3 B.C. to 86/5 B.C. In contrast, the abundance of epigraphical evidence for the preceding decades is almost unprecedented. This suggests that Athenian affairs were not in regular order from at least 94/3 B.C.

⁵²*MHΔEIOΣ*'s government seems to have limited opportunities for Athenian citizens to assemble. Thus the schools of philosophy, the *gymnasia*, the assembly and possibly the theatre were closed (Athenaeus V.212b).

⁵³It may be no accident that one of the slogans of the revolution was *democratia*, as can be inferred from *AΘHNION*'s speech reported by Poseidonius (Athenaeus V.212), the coins of this period and the decree of 86/5 B.C. (see below). Ferguson attributed the "*Demos*" coins to *AΘHNION*'s regime (*HA*, p. 444) (although Badian has assigned these to rebels from Euboia, *AJAH* 1, 1976, pp. 128 n. 69). Also, *AΘHNION* was a Peripatetic. The Academy and Aristotle's Peripatos were the schools of philosophy which grew out of the traditional *polis*. The Stoa, on the other hand, and the Garden were philosophies of the *oikoumene*. Even if his philosophy did not influence his actions, *AΘHNION* could have opportunistically presented himself as an Athenian patriot. On the moderation of *AΘHNION*'s regime, see Badian, *ibid.*, p. 117.

⁵⁴The failure of the governing class to use force against the revolution is attributed by Brinton to decadence. In Athens the election of *AΘHNION* to the hoplite generalship gave the revolutionary "party" control of the military resources.

the terror and repression of *APIETION*'s regime.⁵⁵ The year 87 B.C., by an unlucky coincidence, was a year when Halley's comet became visible,⁵⁶ something which might have aggravated the behaviour of the superstitious masses. The revolution was initially led by members of the peripheral class (some of whom, we have seen, were new citizens at Athens) and was supported by those members of the peripheral class who had been excluded from office in the second generation. This phase of the revolution was not anti-Roman in sentiment, which will explain the participation of the Dionysiac Technitai, who had benefited from the Roman Senate in an embassy of 112/1 B.C.⁵⁷ In the "Terror", even these peripheral families would have fallen victim, as the anarchy and uncertainty of the Mithridatic War induced the mob to unleash its vengeance on all members of the governing class and not just on the governing elite.⁵⁸

After 86/5 B.C. the membership of the governing class changed more swiftly and dramatically than it had in the 150s and 140s B.C. when the pro-Roman elite

⁵⁵The initial defeat of a regime gives unity to a revolution. Thus the election of *AΘHNION* represented only the first stage: "The revolution, hardly begun, seems over." (Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, p. 79). After a brief honeymoon the party disintegrates. This is how we may understand the shift in leadership from *AΘHNION* to *APIETION* and we may date the pro-Mithridatic and anti-Roman sentiment to the second phase of the revolution (cf. Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 148). The propaganda of this period can partly be recovered from the coin-types. *APIETION* issued coins with Pegasus, a Mithridatic symbol, in 88/7 B.C. Several years earlier, during *MHΔEIOΣ*' dictatorship, *ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ-ΑΡΜΟΞΕΝΟΣ* issued coins with a statue of Roma.

⁵⁶F.R. Stephenson, K.K. Yau and H. Hunger, *Nature* 314, 1985, p. 587.

⁵⁷Sherk, *RDGE*, n. 15. See Badian, *AJAH* 1 (1976) p. 113. The Technitai received *AΘHNION* as an honoured guest and called Mithridates VI a "New Dionysus". Badian points out that *AΘHNION* was sent as a representative of the Athenian people and returned before the beginning of the Mithridatic War. There was nothing revolutionary or anti-Roman about his reception. The participation of the Technitai in *AΘHNION*'s moderate regime will explain the puzzle of their reappearance in the first century B.C. (see Geagan, *ANRW*, II.7.1, 1979, p. 375).

⁵⁸Athenian ties to the Black Sea go back to the 5th century B.C. and were related to Athens' need for a secure supply of grain (Mossé, *Athens in Decline*, p. 148). The Athenian mob may have preferred Mithridates VI because of this. Papalas argues that in A.D. 13, when the mob at Athens again "revolted" from Roman rule, the event was really nothing more than a major food riot ("Roman Athens," p. 58).

was gradually displaced by newer families. Few members of the prominent families from the second generation are attested in office after 86/5 B.C. Similarly, few of these families have attested descendants in the generation following the revolution of 88/7 B.C.⁵⁹ Several reasons may be offered. The years 88/7-86/5 were bloody ones in Athenian history. No figure can be put on the total loss of life or property, although all classes seem to have suffered. Six hundred Athenians died on the ill-fated expedition to Delos following the refusal of its inhabitants to join the rebel government at Athens.⁶⁰ It is unlikely that these were members of the elite, but some may have belonged to peripheral families. The reign of terror under *APIETION* would have had a severe impact on the governing class and the wealthier families. Apart from those who lost their lives in the "Terror", we are also told that hundreds fled to Delphi and some perhaps even to Rome itself.⁶¹ Many of these families might never have returned. Finally, Sulla's bloody sack of the city would have seen the slaughter of the supporters of the revolution.

The loss of life, the destruction of property and the disruption of Athenian social classes in the years 88-86 B.C. must have had a strong impact on Athenian society. We may surmise that the governing elite was the most affected by the disaster for several reasons. First, the elite presented a visible target for violence; second, it was the smallest segment of Athenian society and, being more mobile, was most likely to flee the city; finally, the property of the elite was a likely target of vandalism, confiscation and general dispersion. Even if a family of the governing class managed to survive and to return to Athens, its former

⁵⁹Cf. MacKendrick, *The Athenian Aristocracy*, p. 59, for a different interpretation.

⁶⁰Poseidonius (Athenaeus 212b). Four hundred others were taken prisoner. Their fate is not recorded.

⁶¹Philo, the head of the Academy, fled to Rome (Cicero, *Brutus*, 89ff) and may thereby have revealed his true loyalties. The choice of Delphi for a refuge does not seem accidental given the fact that so many of the peripheral and governing families participated in the Pythais and may have had ties of friendship at Delphi.

prosperity and economic standing would not have been guaranteed.⁶² It is not surprising that many elite families are unknown after 86 B.C. But the survival of virtually any family after 86 B.C. is in itself worthy of mention.

The years immediately following the sack of the city by Sulla were a period of restoration and reform. Sulla himself was absent from 86 B.C. until 84 B.C. In these years the archonship, the only magistracy that is well-attested, seems to have fallen into the hands of the gentile families of the religious elite at Athens. The archon of 87/6 B.C., ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ, for example, is certainly a member of a *genos* although the exact identification of his family remains uncertain.⁶³ Another archon at this time, ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, was also a member of a *genos*. He served as a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 and 98/7 B.C. His father had been *epimeletes* of Delos after having served in the Delian *ephebeia* in 136/5 B.C. and a gymnasiarch of the Hermaia in 133/2 B.C. The family belonged to the Delian cleruchy, therefore, and managed to join the governing elite at Athens. But it was not part of the oligarchy before 88/7 B.C. and was one of the "new" families of the second generation.⁶⁴ Similarly, the choice of a *hierophantes* in 86/5 B.C. as archon does not suggest the victory of a gentile and pro-Roman elite, as is sometimes stated, but may instead reflect the temporary emergence of politically neutral families which had not been tainted by the

⁶²The large number of abandoned coin hoards from this period is eloquent testimony (the date of the hoards is controversial, see D.M. Lewis, *NC* 2, 1962, pp. 278-86).

⁶³He could belong to the family of ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ, which belonged to the *genos* of the Philaidai. This is a well-attested family during the second generation although its members held few civic magistracies. On the other hand, he could instead be identified as ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, a member of another well-attested family before 88/7 B.C. His father, ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ, headed a commission to reform weights and measures in c. 100 B.C. But again the family did not belong to the governing oligarchy. Both families became very high-ranking under Augustus (see Chapter 7).

⁶⁴See also Chapter 4. The family became very prominent under Augustus.

politics of the preceding years.⁶⁵ The prosopography of the archon list in this year, the first regular year in Athenian government since 92/1 B.C., is revealing.⁶⁶ ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΜΦΙΟΤΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ served in c. 100 B.C. as secretary of the *Boule* and *demos* (Agora XV, n. 260), between 104-96 B.C. as a prytany magistrate of some kind and in 97/6 B.C. as a *prytanis* for his tribe (Agora XV, n. 259). His family is unattested. In 86/5 B.C. he was elected king-archon. ΦΙΛΩΤΑΣ, who was elected *polemarchos* in the same year, is the son of ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ. His family is also virtually unknown.⁶⁷ ΕΙΠΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΙΠΗΝΑΙΟΤ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ was herald of the Areopagus in 86/5 B.C. He served in 106/5 B.C. as a senior officer of the Pythaid (*epi tas prosodous*). He and his father might have been mint magistrates and his son, ΕΙΠΗΝΑΙΟΣ, was a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. ΕΙΠΗΝΑΙΟΣ, therefore, was beyond middle age in 86/5 B.C. He may have been the most senior magistrate in age on the list, befitting the dignity of his

⁶⁵It is important to note that families which inherited the Eleusinian priesthoods are not generally prominent in government. In addition to these archons, other gentile families may be shown to have survived 88/7 B.C., such as ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ, pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and *daidouchos* in about 75 B.C. (I.G. II² 3508), and ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΑΣΤΟΥ ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ, pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and *daidouchos* after 88/7 B.C. (See Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 50). His son and grandson held the same priesthood. Neither of these families, however, belonged to the governing elite.

⁶⁶The list has no archon and I think it dates to 86/5 B.C. when, we know from another text, the archon was the Eleusinian *hierophantes* (See Appendix A.2). Quite possibly the archon was designated by Sulla. Sulla was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. An archon such as this, rather than representing a gentile elite, as MacKendrick would argue, must be considered politically neutral. The identity of the archon is uncertain. Two candidates may be mentioned. I.G. II² 2452 (Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, pp. 28-9) lists three successive *hierophantes*, all inscribed by different hands sometime after 128/7 B.C.: ΜΕΝΕΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ; ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ(?) ΕΤΕΤΡΟΦΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ; and ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ ΜΕΝΕΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ. The length of a *hierophantes*'s career remains unknown. The archon in 86/5 B.C. could have been either ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ or ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ. ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ is from Salamis and was a gymnasiarch there in 132/1 B.C. and a liturgist in 116/5 B.C. He held no other offices and his son is only attested as an *epimeletes* between 130-120 B.C. (I.G. II² 1940). ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ held no offices other than *hierophantes* (I.G. II² 2452). His father, as we notice from the list above, had also been *hierophantes* and his brother was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 103/2 B.C. His son, in contrast, became archon in 61/0 B.C. and herald of the Areopagus in 56/5 B.C.

⁶⁷ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ was adopted into the family of ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΕΙΡΑΔΙΩΤΗΣ (I.G. II² 4457).

office. His archonship is unrecorded; but although he could have served as archon before the revolution, his family cannot be considered part of the governing oligarchy before 88/7 B.C. The six *thesmothetai* in 86/5 B.C. show a similar pattern. ΠΟΣΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ was a gymnasiarch on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 1928) and a *theoros* at about the same time (*I.G.* II² 1054).⁶⁸ His family is otherwise unattested. ΑΤΤΙΝΑΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. and an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. His first attested office is his term as *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. Similarly, ΠΑΣΙΩΝ ΕΡΜΑΙΣΚΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΥΣΤΙΟΣ was also a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. He was a *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. and went on to become *epimeletes* of Delos (no date; *I.D.* 1873). Only two of the *thesmothetai* in this year belong to families of the Areopagus from before 88/7 B.C. ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ was a *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. His father was herald of the Areopagus in 99/8 B.C. A brother, ΑΘΗΝΟΦΑΝΗΣ, was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. but is otherwise unattested. ΠΑΤΡΩΝ, *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C., is the son of ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ, who was *epimeletes* of Delos in 121/0 B.C. These two families, therefore, belonged to the governing elite during the second generation although they cannot be assigned to the governing oligarchy in the decades preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C.⁶⁹

It was also in 86/5 B.C. that a decree was passed restoring the democracy.⁷⁰ The *proedros* of the *boule* on the day the decree was passed was ΝΕΩΝ ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΥ. He is the son of either ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΣ, a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. and an ephebe in either 123/2 B.C. or 117/6 B.C., or ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ, *proedros* in 106/5 B.C. on the occasion of a decree honouring the Jewish priest Hyrcanus (Josephus XIV.149). More important, perhaps, is the individual who

⁶⁸This is a conjectural career. The *theoros* is attested as [] ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ.

⁶⁹ΠΡΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ was *epimeletes* of Delos in c. 85/4 B.C. (*I.D.* 1604b). His father was a *thesmothetes* in 100/99 B.C. The family is otherwise unattested.

⁷⁰I date the decree to 87/6 B.C. on the basis of the secretary cycle (for the bibliography and controversy see Appendix A.2). Cf. Livy, *Epit.* lxxxi: Sulla "... urbi libertatem et quae habuerat reddidit."

proposed the decree restoring the democracy. $\Delta\text{HME}\Lambda\text{Σ}$ ΔHMEOT $\text{AZHNIET}\Sigma$ was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. but seems to have held no intervening offices.⁷¹ He was in his 60s when he proposed the decree. The decree itself seems to concern the restoration of democracy after the sack of the city and might echo the policies of $\text{A}\Theta\text{HNION}$. Finally, we learn from Plutarch that a certain $\text{MEI}\Delta\text{IA}\Sigma$ and $\text{K}\Lambda\Lambda\text{M}\Phi\text{ON}$, along with several members of the Areopagus, induced Sulla to stop the slaughter during the sack of the city.⁷² A $\text{MEI}\Delta\text{IA}\Sigma$ was *thesmothetes* in 103/2 B.C. but is attested in no other offices. $\text{K}\Lambda\Lambda\text{M}\Phi\text{ON}$ may be identified with $\text{K}\Lambda\Lambda\text{M}\Phi\text{ON}$ $\Sigma\text{OKPATOT}\Sigma$ $\text{ΠAMBONTA}\Delta\text{H}\Sigma$, *agoranomos* on Delos in 124/3 B.C. and possibly a mint magistrate (MM3 T161/0 B.C., MM2, T140/39 B.C.). These two men, therefore, belonged to the governing class or even, in the case of $\text{MEI}\Delta\text{IA}\Sigma$, to the governing elite, but they did not belong to the oligarchy which governed Athens in the last decades of the second generation. They are exactly the kind of politicians we might expect to find active after 88/7 B.C.⁷³ $\text{K}\Lambda\Lambda\text{M}\Phi\text{ON}$'s son went on to become archon in 58/7 B.C.

Many of the ephebes who served at the beginning of the second generation, as was shown in the preceding chapter, went on to have spectacular careers in the decades before 88/7 B.C. But no senior magistrate from before 86 B.C. is attested in office after this date. On the other hand, a number of senior

⁷¹Reinmuth, *BCH* 90 (1966) p. 96, proposes restoring $\text{AZHNIET}\Sigma$ for $\text{AAAIET}\Sigma$ in a line in *I.G.* II² 2336. If correct this will make $\Delta\text{HME}\Lambda\text{Σ}$ a *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus. Interestingly this is also an office held by $\Delta\text{IO}\Delta\text{NPO}\Sigma$, the reformer of weights and measures in c. 100 B.C. This is the kind of office which would bring the incumbent into close contact with the foreign population of the port. $\Delta\text{IO}\Delta\text{NPO}\Sigma$ himself was honoured by an association of foreign merchants.

⁷²Ferguson proposed emending $\text{MEI}\Delta\text{IA}\Sigma$ to $\text{MH}\Delta\text{EIO}\Sigma$, and this has received general acceptance (Badian, *AJAH* 1 (1976) p. 108). But the emendation is unnecessary and may only add to the confusion about this period.

⁷³Badian, *AJAH* 1, 1976, p. 115, claims that Sulla was lenient because "if the Athenian system that he chose to install was to function there had to be men to run it and in particular pay the high price of office...." and "he could not destroy the political class or its economic base". I disagree with this formulation. Sulla destroyed the oligarchy and disenfranchised the supporters of APIETION . The peripheral class were the beneficiaries of Sulla's policy.

magistrates who held office after 86 B.C. had served as ephebes in the second century B.C. They held offices in their fifties, apparently for the first time, that their peers had already held in their early thirties and forties. It is intriguing that these former ephebes apparently held no intervening offices. *NIKANΩP* *NIKANOPOΣ* *ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ*, for example, belongs to an unattested family. But he was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., ephebe in 117/6 B.C. and *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. These offices clearly place *NIKANΩP*, who is not known to have held any political offices, in the ranks of the military elite. But in 85/4 B.C., at age 50, *NIKANΩP* was elected *polemarchos* and in 78/7 B.C. he was elected *epimeletes* of Delos.⁷⁴ [] *ΦΙΑΣ* *MENEMAΞOT* *ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ* was ephebe in 123/2 B.C. but, like *NIKANΩP*, held no political office before 86/5 B.C. In 85/4 B.C., however, he was elected king-archon. Similarly, *NIKHΘΗΣ* *ΑΘΗΝΟΒΙOT* *ΕΠΙΤΥΡΙΑΔΗΣ*, archon in 84/3 B.C., had been a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., an ephebe in 117/6 B.C. and a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. He became archon at 51 years of age. His family is well-attested before 88/7 B.C., but not as part of the governing elite. The family of *ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ* *ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ* shows an interesting history. In the first generation it belonged to the governing elite.⁷⁵ In the intervening period only an ephebe is attested (107/6 B.C.).⁷⁶ But a great-grandson of the ephebe, *ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ*, would become archon between 75-62 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1340), returning the family to the ranks of the governing elite. The family of *ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΣ* and *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* *ΣΤΕΙΡΙΑΕΤΣ* was low-ranking during the second generation. Before 86/5 B.C. it can boast a secretary (*ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΟΤΣ*, in 109/8 B.C.) and two ephebes (*ΘΕΩΡΙΚΟΣ* *ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΤ*, 107/6 B.C. and *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* *ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΤ*?, 107/6 B.C.).⁷⁷ After 86/5 B.C. the family did well. A brother of

⁷⁴In this year he was also gymnasiarch on Delos. This is the only instance where one individual held both offices in the same year and may indicate a shortage of candidates.

⁷⁵See *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ* *ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΤ* *ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ* in Chapter 1.

⁷⁶*ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ*, a grandson of *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΤ*' brother *ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ*.

⁷⁷Could the pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C., *ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΣ* *ΘΕΩΡΙΚΟΤ*, be the son of the first ephebe?

the two ephebes, *OINOΦΙΛΟΣ*, was treasurer of the prytany in c. 80 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 264), and in 71/0 B.C. became archon;⁷⁸ a grandson of *ΣΤΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΣ*, the ephebe in 107/6 B.C., served in c. 50 B.C. as gymnasiarch on Delos (*I.G.* II² 2875). Here is a family of obscure origin which managed to survive the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and is attested in several civic offices afterwards.⁷⁹ *ΜΝΑΣΕΑΣ ΜΝΑΣΕΟΤ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ* was an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. His father is only attested as a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. *ΜΝΑΣΕΑΣ* went on to become hoplite-general between 80/79-78/7 B.C., when he was only in his mid-thirties. This was a year in which the *Sylleia*, games in honour of the man who had sacked the city and slaughtered its population, were celebrated by the ephebes under the direction of the hoplite general.⁸⁰

Other families which first rose to prominence after the revolution of 88/7 B.C. would include that of *ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΤ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ* and his brother. They were pythaist *paides* in 106/5 B.C. Their family is otherwise unattested, but *ΕΡΜΑΦΙΛΟΣ* became *epimeletes* of Delos, having already been archon, sometime after 88/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 1955).⁸¹ Similarly, *ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* and his brother were ephebes in 107/6 B.C. Their father apparently held no offices and the origin of the family is unclear. *ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ* would have turned 30 years of age in 95/4 B.C., but it seems that his career was postponed until after the revolution. In about 80 B.C. he served as *epimeletes* of

⁷⁸ *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ* is a second possible identification for the archon although I think he is less likely.

⁷⁹ Members of the family also held office under Augustus. See Chapter 7.

⁸⁰ On the *Sylleia* see Raubitschek, "Sylleia," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A.C. Johnson*, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton, Princeton, 1951, pp. 49-57 and Pelekidis, *L'Éphébie attique*, pp. 236-9. Raubitschek takes a cynical view and regards the *Sylleia* as nothing more than a renamed Epitaphia and Theseia. Pelekidis rejects this view. The *Sylleia* were discontinued in 78/7 B.C. They were begun at Athens in either 84/3 B.C. (before they were instituted at Rome) or in 81/0 B.C.

⁸¹ Depending on his age as pythaist *pais* (see Chapter 1).

Delos (*I.D.* 2508),⁸² and in unknown years he served on Delos as priest of Isis and priest of Asclepius. His two daughters and a niece also served as *kanephoroi* on Delos after 88/7 B.C. The family, therefore, seems to have belonged to the Delian cleruchy after the revolution. *ΣΩΣΟΣ ΧΑΡΜΙΔΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ* served as *thesmothetes* in 85/4 B.C. His year as priest of Isis cannot be dated (*I.G.* II² 4702). His father was a *hieropoios* on Delos in 127/6 B.C., and the family probably belonged to the cleruchy during the second generation. *ΠΥΘΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΘΡΑΣΩΝΟΣ*, archon in 85/4 B.C., is possibly a son of *ΘΡΑΣΩΝ ΟΥΛΙΑΔΟΥ*, who was *architheoros* in 138/7 B.C.⁸³ Few of these families, as we have seen above, were able to join the governing elite at Athens during the second generation.

Apart from Areopagites, other magistrates who served after 87/6 B.C. may also be traced to families which survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C. These families too did not belong to the governing elite during the second generation. *ΠΑΣΙΝΙΚΟΣ*, treasurer of the stratiotic fund in 83/2 B.C., might be a grandson of *ΠΑΣΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ*, a *prytanis* between 160/59-146/5 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 226). *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ* was priest of Apollo in c. 80 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 55). His father was ephebe in 102/1 B.C. Although the family was a member of a *genos*, it was not part of the governing elite during the second generation. In 55/4 B.C., *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΣ*, a son of *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ*, became archon. Similarly, *ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ ΣΩΠΟΛΙΔΟΣ*, *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C., is the son of an ephebe who served in 117/6 B.C.⁸⁴ Finally we may consider *ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ*, who served as ephebe in 98/7 B.C. His family is

⁸²His archonship cannot be dated.

⁸³A second candidate is *ΘΡΑΣΩΝ ΠΟΛΥΕΥΚΤΟΥ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΕΥΣ*, liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939).

⁸⁴*ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΥ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ*, an ephebe in 106/5 B.C., served on Delos in 75/4 B.C. as *kleidouchos* of the Cynthian deities. A *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C., *ΦΙΛΟΜΗΝΟΣ ΕΥΜΗΛΟΥ* (*Agora* XV, n. 272) from Aiantis (Tribe X), could be the ephebe *ΦΙΛΟΜΗΝΟΣ ΕΥΜΑΧΟΥ* from 102/1 B.C. if the scribe made a mistake in recording one of the names. *ΘΕΑΡΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ*, an ephebe in 107/6 B.C., served as a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 273). His family is unknown.

otherwise unattested before 86/5 B.C. But $\Sigma\Omega\text{KPATH}\Sigma$ served as *agoranomos* on Delos (*I.D.* 1835), an office for which he had to be at least 30 years of age, sometime after 87/6 B.C. He was also a priest of Apollo on Delos (*I.D.* 1936), also probably after 87/6 B.C.⁸⁵ The family of $\Phi\text{I}\text{O}\text{K}\text{A}\text{H}\Sigma$ $\Sigma\text{T}\text{A}\Sigma\text{E}\text{O}\text{T}$ $\text{K}\text{O}\text{A}\text{N}\text{N}\text{H}\text{O}\text{E}\text{N}$ must also be considered a survivor of the revolution of 88/7 B.C. $\Sigma\text{T}\text{A}\Sigma\text{E}\text{A}\Sigma$ and his son, $\Phi\text{I}\text{O}\text{K}\text{A}\text{H}\Sigma$, are well-attested on Delos during the second generation as gymnastic instructors (Appendix B.2). $\Phi\text{I}\text{O}\text{K}\text{A}\text{H}\Sigma$ may have moved to Athens, probably soon before 88/7 B.C. At any rate he and his property escaped the "Delian Vespers" and members of his family are attested as *paidotribai* throughout the first century B.C.⁸⁶ The family of $\Phi\text{A}\text{I}\Delta\text{P}\text{O}\Sigma$ $\text{B}\text{E}\text{P}\text{E}\text{N}\text{I}\text{K}\text{I}\Delta\text{H}\Sigma$ also deserves mention here. $\Phi\text{A}\text{I}\Delta\text{P}\text{O}\Sigma$ was an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. His brother, $\text{K}\text{A}\text{M}\text{I}\text{O}\text{E}\text{O}\Sigma$, served as a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939) and was a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. when he is also recorded as a victor in games at Delphi. They were the sons of a member of the governing elite during the first generation⁸⁷ but themselves held no political offices. But $\Phi\text{A}\text{I}\Delta\text{P}\text{O}\Sigma$ would become a famous teacher of Epicureanism at Athens in the first century B.C. He is mentioned in two dedications at Athens which date to the 70s B.C. and his son, $\text{A}\text{T}\Sigma\text{I}\Delta\Delta\text{H}\Sigma$, would become archon in 51/0 B.C.⁸⁸ The Epicurean School of philosophy, therefore, enjoyed a period of prestige and activity after 86/5 B.C. which it did not have before the revolution, when it included the notorious $\text{A}\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{T}\text{I}\text{O}\text{N}$ in the ranks of its adherents.

The *ephebeia* was probably suspended during the revolution and possibly

⁸⁵ $\Sigma\Omega\text{KPATH}\Sigma$ could have belonged to a Delian cleruch family or he could have moved to Delos after 86/5 B.C. A cousin, $\Sigma\Omega\text{KPATH}\Sigma$ $\Sigma\text{A}\text{P}\text{A}\text{I}\text{I}\text{O}\text{N}\text{O}\Sigma$, became priest of Asclepius in 63/2 B.C. and a son, $\Sigma\Omega\text{KPATH}\Sigma$, was a treasurer of his tribe's prytany in 45/4 B.C.

⁸⁶ Note also $\text{K}\text{P}\text{O}\text{I}\Sigma\text{O}\Sigma$, a *zakoros* on Delos in c. 90 B.C. (*I.D.* 2210). $\Delta\text{I}\text{O}\Delta\text{N}\text{P}\text{O}\Sigma$ $\text{K}\text{P}\text{O}\text{I}\Sigma\text{O}\text{T}$ $\text{A}\text{N}\text{A}\text{I}\text{T}\text{P}\text{A}\Sigma\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$, *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C., could be his son. $\Delta\text{I}\text{O}\Delta\text{N}\text{P}\text{O}\Sigma$ could have been born before 88/7 B.C. if he was in his fifties and iterating as *prytanis*. But $\text{K}\text{P}\text{O}\text{I}\Sigma\text{O}\Sigma$ might have also moved to Athens before the revolution.

⁸⁷ See Chapter 3.

⁸⁸ See Chapter 6.

even afterwards. But it was revived soon after, and a list of ephebes dating from between 80/79-78/7 B.C. will further indicate which families survived after 88/7 B.C. A few of the one hundred and eleven ephebes in this year are clearly the sons of members of the governing elite before 88/7 B.C. *ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΑΡΕΤΙΟΣ*, for example, was related to a very powerful family of the second generation.⁸⁹ *ΑΓΑΘΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ*, an ephebe in this year, went on to become *epimeletes* of Delos in 49/8 B.C. His father had also been *epimeletes* of Delos in 110/9 B.C. and in 100/99 B.C. had served as *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus. Similarly, the father of *[.]ΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ* was general in the Peiraieus in 97/6 B.C. The grandfather of *ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* was *epimeletes* of Delos sometime before 126/5 B.C. (*I.D.* 1643) and was an orator at Athens in 124/3 B.C. *ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ* himself became *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C.⁹⁰ The father of *ΝΑΡΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΡΥΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ* was a pythaist in 106/5 B.C. and king-archon in 98/7 B.C. and his uncle was a temple administrator in 110/9 B.C. Similarly, *[_] ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΥ*, who was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 273), could be the same individual, or a close relative of the ephebe *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΟΥΣΙΟΥ* from 80/79-78/7 B.C. His grandfather, *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ* was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 113/2 B.C. and a temple administrator in 108/7 B.C. Finally, *ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* is a nephew of *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ*, the *polemarchos* in 102/1 B.C. His brother was an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. and his father a *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C.

The majority of the ephebes named on this list, however, cannot be identified as the sons of fathers who belonged to the governing elite of the second generation. We may begin, in fact, with the *kosmetes* himself, *[_]ΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΥΣ*, who was an ephebe in 117/6 B.C. (the year when the *ephebeia* might have been opened up to the peripheral governing class). He is not known to have held any intervening offices. One of the ephebes who served under

⁸⁹See Chapter 2.

⁹⁰Note that another branch of this family is also attested after 88/7 B.C.

his direction, *ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ ΘΕΑΙΝΕΤΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ*, is a great-grandson of a homonymous archon from 144/3 B.C. His grandfather was a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. This family was not part of the governing elite during the second generation. The same is true for the family of *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΧΜΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΤΑΔΟΥ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ*. His grandfather, *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΧΜΟΣ*, was archon in 159/8 B.C. His aunt, *ΦΙΛΑΝΘΩ*, was a *kanephoros* in 138/7 B.C. and his father a pythaist in 106/5 and 98/7 B.C. Although the family belonged to the *genos* of the Kerykes, it cannot be considered a member of the elite during the second generation.⁹¹ Similarly, the grandfather of *ΠΑΝΤΑΚΛΗΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ* was a temple administrator in 141/0 B.C. A son of *ΠΑΝΤΑΚΛΗΣ* would be an ephebe in the 30s B.C. (*I.G.* Π² 1961). Two cousins, sons of *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ* and *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* (their names are not extant), are named as ephebes in the same year. They might be related to an important cleruch family of the first generation.⁹² Many of the ephebes on this list are, in fact, the sons of men who themselves had served as ephebes. Their names are evidence for a certain continuity in the membership of the military elite before and after 88/7 B.C.⁹³ Some of the ephebes from between 80/79-78/7 B.C. also seem to be related to low-ranking cleruch families. *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΤΙΟΣ*, for example, is the son of *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ*, who was a pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C. and an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. A brother of

⁹¹ *ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΝΘΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ* was also a ephebe in this year. He was an *amphithales* in 91/0 B.C. His is a very-well attested gentile family during the second generation, but it held few magistracies.

⁹² See the family of *ΕΥΒΟΤΛΟΣ-ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* in Chapter 3.

⁹³ *ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ* (from Tribe XI) is the son of *ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ*, who was an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. The father held no magistracies. The father of *ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΧΙΕΤΣ* had been an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. He too held no magistracies. *ΜΟΙΡΑΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΟΙΡΑΓΕΝΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΤΣ*, an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C., is the grandson of an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. *ΣΟΦΟΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝ[] ΕΛΛΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ* could be the son of *ΞΕΝΩΝ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ*, ephebe in 107/6 B.C. or *ΞΕΝΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΥ*, ephebe after 104/3 B.C. *ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΑΜΠΠΡΕΤΣ* is the son of an ephebe who served in 102/1 B.C. His grandfather, *ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΙΟΥ*, was an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. *ΕΡΜΙΑΣ ΕΡΜΙΟΥ*, a *zakoros* of the Cynthian deities on Delos in 97/6 B.C., may be related. The father of *ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΝΑΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ* was an ephebe in 106/5 B.C. Finally, the grandfather or uncle of *ΔΗΜΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ* was an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. (*ΔΗΜΟΤΕΛΗΣ* from Tribe VI).

ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ was a priest of Sarapis in 111/0 B.C. and priest of Apollo in 100/99 B.C. The father of ΞΕΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ was a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 100 B.C. (I.D. 2607) and his aunt, []Ν ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΔΟΥ, served as underpriestess of Artemis on the island in either 101/0 or 100/99 B.C.⁹⁴ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ may be related to a cleruch family. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, priest of the Cynthian deities in 119/8 B.C. and priest of Sarapis in 116/5 B.C., could be his grandfather. He was an allotted pythaist in 98/7 B.C. The ephebe's father is unattested in any office or function. ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ is the son of a priest of Aphrodite on Delos between 105/4-104/3 B.C. His grandfather, ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΙΟΥ, was a pythaist in 106/5 B.C. The pythaist in 106/5 and 98/7 B.C., ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΝΙΚΙΟΥ, is his brother. The family belongs to the *genos* of the Euneidai but not to the governing elite.

In addition to those ephebes named on the ephebic list dating to between 80/79-78/7 B.C. who can be traced to families attested before 88/7 B.C., the majority of the ephebes in this year belong to new or unknown families.⁹⁵ Some of these ephebes would hold an archonship later in life. ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΙΤΕΑΙΟΣ, for example, might be the archon who served between 68/7-63/2 B.C. Similarly, ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ could be the archon in office between 68/7-66/5 B.C. ΖΗΝΙΩΝ, who was archon between 75/4-63/2 B.C. (or 68/7-63/2 B.C.), could be identified with either ΖΗΝΙΩΝ ΖΗΝΙΩΝ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, who was also an ephebe with ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ and ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ, or with ΖΗΝΙΩΝ

⁹⁴His cousin (or possibly brother) named ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ was also an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. He is related to ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, who was *epimeletes* of Delos in 126/5 B.C. and an orator at Athens in 124/3 B.C. See above.

⁹⁵Two sons of ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, for example, belong to a family which is unknown. Similarly, the father of two brothers, []ΣΙΩΝ and [] ΦΑΡΝΑΚΟΥ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΥ, is unknown. ΦΙΛΙΝΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΝΟΥ ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕΥΣ was an *amphithales* in 91/0 B.C. but his family cannot be identified. []ΔΗΣ ΕΥΒΙΟΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ was a *mellephebos* between 75-64 B.C. (I.G. II² 2991a). His family is not known. The name ΕΥΒΙΟΤΟΣ is rare and I think he might be related, through his mother, to the family of ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΩΝ-ΕΥΒΙΟΤΟΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ, a well-attested family before 88/7 B.C. with four ephebes but no civic offices. Sons were often named after a male relative in the female line (cf. Demosthenes 43.74 and E. Fraenkel, "Namenwesen," *RE* 16, 1619).

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ, a pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C. ΑΕΤΚΙΟΣ ΑΕΤΚΙΟΥ from Antiochis (XII) might be the archon of 59/8 B.C. Other ephebes in this year are subsequently attested in office. ΑΕΤΚΙΟΣ ΑΕΤΚΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, for example, served as a *prytanis* in c. 48 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 286) and ΑΕΩΝ ΑΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ might have served as a *prytanis* for his tribe in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89).⁹⁶ None of these individuals belong to known families. Another interesting feature about the *ephebeia* in this year is that five of the ephebes have Roman names. In addition to the two ephebes with Roman names mentioned above, there are two brothers, ΠΟΠΑΙΟΣ and ΔΕΚΜΟΣ ΠΟΠΑΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ, and ΤΙΤΟΣ ΤΙΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ.⁹⁷ These must all be considered the sons of new citizens.

The revolution of 88/7 B.C., in conclusion, went through two phases. The non-governing elites wanted political power and their slogan might have been *democratia*, but if we may judge from ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ's moderate regime, these peripheral families were not necessarily anti-Roman. The masses on the other hand wanted a complete revolution. Sulla's intervention put a quick end to their avenging reign of terror. But members of the peripheral governing class, although they ignited the fires of revolution, were not themselves consumed in its flames. After the events of 91/0-86/5 B.C., the back of the former governing oligarchy was broken for good.⁹⁸ The prosopography of magistrates in office after 86/5 B.C. shows conclusively that members of the peripheral class were able to take

⁹⁶This career is based on a conjectural restoration in the text. The name of the *prytanis* is given as ΑΕΩ[] ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ. It is either the ephebe or a relative.

⁹⁷His son was a *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C. and a grandson an ephebe in 13/2 B.C.

⁹⁸The families of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ and ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ survived into the first century. ΔΙΟΚΑΗΣ, a grandson of ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ, held the archonship in 39/8 B.C. (see Chapter 6). But the family then dies out. ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ, the son of ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ the dictator, was a Delian *pompostolos* in c. 100 B.C. (I.D. 2607) and in c. 94/3 B.C. was a patron of the gymnasium there (I.D. 1930). He became archon sometime between 75/4-63/2 B.C. (I.G. II² 1340). His daughter was a hearth-initiate in c. 50 B.C. (I.G. II² 3491). This family also dies out after this generation. In contrast, many of the "new" families in office after 88/7 B.C. which have been discussed above became very prominent under Augustus.

their place in the governing elite of Athens.⁹⁹ The ephebes in 80/79-78/7 B.C., finally, participated in the celebration of the Sylleia, games in honour of Sulla. The *ephebeia* in this year shows strong participation from families of the peripheral governing class, the same kind of families which predominate in magistracies after 87/6 B.C. If these were the families which benefited the most from Sulla's capture of the city, they might have been happy to participate in a festival in honour of Sulla.

Another consequence of the revolution of 88/7 B.C. is the permanent decline in the importance of Delos. Athens soon recovers responsibility for the administration of the island, and the occasional text from the first century B.C. records the name of an *epimeletes* of the island or a liturgist. The island never regains the importance it had acquired during the second generation for careers and the acquisition of wealth.¹⁰⁰ A number of cleruch families seem to have moved to Athens after 86 B.C., but it can be shown that several cleruch families survive after 88/7 B.C. and continue to reside on the island. A few other families may even have moved to Delos after 88/7 B.C. Perhaps these families were able to take advantage of new opportunities provided by the complete devastation of

⁹⁹Sulla had disenfranchised the rebels. This must be taken to refer to the supporters of *APIETION* and not *AΘHNION*.

¹⁰⁰There is no agreement among historians for the decline in the economic importance of Delos. The problem is obviously related to explanations for the rise of Delos as well. A.J.N. Wilson attributes the decline to 67 B.C. when Pompey destroyed the pirates and the slave trade (*Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*, Manchester, 1966). Rostovtzeff (*CAH* VIII, chap. xx, p. 647) attributes it to the levying of taxes (which seem to have been lifted in 58 B.C.). Roussel, *DCA*, p. 18, attributed the decline primarily to the destruction of the island in 88/7 B.C. Other explanations focus on the shifting of trade routes from Puteoli directly to the east, the refoundation of Corinth in 46 B.C. and even the physical destruction of Delos in 88 and 69 B.C. (Bruneau, *BCH* 92, 1968, pp. 633-709, however, downplays the importance of the destruction in either 88/7 and 69 B.C. as a factor in the decline of the island, stressing instead a shift in trading patterns during the first century B.C.). The declaration that Delos was to be free of vectigal in 58 B.C. raises the question of the status of Athens after 86 B.C. Delos was freed of taxes in 167/6 B.C. When the island became taxable again is unclear. But if Athens paid tribute after 86 B.C., the *publicani* could have considered Delos to be taxable also. The legislation in 58 B.C. would then have been only a reaffirmation of her previous tax-free status.

the community during the Mithridatic War.¹⁰¹ After c. 80 B.C., furthermore, the number of attested Athenian offices falls off sharply with the decline in the number of texts which can be dated to these years. The period from c. 80 to c. 50 B.C. is virtually unattested in the epigraphical record and presents a bleak picture, perhaps due to a drop in civic activity and a period of impoverishment. A few individuals can be identified with a known family, but Athenian prosopography only again becomes sufficient for analysis in the period beginning in about 50 B.C. with the advent of the Roman civil wars.

¹⁰¹The island, it may be said with certainty, was not deserted after 86 B.C. This can be shown from the prosopographical evidence already presented in Chapters 3 and 4 for cleruch families which survived the events of 88/7 B.C. D. van Berchem, "Les Italiens d'Argos et le déclin de Délos," *BCH* 86 (1962) pp. 305-15 (also 87, 1963, pp. 322-4), argues that the Italian collegium on Delos quickly recovered after 86 B.C. but moved to Argos after 69 B.C. Magistrates, some related to cleruch families from the second century, are attested during the first century B.C., suggesting that some families remained as residents even after 69 B.C. Note that Cicero visited the island in 51 B.C. on his way to the province of Cilicia. Unfortunately he does not comment on the condition of the island at that time.

Chapter 6

Athens During the Roman Civil Wars

The literary evidence for Athenian history in the years between the conference at Luca in 56 B.C. and the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. is severely limited. There are several passages in Cicero's letters, some details on the course of the Roman civil wars fought in Greece, but little explicit evidence for the factions or the events which dominated Athenian politics in these critical years. The generalization that the Greeks were indifferent to the civil wars and their outcome, so long as peace was assured, has been accepted as an adequate account of Greek attitudes. According to this view the Greeks were neutrals forced from time to time to lend perfunctory support to one or another faction.¹ Individual Greeks did align themselves with Roman factions; Theophanes and Potamon of Mytilene come immediately to mind,² and in Thessaly there is evidence for factional strife which was exploited by Pompey and Caesar.³ While Athenian relations with members of the Roman elite and the effect of the civil wars on Athenian politics, on the other hand, will never be known in great detail, S. Dow's description of *HPNΔHΣ* of Marathon, whom we will discuss later, as the "leading pro-Roman of his day",⁴ rings hollow. MacKendrick, in advancing a different

¹H. Bengston, *Griechische Geschichte*, Munich, 1977, p. 501. On Athens during this period see Accame, *Il Dominioromano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*, Rome, 1946, pp. 104-11, 163-87.

²Strabo 13.2.3. See also Sherk, "Caesar and Mytilene," *GRBS* 4 (1963) pp. 145-53. Is it possible that Potamon was the leader of a pro-Roman faction opposed to Theophanes?

³Caesar, *BC*, 3.35.

⁴*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 169.

account of Athenian politics at this time, suggests that there was a conflict between aristocratic (or eupatrid families) and non-aristocratic families.⁵ But he does not make a connection between this conflict and the Roman civil wars. Because eupatrid Athenians are attested in political office under Caesar as well as under Antony, we are forced to conclude that if there was factional conflict in Athens, the lines of demarcation were more complicated than MacKendrick will allow. Dow and MacKendrick, furthermore, both suppose that the Athenian attitude to the Romans was unanimous and unchanging. At a time when Rome was being torn apart by civil war, however, different groups at Athens might have taken sides and have seen their fortune bound up with the victory of the particular Roman faction which they thought would advance their own interests.⁶

In 52 B.C., C. Memmius arrived in Athens after going into exile to escape conviction for political bribery in the elections for 53 B.C. He bought some property in the deme of Melite which contained the ruins of the house of Epicurus and was granted permission by a decree of the Areopagus to build a new house on the site. Melite had long been a fashionable deme in Attica. Themistocles had purchased property there when he moved from Sounion to Athens, and he married into a family from the city deme Alopeke. When Memmius bought property in Melite he was moving into the center of Athens, and perhaps like Cicero's friend Atticus, into the center of Athenian public life. But whatever his

⁵MacKendrick, *The Athenian Aristocracy*, pp. 65-66. MacKendrick uses eupatrid status as an explanation of Athenian politics in the first century B.C. although his own narrative contradicts eupatrid status as a causal or explanatory factor for Athenian politics. MacKendrick, for example, regards the period after 38/7 B.C. as one of eupatrid domination, but ΕΥΚΛΗΣ, who was archon in 44/3 B.C. (see below) is also a eupatrid. Similarly, ΗΡΩΔΗΣ, the father of ΕΥΚΛΗΣ, was a well-known associate of Caesar, contradicting MacKendrick's account of the civil war. Similarly, he attributes I.G. II² 1713, an archon list, to "orderly eupatrid hands". But the list also covers a period he describes as one dominated by "nouveaux riches".

⁶Cf. A.N. Sherwin-White, "The Roman Citizenship: A Survey of its Development into a World Franchise," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* Vol. I.2, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin, 1972. p. 48, who asserts that there was factional strife in Greece at this time which was ideologically pro- or anti-Roman. Badian, in discussing the earlier civil war between Sulla and Marius, posed a similar question, asking how the Athenian elite responded to the civil war at Rome, *AJAH* 1 (1976).

actual intentions, the decree of the Areopagus placed Memmius at the center of a political controversy. Cicero tells us in a letter to Atticus (July 51 B.C.) that the decree was passed in the hoplite generalship of ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ.⁷ The date of ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ' generalship is unknown. But Memmius did not go into exile until 52 B.C. and had remained at Rome waiting futilely for Pompey to come to his assistance.⁸ The decree mentioning ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ could only have been passed after Memmius arrived in Athens, and the hoplite generalship of ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ probably dates to 52/1 B.C. In addition, this is the first time the hoplite general seems to be named as an eponymous magistrate in place of the archon. Some have argued that this is a slip on Cicero's part and simply reflects the rising prominence of the general against the archon. But the hoplite general, although never an eponymous magistrate,⁹ did have the right to make motions in the Areopagus. It is for this reason, I suggest, that Cicero mentions his name in the context of the decree. More importantly, the decree itself appears to be a highly partisan act. It would have been construed as a *beneficium* for a controversial Roman politician who arrived in Athens recently convicted under a retroactive application of Pompey's legislation on *ambitus*,¹⁰ and, intentionally or not, the decree infuriated the members of the Epicurean school. They raised an ineffectual storm of protest against the Areopagus -- a storm of protest which Cicero did his best to ignore. Patro, the head of the school and a friend of Atticus, wanted Cicero to approach the Areopagus directly and demand a retraction of the decree. Xeno, with better political sense, argued that Memmius' friends in the Areopagus would never agree to a retraction unless Memmius

⁷Ad Att. V.11.

⁸For the circumstances of Memmius' exile see E. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley, 1974, pp. 332, 345 and 348.

⁹See Geagan, *AC*, p. 24.

¹⁰Caesar had the exiles from Pompey's legislation recalled (*BC* 3.1) and perhaps Memmius was one of them.

himself agreed.¹¹ Cicero, hoping to avoid conflict, readily agreed with this tactic and eventually, through pressure on Memmius, the plans to build on the property were quietly dropped.¹² We do not know if the decree itself was ever formally rescinded. But the incident reveals that members of a school of philosophy at Athens turned to Roman friends of their own, principally Atticus,¹³ to seek redress against a partisan decree of the Areopagus benefitting a personal enemy of Pompey. Cicero was not ashamed to take the credit for this resolution. But Atticus, a student of Phaidros, had honoured his teacher with a statue. When members of Phaidros' family subsequently honoured Atticus himself with a statue, this could be in connection with the Memmius incident.¹⁴

Memmius, the patron of Lucretius and evidently a sympathizer of the Epicurean philosophy, had come to Athens to retire from Roman politics. This may explain his interest in the property of Epicurus. But other Romans in the 50s B.C. were also active at Athens in the construction of public buildings. The individuals involved all had political interests to advance in the Greek east, although it is impossible to prove that they had political motives in undertaking such projects. Pompey undertook to rebuild the Deigma, an important warehouse in the Peiraieus, sometime in the 50s B.C.¹⁵ At about the same time Ariobarzanes II of Cappadocia undertook to rebuild the Odeon of Pericles.¹⁶ Ariobarzanes was a client king of Pompey and heavily indebted to him both financially and politically. The construction in Athens was supervised by two

¹¹*Ad Fam.* XIII.1.

¹²*Ad Att.* V.19.

¹³It is interesting to note that Cicero refers to the Areopagus, in his letter to Atticus, as "your Areopagus" (*Ad Att.* V.11).

¹⁴*I.G.* II² 3513.

¹⁵G.R. Culley, "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: *I.G.* II² 1035," *Hesperia* 44 (1975) pp. 207-23.

¹⁶*I.G.* II² 3426 and Vit. 5.9.1.

Romans, brothers belonging to the *gens* Stallii. These individuals are otherwise unknown but the *gens* seems to hail from Lucania. They could be members of a trading family from the port of Puteoli.¹⁷ This would be the kind of family which would have benefited from Pompey's eastern settlements. Another undertaking at this time has interesting political ramifications. In about 52 B.C. Appius Claudius Pulcher began to build a Propylaea at Eleusis.¹⁸ Some have attributed this construction to his deep sense of religion. But a number of Athenian aristocratic families served in the hereditary priesthoods at Eleusis throughout the first century B.C., and the cult attracted the interest of a number of Roman aristocrats (including Sulla, Cicero, Atticus, Antony and Octavian). The direct advantages which would have accrued to Claudius Pulcher from his Propylaea are not readily apparent.¹⁹ But when Pompey appointed Claudius his chief legate in Greece in 49 B.C.,²⁰ it may not be coincidental that at the outbreak of the civil war a number of Greek cities, including Athens, came over to Pompey's side. A letter of February 50 B.C., in which Cicero mentions Claudius Pulcher's construction of the Propylaea at Eleusis, tells us that Caesar had given a certain Herodes fifty talents. Cicero's informant adds that Pompey complained in anger that his own money had been squandered. Some have argued that Pompey was thinking of debts which Caesar had never repaid, but we know from Plutarch

¹⁷Other families from that region, such as the Granii, are attested at Athens at this time. Note that M. Stalius C. f. could be related to a Roman trader on Delos attested in c. 100 B.C. as *ΜΑΑΡΚΟΣ ΣΤΑΙ[]*. Lucilius had called Puteoli a "lesser Delos" (Festus, 109L), and it would not be surprising to find relatives of one family in both places.

¹⁸Cicero, *Ad Att.* 6.1.25 and *CIL* III 547. Cicero, inspired by Claudius' example, conceived the notion of building a propylaea to the Academy. The plan was never carried out. But Marcellus, Cicero's friend, was subsequently buried at the Academy.

¹⁹Athens had indirectly become an ally of Rome in 201/0 B.C. through an incident involving the priesthood at Eleusis. Two young Acarnanians were executed for their fraudulent participation in the Eleusinian mysteries. Philip V, through a treaty with the Acarnanians, declared war on Athens for the affront. Athens then sought the alliance with Rome (Ferguson, *HA*, pp. 267-8). The consequence of executing the Acarnanian youths, however justified by tradition and religious scruple, must have been apparent to the Eleusinian priests.

²⁰Broughton, *MRR*, p. 261.

that in 60 B.C.²¹ Pompey had given the Athenians fifty talents for the construction of public monuments. This must be the money which Pompey now regarded as squandered. Pompey's anger indicates that he regarded Caesar's grant to Herodes as a political gesture and an attempt to win clients at Athens. Public works with possible political motives may be also discerned at other periods in the civil wars. In 42 B.C. M. Antony seems to have promised to rebuild the temple of Apollo at Delphi.²² His promise, which was never actually carried out, might have been an attempt to counter Octavian's propaganda that he was somehow descended from Apollo. The cult of Asclepius might also have had political affiliations. The cult was one of the few at Athens in which the priesthood was not dominated by the hereditary religious elite. The priest of the cult was allotted or appointed annually following a regular tribal cycle.²³ Several families associated with the cult in the 50s and 40s B.C. survived into the reign of Augustus. $\Sigma\Omega\text{ΚΡΑΤΗΣ } \Sigma\Omega\text{ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ } \text{ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ}$, for example, was a treasurer of his tribe's prytany in 44/3 B.C. He was the son of an ephebe in 98/7 B.C. who served after 86/5 B.C. as *agoranomos* on Delos and as priest of Apollo on the island. His uncle was priest of Asclepius in 63/2 B.C. $\text{ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ } \text{ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ } \text{ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ}$ was *polemarchos* in 56/5 B.C. His brother, $\Delta\text{ΙΟΦΑΝΗΣ}$, was priest of Asclepius in 43/2 B.C. after having served as treasurer of his tribe's prytany in either 47/6-43/2 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 278). Finally, it may be important to note that in 51/0 B.C. $\Delta\text{ΙΟΚΛΗΣ } \Delta\text{ΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ } \text{ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ}$ served as priest of Asclepius and undertook some repairs to the sanctuary.²⁴ He reappears in c. 30 B.C.

²¹Plutarch, *Pompey*, 42.5.6.

²²Plutarch, *Antony*, 23.5. R. Flacelière, "Cicéron à Delphes," *BCH Suppl* IV (1977) pp. 159-60, n. 11, argues against Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 409-10, to say that the context of Plutarch's passage refers to the Pythion at Athens and not the great temple of Apollo at Delphi.

²³For the tribal cycle see Appendix A.2. This feature of the priesthood gave the cult a strong democratic flavour well before the first century B.C.

²⁴51/0 B.C. was also the year in which ΑΤΕΙΑΔΗΣ held the archonship.

(*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 20, pp. 292-3) in an unidentified magistracy.²⁵ He is descended from a family which is well-attested in the second generation but which held no magistracies.²⁶ The reconstruction in the sanctuary undertaken by ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ might have been motivated by exceptional piety, but it is intriguing that several families associated with the cult during the first century B.C. held magistracies in the decades when Caesar and Octavian were dominant.²⁷

In addition to the involvement of prominent Romans with building programs in Greece during the 50s B.C., several other Romans were honoured at Athens and elsewhere in Greece at this time. The honours voted to these Romans could have had political motives. It is to this decade that I would date several dedications honouring M. Junius Brutus. A statue to Brutus was set up at Athens sometime after 59 B.C. when he was adopted by Q. Servilius Caepio. A plausible occasion would be 53 B.C. when he served as *quaestor* in Cilicia for Ap. Claudius Pulcher, his father-in-law and governor of the province.²⁸ It may also have been at this time that Brutus was honoured at Oropus.²⁹ Brutus was also honoured with a dedication on Delos, although Q. Hortensius Hortalus is named on the dedication in a manner which suggests that Brutus was absent and Hortalus was acting on his behalf.³⁰ This suggests that Hortalus was acting as an agent for

²⁵He is named in this text as only [] ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ.

²⁶See Chapter 5.

²⁷Note that ΕΥΔΟΞΟΣ ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ was a *mellephebos* in 95/4 B.C. He held a senior magistracy in 57/6 B.C. His son would become priest of Asclepius under Augustus (*I.G.* II² 4474). Only one family associated with the cult of Asclepius may be identified with a different faction (see ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ below).

²⁸A.E. Raubitschek, "The Brutus Statue in Athens," *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigraphia greca et latina*, Rome, 1959, pp. 15-21, dates the dedication to 44 B.C. See also Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Brutus*, Munich, 1970, pp. 13-4. He is sceptical of Raubitschek's identification of the honorand on the dedication as Brutus.

²⁹*I.G.* VII 383.

³⁰*I.D.* 1622.

Brutus in the east. He had served as a fleet commander in 49 B.C. but his operations at that time were confined to the Adriatic. It is possible that he sailed to the Aegean in 48 B.C. when Pompey fled to the east. Equally plausible as an occasion for the Delian dedication, however, would be some previous unrecorded occasion when Hortulus was acting, perhaps in some financial transaction, on Brutus' behalf in the Greek east.³¹ Two Roman brothers, L. and Ap. Saufei Ap. f., were also honoured at Athens at this time. They were related to a family of *negotiatores* on Delos,³² and L. Saufei, at least, was a resident of Athens and a good friend of Atticus. The brothers were both students of Phaidros the Epicurean philosopher and honoured him with a dedication.³³ They were themselves honoured by the Athenian *demos* sometime before Appius Saufei died in 51 B.C. The political affiliations of Appius are intriguing. It is reported that he was fond of Cicero for the conviction *de vi* of T. Minatius Plancus Bursa, a tribune of Pompey. If we accept an emendation proposed by A. Raubitschek, Appius himself was defended by Cicero and M. Caelius and acquitted in another politically motivated trial at this time.³⁴ This would clearly mark Appius as an enemy of Pompey. The political importance of the dedications voted by the *demos* for Appius and his brother remains unknown. But the Saufei brothers were students of Phaidros whose son, ΑΡΕΙΑΔΗΣ , was elected archon in 51/0 B.C. After the assassination of Julius Caesar, ΑΡΕΙΑΔΗΣ was nominated by Antony, to the disgust of Cicero, for a rigged jury.³⁵ This evidence suggests that factions at Athens were already aligning themselves with Roman factions before the actual outbreak of the civil war in 49 B.C.

³¹It makes sense to associate the dedications at Athens and Delos to Brutus' quaestorship. When Cicero was governor of Cilicia in 51/0 B.C. he followed this route on his way to the province.

³²*I.D.* 1754-5.

³³*I.G.* II² 3897.

³⁴Raubitschek, "Phaidros and his Roman Pupils," *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p. 102-3. But cf. Gruen, *Last Generation*, pp. 343-4.

³⁵Cicero, *Phil.*, V.5.13-4.

The prosopographical evidence for magistrates in office during the 50s B.C. allows us to identify a number of individuals and families which were politically active at this time. Virtually all of these families are "new" and cannot be traced to political families from the second generation attested before 88/7 B.C. Some of the magistrates at this time cannot even be identified prosopographically. *ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ*, for example, served in an unknown magistracy in 61/0 and 56/5 B.C. The office he held seems to have been an important one, for the archon *ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΟΣ*, who also cannot be identified, served in the same capacity in 63/2 and 62/1 B.C.³⁶ *ΘΕΟΓΝΙΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ* served in c. 50 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1711) as an *agoranomos*. He is a descendant of a gymnasiarch on Delos in 159/8 B.C. The family, however, cannot be traced through the second generation. *ΑΓΑΣΙΑΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ*, who served as a treasurer of the stratiotic fund in 55/4-54/3 B.C., is a descendant of a *proedros* in 155/4 B.C. Again the family is not known to have held any intervening magistracies. Finally, *ΘΕΑΝΤΕΛΟΣ ΘΕΑΝΤΕΛΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΙΔΗΣ*, *proedros* in 52/1 B.C., is descended from a cleruch family with several attested members in c. 100 B.C. Members of the family are not known to have held any civic magistracies during the second generation. The obscurity of these magistrates and their families may reflect the impact of the events in 88/7 B.C. on the composition of the governing class.³⁷

Other attested magistrates in the 50s B.C., on the other hand, can be traced to individuals or families of the peripheral class which must have participated in some way in the events of 88/7 B.C. But some of these families, such as that of *ΘΡΑΣΩΝ ΕΥΘΥΚΑΡΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ*, nonetheless remain obscure in origin. *ΘΡΑΣΩΝ* was elected *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C. and thereby joined the Areopagus. He is the grandson of a homonymous orator from 135/4 B.C. Otherwise the family is unattested. *ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ*, in contrast, was *epimeletes* of Delos in 54/3 B.C. Having been a pythaist *pais* in

³⁶See Dow, *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 118.

³⁷See Chapter 5.

98/7 B.C., he was a youth during the revolution of 88/7 B.C., too young to have held magistracies, perhaps, but old enough to have served as a soldier. His father had been a *epimeletes* of Delos in 98/7 B.C. and so was part of the governing elite at this time. A son of ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ, ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΣ, became a *prytanis* under Augustus (*Agora* XV, n. 303). But ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ is the last member of the family who is known to have belonged to the Areopagus. The family of ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΟΙΝΟΦΙΑΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ, on the other hand, is one of the best attested families from the middle years of the first century B.C. ΕΥΚΛΗΣ served as a gymnasiarch in c. 50 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3151) and his sister, ΚΑΕΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΑ, was priestess of Demeter and Kore at about the same time (*I.G.* II² 3490). A relative, ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΑΜΦΙΟΥ, also served as *prytanis* at this time (*Agora* XV, n. 275). And ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ, the father of ΕΥΚΛΗΣ and ΚΑΕΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΑ, seems to have risen from junior magistracies to become archon after 88/7 B.C.³⁸ Other magistrates can also be identified prosopographically. When the Areopagus considered the dispute over the property of Memmius in 51/0 B.C., for example, some of the following individuals could have been present. ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ was elected archon in 61/0 B.C. and, in 56/5 B.C., became herald of the Areopagus. He is the son of a Delian gymnasiarch in 103/2 B.C. and a grandson of a man who held a junior magistracy in the first generation. A member of the *genos* of the Eumolpidae, ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ' son served under Augustus as *hierophantes* (*I.G.* II² 3512) and, in 13/2 B.C., as *kosmetes* of the ephebes. The family therefore survived the civil wars and the brief oligarchic regime under Antony and remained part of the governing class during the last half of the first century B.C. Similarly, ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ was *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C. His son was elected eponymous archon in 30/29 B.C. This was a significant year, following Octavian's victory over Antony in 31/0 B.C. The election of the younger ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ must reflect the family's political loyalties. Another member of the Areopagus would be ΑΓΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ, who was

³⁸The family belongs to the Philaidai. ΕΥΚΛΗΣ was adopted by ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ, who is otherwise unknown (*I.G.* II² 3151). On ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ, see Chapter 5.

archon in 52/1 B.C. His father was an ephebe in 117/6 B.C. but held no magistracies afterwards. A grandfather was an *agonothetes* in c. 140 B.C. (*I.G.* Π² 961). A second archon can be traced to a peripheral family attested from the second generation. *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΙΑΕΤΣ* was archon in 55/4 B.C. His father had been a priest of Apollo in c. 80 B.C. (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 55) and his grandfather an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. *ΚΑΛΛΙΦΩΝ ΚΑΛΛΙΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ* was archon in 58/7 B.C. He is the son of an *agoranomos* on Delos, *ΚΑΛΛΙΦΩΝ ΣΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ*, in 124/3 B.C. An ephebe in 80-77 B.C., *ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ*, was *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C. and held an unidentified magistracy in 54/3 B.C. His father had been a member of the Areopagus and served in 126/5 B.C. as *epimeletes* of Delos and in 124/3 B.C. as an orator. *ΙΑΣΩΝ ΘΗΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ* was king-archon in 56/5 B.C. His adoptive family is very well-attested but held no civic magistracies.³⁹ Finally, *ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ ΣΩΠΟΛΙΔΟΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ* was *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C. His father was ephebe in 117/6 B.C. and held no intervening offices. A son, *ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ*, became ephebe in 38/7 B.C. In spite of the success of these families in the 50s B.C., none of their families are attested under Augustus.⁴⁰

Most of the magistrates who held office during the 50s B.C. seem to be descended from families which enjoyed only peripheral status during the second

³⁹ Similarly, his natural father, *ΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, was a *kleidouchos* on Delos in 94/3 B.C. and may be related to *ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, a *toxotes* in 123/2 B.C., and his son, *ΤΙΜΟΞΕΝΟΣ*, who was ephebe in 107/6 B.C.

⁴⁰ The fact that a member of one family, *ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ*, served as an ephebe under Antony may be significant.

generation.⁴¹ It is impossible to infer the political allegiances of specific

⁴¹A number of *prytaneis* who served in the 50s B.C. may also be mentioned here. Virtually all of these individuals belong to obscure families. Two cousins, ΜΕΛΙΤΩΝ ΜΕΔΟΝΤΟΣ and ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΙ, served as *prytaneis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 275). Their family is otherwise unattested. ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΓΕΙΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ and his son, ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ, served together as *prytaneis* at about the same time (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89). ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΥΣ ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΩΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ served as a magistrate on Delos in 50/49 B.C. and in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 51, 1982, n. 9, pp. 209-10)⁴² as a *prytanis*. ΣΟΤΝΙΑΔΗΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ served as a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 267) and again in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 18, pp. 289-90). Other *prytaneis* in the 50s B.C. can be more securely identified. ΛΕΩΝ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ was an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. and a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89). Similarly, ΦΙΛΟΜΗΛΟΣ ΕΥΜΑΧΟΥ ΧΟΛΛΕΙΔΗΣ, *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 272),⁴³ might have been an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΘΕΑΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ, a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 273), is the son of an ephebe from 107/6 B.C. His father first served as a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 267) and then iterated in the office when he served with his son. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΖΩΠΥΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, another *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89), is the son of an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. and a grandson of a *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C. ΙΑΣΩΝ ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ (Tribe X), a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 267), might be the son of an ephebe in 123/2 B.C. and a brother of ΘΕΟΦΙΛΗ, an *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C. Their father might have been archon in 109/8 B.C. ΘΟΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ, *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 273), is the son of an ephebe in 107/6 B.C. and a great-grandson of a liturgist in 149/8 B.C. (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ, I.G. II² 1938). ΖΩΠΥΡΟΣ ΟΝΑΣΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ, another *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 275), must be related in some way to ΟΝΑΣΩ ΘΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ, a priestess of the Mother of the Gods in c. 100 B.C. (I.G. II² 1334). ΑΝΑΣ[] ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ, a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89), could be related to ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΝΑΣΙΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ, who served as a secretary in 125/4 B.C. Similarly, ΑΥΣΑΝ[] ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ, also a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89), could be related to a ΑΥΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΘΕΩΡΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ, who was himself *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C. and whose father was a liturgist in c. 130 B.C. (AM 97, 1982, p. 101). A relative, ΘΕΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΩΡΟΥ (Tribe IX), was ephebe in 98/7 B.C. ΤΕΛΕΣΙΔΗΜΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ was *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 275). He must be related to ΗΡΑΚΩΝ ΧΑΡΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ (Tribe V), a *phylarchos* in 106/5 B.C. Only one of these mid-century *prytaneis* can be traced to an Areopagite family from the second generation. ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ served as an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. and a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 273).⁴⁴ His father was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 113/2 B.C. and a temple administrator in 108/7 B.C.

⁴²This is a conjectural career. The *prytanis* appears as [] ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΩΣ in a fragmentary list without tribal affiliation, but the name is so rare that this is a plausible collation.

⁴³This is a highly conjectural career. The ephebe is named as ΦΙΛΟΜΗΛΟΣ ΕΥΜΑΧΟΥ ΧΟΛΛΕΙΔΗΣ. The *prytanis* is attested as ΦΙΛΟΜΗΛΟΣ ΕΥΜΗΛΟΥ ΧΟΛΛΕΙΔΗΣ. The names are so similar that scribal error or a family affiliation might be postulated.

⁴⁴The *prytanis* is named as only [] ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ. But the ephebe would have been just the right age to have been a *prytanis* around this time. In any case, the ephebe and the *prytanis* are probably related.

individuals or families. Some families must have declined during the tumultuous years of the 40s and 30s B.C. as a consequence of political circumstances. Members of other families attested during the 50s B.C. are attested in office during the early 40s B.C. or the early years of Octavian's rise to power. This suggests that certain individuals and families were successful in supporting Caesar against Pompey and later Octavian against Antony. ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, for example, was *polemarchos* in 56/5 B.C. and then served twice as *prytanis* between 50 and 40 B.C. (*Agora XV*, nn. 280 and 278). His brother, ΔΙΟΦΑΝΗΣ, was treasurer of the prytany between 47/6-43/2 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 278) and, in 43/2 B.C., held the priesthood of Asclepius. The family cannot be traced past this generation, although it was very prominent during the 50s and 40s B.C. Other identifiable families from the 40s B.C. are members of the peripheral governing class. ΖΗΝΩΝ ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served as a *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. and again in either 47/6 or 43/2 B.C. (*Agora XV*, nn. 280 and 278). ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served as *prytanis* in the same years as ΖΗΝΩΝ. ΕΠΑΤΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served in the same office between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 280) and his son in c. 40 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89). ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΦΙΛΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ and his son, ΔΙΦΙΛΟΣ, served together in c. 50 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89). ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ subsequently served again in the 40s B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 280). He is the son of a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and his uncle was a pythaist in 98/7 B.C. Two cousins, ΑΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΕΠΑΤΩΝΟΣ and ΕΠΑΤΩΝ ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served together in either 47/6 or 43/2 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 278). An individual known only as []ΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 280). ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, who served in either 47/6 or 43/2 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 278), could be a relative. ΑΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΑΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ was an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. and served as *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 280).

Although none of the magistrates named above or their families are attested after 40 B.C., a few other magistrates who served in the 50s and 40s B.C. are known to have survived into the reign of Augustus. ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΥΛΟΥ

ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ, for example, was a *prytanis* and a secretary of his tribe's prytany in the 50s B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 18, pp. 289-90 and *Agora* XV, n. 273).⁴⁵ He reappears in 29/8 B.C. as an *agoranomos*. ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ Ο[] ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥ served as a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 267) and again between 30-20 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 289). Similarly, ΙΟΦΩΝ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ served as a *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 46, pp. 236-7) and again in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 21, pp. 293-94). ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥ was a priest of Asclepius in 51/0 B.C. and a magistrate in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 20, pp. 292-3). He is descended from a family which is well-attested in the second generation but which did not belong to the governing elite. ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΠΟΣΕΟΥΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥ was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 273) and again between 30-20 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 289).⁴⁶ He is descended from a family which also 'belonged to the peripheral governing class during the second generation. His father, interestingly, managed to become *thesmothetes* after 88/7 B.C.⁴⁷ Finally, ΑΕΤΚΙΟΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥ was a *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 278) and an orator in 36/5 B.C. ΜΕΝΝΕΑΣ ΜΕΝΝΕΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥ, a *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 280), served as a *hymnagogos* in 20/19 B.C. when he was in his sixties. He might have been an orator in c. 50 B.C.⁴⁸ These examples are the only evidence for the survival of individuals from the domination of Caesar to the reign of Augustus.

Other magistrates attested in office in the 50s and 40s B.C. belong to families with descendants who held various magistracies in the 30s B.C. or during the reign of Augustus. Thus, ΕΥΔΗΜΟΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥ was herald of the archon in 56/5 B.C. This is a low-ranking magistracy but possibly a stepping-

⁴⁵The *prytanis* is attested as ΔΙΟΝΟΥΣ[] of tribe X. The secretary is known only as ΔΙΟ[] ΜΑΡΑΘΝΙΟΣ. This career, therefore, is only speculative.

⁴⁶This is a conjectural career. In the latter text, the *prytanis* is named as ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ Τ[] ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥ. Because the T is dotted it could stand for Π.

⁴⁷On these last two families see Chapter 5.

⁴⁸The orator is named only as ΜΕΝΝ[] (*I.G.* II² 1052).

stone to the archonship itself.⁴⁹ His son would become a prominent magistrate under Augustus. ΕΤΡΕΤΡΑΤΟΣ []ΕΟΥ ΛΟΥΣΙΕΥΣ was *epimeletes* of Delos in c. 50 B.C. (*I.D.* 1625). His son, ΕΝΣΕΟΣ, appears as a *prytanis* in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 21, pp. 293-94)⁵⁰ Similarly, ΑΙΞΙΝΗΣ ΑΙΞΙΝΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΠΕΥΣ was a *prytanis* in c. 60 and c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, nn. 267 and 273). A son or relative served as treasurer of his tribe's prytany between 30-20 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 289).⁵¹ ΜΑΝΙΟΣ ΒΡΑΚΚΙΟΣ ΧΟΜΕΙΔΗΣ was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 272) together with his son. The son went on to hold a magistracy in 34/3 B.C. ΙΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ was a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and an ephēbe in 102/1 B.C. He may have been a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 275). His grandson or nephew, ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΣΚΑΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ, was a *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C. []ΑΙΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ (Tribe IV) was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 272). A relative, ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ (Tribe IV), would serve as *prytanis* early in the first century A.D. (*Agora* XV, n. 307). Similarly, ΕΝΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΕΠΑΙΝΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΠΕΥΣ was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 273). A son or cousin, ΕΠΑΙΝΟΣ ΕΤΦΟΝΙΟΥ, was a *hieromnemon* between A.D. 1-13 (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 64). The family of ΗΡΩΔΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, which will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter, may be mentioned here as an example of another family which is attested in the Areopagus during the 50s B.C. and which prospered under Augustus. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ served as *architheoros* of the *genos* of the Erysichthonidai in 98/7 B.C. and reappears in c. 50 B.C. as an *epimeletes* of the Lyceum (*I.G.* II² 2875). His son could be ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, a pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C. (and *hieromnemon* in 20/19 B.C. at 91 years of age?). Finally, attention must be drawn to another magistrate with possible philosophical connections in the 50s B.C. This is the archon of 51/0

⁴⁹See Chapter 2.

⁵⁰Perhaps []ΕΟΥ should be restored [ΕΝ]ΕΟΥ.

⁵¹The treasurer is named as [.....] ΑΙΞΙ[] ΦΑΛΗΠΕΥΣ. He is probably a relative of our ΑΙΞΙΝΗΣ.

B.C., *ΑΡΣΙΑΔΗΣ ΦΑΙΔΡΟΥ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ*, who was the son of the famous Epicurean philosopher. An ancestor, *ΑΡΣΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ*, was archon in 149/8 B.C. but the family declined during the second generation⁵² only to rise again into the Areopagus with the election of *ΑΡΣΙΑΔΗΣ* as archon, an event which could be related, as was suggested above, to the dispute over the property of Memmius.

Another Roman visitor, M. Claudius Marcellus, the notorious consul of 51 B.C., was to attract political interest at Athens around this time. In 50 B.C. he left Rome for the last time to go into exile at Mytilene. He must have passed through Athens on his way, and, although none of our sources explicitly mention a visit by him to Athens at this time, this is when I believe the Areopagus passed a decree honouring Marcellus and his wife for their *sophrosyne*.⁵³ For some reason the name of Marcellus has been erased from the stone. This led O. Broneer, the first editor, to date the inscription to 45 B.C. after Marcellus had been murdered in the Peiraieus. The decree, however, gives no indication that Marcellus was dead at the time it was passed, and the use of *sophrosyne*, a rare word in dedications, seems an inappropriate epitaph for a man who was killed in a brawl in the Peiraieus.⁵⁴ Cicero defines *sophrosyne* as the Greek equivalent of *moderatio*, *temperantia* and *modestia*.⁵⁵ It is also used by Greek authors for a moderate political constitution. Although Marcellus was a bit too extreme in his

⁵²See Chapter 5.

⁵³*I.G.* II² 4111. See O. Broneer, "Greek Inscriptions of Roman Date," *AJA* 36 (1932) pp. 395-7. J. Oliver, "The Descendants of Asinius Pollio," *AJPh* 68 (1947) pp. 147-60, restores the name differently and dates the text to the reign of Tiberius.

⁵⁴Note that Pompey's wife was honoured for her *sophrosyne* in 49 B.C. by Pergamum (*SIG* 758).

⁵⁵Cicero, *Tusc.*, 3.16.

strict defence of the Republic for Cicero's liking,⁵⁶ it is plausible that when he arrived in Athens he was honoured by those members of the Areopagus who agreed with his ideology and his politics.⁵⁷ It should be pointed out in this context that Marcellus had chosen Mytilene, at this time a bastion of support for Pompey,⁵⁸ as his place of exile. The erasure of his name can also be explained differently. When Athens went over to Caesar in 48 B.C. the Athenians themselves or Roman partisans could have erased the name of the still-hated Marcellus. After Caesar pardoned Marcellus in 46 B.C., it is unlikely anyone would have cared to erase the name. In 42 B.C. the year to which Broneer dated the erasure, there were more recent grievances to exercise men's minds.

After Marcellus left Athens he did not return until his fateful arrival in March of 45 B.C. In the meantime Pompey had raised forces in the east, appointed Appius Claudius Pulcher his legate in Greece and won the support of Athens along with other Greek cities. It is impossible to determine how the Athenians decided to send Pompey ships and supplies but there is no reason to assume that the Athenians were unanimous in their decision. In fact, it is more plausible to suppose that neither Pompey or Caesar had overwhelming support in the city. We learn from Appian that before the struggle began both Pompey and Caesar approached the Athenians asking them to refrain from participating in the civil war.⁵⁹ The Athenians are reported to have replied that they wanted a say in the outcome. This appeal, if it is historical, suggests that Pompey and Caesar,

⁵⁶Although Cicero does praise Marcellus for his outstanding *constantia* (*Ad Att.* 13.10.3). *Constantia* is usually glossed by *moderantia* and *fides*, all words expressive of the aristocratic ideal.

⁵⁷As we will see later, there is no reason to suppose that the Athenians officially honoured Marcellus after the murder.

⁵⁸Mytilene honoured Pompey with altars, a forerunner of the altars dedicated to the Roman emperors (Geagan, "Imperial Visits: The Epigraphical Evidence," *Transactions of the International Congress on Greek and Latin Epigraphy, 3-9 October 1982*, Athens, 1984, p. 73 and n. 17).

⁵⁹Appian, *BC*, II.70.

unsure of their own support in the city, were anxious to deny the city to their opponent. Also, when Q. Fufius Calenus, Caesar's legate in Greece, entered Attica he was able to ravage the countryside and the unwalled Peiraieus, but not the city itself.⁶⁰ This incident shows that the city still had walls and, by implication, could have resisted either Caesar or Pompey if it had chosen to do so.⁶¹ Some Athenian politicians, therefore, were able to carry a decision to send support to Pompey. Their only motive would have been self-interest and they expected Pompey to prevail as he had in other eastern campaigns. But once Calenus was overrunning Attica, the wisdom or advantage in supporting Pompey would have seemed less apparent to those in the middle, who may have begun to waver. Dio Cassius tells us that the Athenians surrendered to Caesar after the defeat of Pompey at Pharsalus.⁶² But Appian reports a slightly different story. He says that on the second day after the battle Caesar met with what he calls "the suppliant Athenians" and Caesar then pardoned the city for supporting Pompey.⁶³ It would have been impossible for the city to dispatch envoys to Pharsalus so soon after the battle and so the identity of these suppliant Athenians is a mystery.⁶⁴ They could have been Athenians who had served with Pompey and who were now claiming to speak for the city. But would they have received an audience with Caesar so soon after the battle? Another possibility is that these Athenians represented a different faction in the city. They might have requested an audience with Caesar before the battle, or, exercising greater prudence, they

⁶⁰Dio 42.14.

⁶¹For the rebuilding of the walls see Papalas, "Roman Athens," p. 15. J. Travlos, *A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London, 1971, p. 161, dates the rebuilding of the walls after their destruction in 86 B.C. to the reign of Valerian.

⁶²Dio 42.14.1.

⁶³Appian, *BC*, II.88.

⁶⁴The news of the battle would have to be conveyed to Athens, a meeting convened, envoys selected and dispatched to Caesar. When they arrived the envoys would have had to contact Caesar's entourage and request an audience. All of this would have taken time.

might have waited nearby until the outcome was certain.⁶⁵ In any case, we have to appreciate the dilemma facing the Athenians belonging to all factions. Caesar's *clementia* was not to be counted on, and there must have been anxiety in the city when the outcome of the struggle began to look more uncertain.

Although Caesar pardoned the city, his victory and his pardon were not without consequences for some members of the Athenian population, as later events will show. The individuals who had supported Pompey were probably affected in some way while the *demos* seems to have benefitted from Caesar's period of domination. The *demos* acting alone erected two monuments in the name of Caesar. It was also in the 40s B.C. that an association called the Soteriastai was founded by ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ. The association had a priest, *archeranistes* and a treasurer.⁶⁶ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ is otherwise unknown. His association could have been formed to celebrate Caesar's victory (Caesar was honoured by the *demos* as a saviour or *soter* between 47-44 B.C.).⁶⁷ Decrees from this period do not exhibit the oligarchic features of other decrees from the preceding and following decades.⁶⁸ Evidence for a temporary change in Athenian politics is also found in the prosopographical evidence for the few magistrates who are attested in office during the crucial years of the Roman civil war. ΣΙΜΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΘΟΡΑΚΙΟΣ was a magistrate on Delos in 49/8 B.C. His family is obscure although a relative, ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ, was a priest of

⁶⁵In 168 B.C. Rhodian ambassadors were not as careful. They arrived before the battle of Pydna offering mediation to Aemilius Paullus (Livy 44.35.4-6). When Aemilius won his decisive victory, the Rhodians were seriously compromised.

⁶⁶*I.G. II*² 1343.

⁶⁷*I.G. II*² 3222 and *SEG* XIV.121 (see Geagan, *Transactions of the International Congress on Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, 3-9 October 1982, p. 71). Cf. Ferguson, *Klio* 7 (1907) p. 214.

⁶⁸*I.G. II*² 1041, 1063, *Agora* XV, n. 281 and *Hesperia* 34 (1975) p. 255ff (= *I.G. II*² 1040+1025). Geagan regards these decrees as evidence of a brief revival of former democratic practices during the 40s B.C. (*AC*, p. 69). See also Geagan, *ANRW* II.7.1, 1979, pp. 375-6 (with bibliography pp. 416-7). The date of these documents is crucial for dating the period of "democratic" government. Accame attempts to date the democratic constitution to the arrival in Athens of Brutus in 44 B.C.

the Cynthian deities in c. 100 B.C. (*I.D.* 2419). The father of $\Delta\text{HMOKPAT}\text{H}\Sigma$ was a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939) and his grandfather, $\text{TIMOKPAT}\text{H}\Sigma$, served as *epi tas prosodous* in 182/1 B.C. ΣIMON , therefore, held the first attested civic magistracy in this family for several generations in the year of the outbreak of the civil war. This was also the year when a $\Delta\text{HMOXAPH}\Sigma$ was archon. He cannot be securely identified.⁶⁹ Similarly, $\Delta\text{IONTEO}\Delta\text{NPO}\Sigma$ $\text{MOEXIONNO}\Sigma$ $\text{TPIKOPT}\Sigma\text{IO}\Sigma$ held an unspecified Delian magistracy in 44/3 and 43/2 B.C. At about the same time he also served as *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 1818). His family, too, cannot be identified. The same is true for $\text{APIETONIKO}\Sigma$ $\text{ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟ}\Sigma$ $\text{AZHNIET}\Sigma$, who served as *prytanis* in either 47/6 or 43/2 B.C. (*Agora XV*, n. 278) and in 44/3 B.C. might have become king-archon.⁷⁰

Apart from $\text{APIETONIKO}\Sigma$, the only senior magistrates in the 40s B.C. whose names are known to us are the eponymous archons. Their prosopography is especially rewarding. In 45/4 B.C. the archon was $\text{ΑΠΟΛΗ}\Sigma\text{Ι}\Sigma$. He is the son of $\text{ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩ}\text{N}$ of Teos, a philosopher who migrated to Athens, received Athenian citizenship and was adopted into a family from Oion.⁷¹ $\text{ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩ}\text{N}$ was one of the principal actors in the democratic revolution of 88/7 B.C. which led to the sack of the city by Sulla.⁷² The family into which he was adopted can be traced into the second century but $\text{ΑΠΟΛΗ}\Sigma\text{Ι}\Sigma$ would belong to the first generation of the family to be attested in a senior magistracy. $\text{ΑΠΟΛΗ}\Sigma\text{Ι}\Sigma$ was succeeded by $\text{ΕΥΚΛΗ}\Sigma$, son of the $\text{ΗΡΩΔΗ}\Sigma$ of Marathon who had received the fifty talents from Caesar a few years before. $\text{ΗΡΩΔΗ}\Sigma$ himself had been archon in 60/59 B.C. and

⁶⁹There are two possibilities. He could be related to $\text{MENANΔPO}\Sigma$ $\text{AZHNIET}\Sigma$, whom I identify as the archon in 38/7 B.C. But the name $\Delta\text{HMOXAPH}\Sigma$ also appears in a family from Aithalidai attested in the second century B.C.

⁷⁰As pointed out in Chapter 2, this is a conjectural collation. The king-archon in 44/3 is known only by his patronymic $\text{ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟ}\Sigma$. But in such a turbulent period it is plausible that our *prytanis* or a relative would become archon.

⁷¹*PA* 1343. E. Kapetanopoulos, "Apolexis ex Oiou," *Athenaeum* 1974, pp. 345-7, questions the identification of $\text{ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩ}\text{N}$ as a member of this family.

⁷²See Chapter 5.

ΕΥΚΛΗΣ would serve as a life-long priest of Apollo to the end of the first century. Only fifteen years separate the archonships of father and son, and this forces us to conclude that *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* attained the archonship at 30 years of age or shortly thereafter, while his father could not have become archon until at least his early 40s. It is plausible that *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ'* career was advanced because of his father's association with Caesar.⁷³ Later *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* would complete the agora which was begun in Athens under Caesar's direction.⁷⁴ *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ'* sons would also serve in a number of senior magistracies at Athens and eventually the family would produce the millionaire and sophist Herodes Atticus.⁷⁵ As with *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* and his family, *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* and *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* are the first members of their family to be attested in senior magistracies.⁷⁶ The predecessor to *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* in the archonship is none other than *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*, probably the hoplite general from 52/1 B.C. His family connections are uncertain. P. Roussel identified him as a member of a family from the deme Azenia, although the evidence for this connection is not certain.⁷⁷ There is a second more interesting possibility as well. *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* had a son named *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*. Because the name of the eldest son in this family generally alternated between *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* and *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ*, it is possible that *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* had an unattested elder son named *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ*. His attested son, *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*, could have been named after an uncle or relative. *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*, the archon of 46/5 B.C., and *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ*, both apparently supporters of Caesar, would have been brothers or cousins. Even if we accept Roussel's identification, the conclusion is the same, for in either case *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ* was a political *arriviste*.

⁷³The archon list from 44/3 B.C., the year when *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* was archon, is fragmentary. Only the patronymics of the other archons can be read. But none of these men can be identified even tentatively. In contrast, over sixty archons can be identified prosopographically during the Augustan period (see Chapter 7).

⁷⁴*I.G.* II² 3175.

⁷⁵Graindor, *Hérode Atticus et sa famille*, pp. 1-9.

⁷⁶*ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* might have dedicated an altar to Athena Democratia in 89/8 B.C. (cf. Ferguson, *HA*, p. 444). Raubitschek redated the dedication to the Augustan period on the basis of letter forms (*Hesperia* 31, 1962, p. 240).

⁷⁷*I.D.* 2509.

ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ, as we saw above, was associated in some way with the decree of the Areopagus in favour of C. Memmius. When he was archon in 46/5 B.C., ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ may have been involved in another incident at Athens involving a prominent Roman politician. This incident, unlike the dispute over the property of Memmius, had more serious consequences. In March of ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ' archonship M. Marcellus departed from Mytilene to return to Rome and presumably to a reconciliation with Caesar. He arrived in Athens, stayed for a few days in a tent in the Peiraieus, got into a brawl with a minor partisan of Caesar's and was mortally wounded with a knife. We know the details of the murder and subsequent events because of a letter written in March of 45 B.C. by Cicero's correspondent Servius Sulpicius Rufus, who was in Athens at the time.⁷⁸ When Sulpicius heard the news he rushed to Marcellus' tent only to find that Marcellus' slaves had fled in panic and Marcellus had already died. The details provided by Sulpicius all provide tantalizing political implications. First, it is odd that Marcellus, according to Sulpicius, stayed in a tent while in Athens. This detail has caused Athenian historians considerable difficulty. J. Day in his economic history of Athens argues that Marcellus stayed in a tent because he preferred the outdoors.⁷⁹ A. Papalas, however, argued that the letter from Sulpicius is evidence for a serious economic decline at Athens. According to Papalas, the Peiraieus was no longer equipped to accommodate travellers with hotels and so Marcellus was forced into a tent in March.⁸⁰ Both explanations miss the more obvious question -- why did Marcellus not stay with a friend in the city? When Cicero visited Athens in 51 B.C. he and his brother stayed with Greek hosts in the very centre of Athens.⁸¹ Similarly Plutarch tells us that Brutus,

⁷⁸*Ad Fam.* IV.12.

⁷⁹Day, *Economic History*, p. 144.

⁸⁰Papalas, "Roman Athens," p. 29, n. 5.

⁸¹*Ad Att.* V.11.

when he arrived in Athens in 44 B.C., stayed with a friend in the city.⁸² We must assume, therefore, that no one in Athens was willing to put Marcellus up or, perhaps more likely, Marcellus was unwilling to impose his presence on an Athenian or Roman host in the city. This explanation is consistent with Athenian behaviour following his murder.

The murder of Marcellus was popularly attributed to Caesar. The rumour has little credence among modern historians and Cicero himself eventually went to some effort to discount the accusation.⁸³ But if, in the weeks following the murder, Caesar was widely suspected at Rome, how did the Athenians interpret the event in the hours and days after it occurred? Sulpicius tells Cicero in his letter that he approached the Athenians (How he made the request and to whom is unclear) and asked for permission to bury Marcellus inside the city. He was told that this was contrary to Athenian custom and was told he could bury Marcellus at the Academy. Burial within city walls was an uncommon practice in any pre-modern society apart from random burials of infants in the walls of houses.⁸⁴ At Rome there was a ban on cremations or burials within the *pomerium*, which in historical times was roughly defined by the perimeter of the city walls. Sulpicius' request, therefore, deserves closer scrutiny. At this time Sulpicius was serving as a legate in Greece. Although his exact position and his duties remain unclear,⁸⁵ he would not have had any direct authority over the Athenians. This would have precluded him from making a direct request that the

⁸²Plutarch, *Brutus*, 24.1.

⁸³F. Munzer, "Claudius", *RE* III, n. 229, 2764.

⁸⁴R.S. Young observes that the ban on burial did not apply to children, who were cremated or buried in the perimeter of the Agora down to the 3rd century B.C. ("*Sepulturae intra murem*," *Hesperia* 20, 1951, p. 67). F.E. Winter, "*Sepulturae intra murem* and the pre-Persian Walls of Athens," *Hesperia* Supplement XIX, 1982, pp. 199-204, dates the ban on burials in the region of the Agora to c. 490 B.C. and the construction of the Themistoclean wall. The Valerian wall, like the pre-Persian perimeter defence, excluded the Agora and consequently late Roman burials are found in the Agora after 267 A.D.

⁸⁵Broughton, *MRR*, p. 310.

Athenians publicly bury Marcellus or honour him in some way. He was granted as a concession a burial at the Academy, but this was not an unusual gesture. From excavations at the Academy, it is clear that the Academy and its environs served as one of the major cemeteries in Athens.⁸⁶ The place of honour in Athens, the place where soldiers or statesmen were buried at public expense with a *demosion sema*, was on the road leading from the city walls towards the Academy, not the Academy itself.⁸⁷ Sulpicius might have made an impossible request knowing it would be rejected, but hoping that the Athenians would respond with an offer of a public funeral. When the Athenians indicated to Sulpicius that he could hold a funeral for Marcellus at the Academy, they were diplomatically refusing Sulpicius' request for public honours for Marcellus.⁸⁸ There is a second possibility, although the conclusion is the same. Sulpicius tells Cicero that he asked for a *sepultura* inside the city walls. Previous commentators have taken this to mean a burial or cremation.⁸⁹ Yet, as we have seen, this makes Sulpicius' request rather absurd in the Greco-Roman context. It is possible the Athenians did not understand Sulpicius' real request, or, if they did, they were nonetheless unwilling to grant it to him, for *sepultura* can also mean a funeral ceremony. At Rome leading citizens were often laid-in-state in the *forum* before

⁸⁶For references see Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary*, p. 44. Also cf. Pausanias I.29. The exact perimeter of the Academy remains unknown but the burials found in the vicinity seem to lie outside the Academy itself. Graves from the geometric period to the 1st century B.C. have been reported (*BCH* 54, 1930, p. 460, 1931, p. 466, 1933, pp. 250-1, 1935, p. 251, and *AA* 1931, p. 218).

⁸⁷D.C. Kuntz and J. Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs*, New York, 1971, p. 108; C.W. Clairmont, *Patrios Nomos: Public Burials in Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, Oxford, 1983, figures 1-7 and pp. 29ff. Roman burials indicate that the Academy road remained a prestigious burial place and Clairmont underscores the prestige of even private burial along the Academy Road (*ibid.*, pp. 38-9 and 45).

⁸⁸There were two kinds of public burial. In the first the polis buried its war dead in a public monument. It was also possible for a family or friends of a deceased individual to receive a grant of money allowing them to erect a semi-public monument for an outstanding individual. I do not think this occurred in the case of Marcellus because Sulpicius does not mention a grant of money. The legal status of the Academy is also uncertain. Pausanias reports that it was once private property but that in his day it was a public gymnasium (I.29.2). A boundary stone from the Academy confirms that the Academy was at one time public property.

⁸⁹Young, *Hesperia* 20 (1951) p. 67.

being carried outside the city for the cremation or interment.⁹⁰ Sulpicius might only have wanted to hold a lying-in-state in Athens, perhaps in the Agora, before disposing of the body. The Athenians might have understood him to mean that he wanted to bury Marcellus or cremate him inside the city. On the other hand, because Marcellus had died outside the city, the Athenians may have preferred to keep him there. Religious taboo could also have precluded them from allowing a dead body to be carried, not out of the city as was usual, but into the city, an act which could be construed as contrary to nature. But however we understand Sulpicius' request and the Athenian interpretation of it, the conclusion must be the same. The Athenians did not make any effort to assist Sulpicius or to honour Marcellus.⁹¹

After the cremation Sulpicius tells Cicero that he made arrangements with the Athenians "in that place", presumably the Academy, to erect a monument for Marcellus. In his letter Sulpicius clearly separates the official request he made of the Athenian authorities for a *sepultura* inside the city and the private arrangements he had to make for the funeral. The funeral would have attracted spectators, including some Athenians who might have respected Marcellus, and it is with people like these that Sulpicius arranged for a monument. Whether the monument was ever erected remains unknown. Broneer had associated the decree I discussed earlier with this monument, but the decree honouring Marcellus was discovered on the Acropolis and is more appropriate in the context of Marcellus' retirement to Mytilene. And, as we have seen, there is no reason to conclude from Sulpicius' letter that the Athenians officially honoured Marcellus. Indeed, before Rome could even begin to buzz with rumours about who was behind the murder of Marcellus, the Athenian authorities were faced with a difficult situation. If they honoured Marcellus, who had after all just been

⁹⁰J.M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, London, 1971, p. 47. Julius Caesar's body was carried to the *forum* after his murder in the Senate.

⁹¹Sulpicius' irritation at this treatment is evident from the tone of his letter.

murdered by a known supporter of Caesar, they risked Caesar's displeasure. On the other hand, if they dishonoured Marcellus, they also risked the anger of Caesar, for he had recently pardoned Marcellus for his mistakes. The compromise was to leave all the arrangements to Sulpicius and to allow him to cremate and bury Marcellus at the Academy.

In September of 44 B.C. Brutus arrived in Athens ostensibly on his way to assume his new duties as a commissioner in charge of the grain supply from Asia. The Athenians, we are told, rushed to greet Brutus as though he were a liberator⁹² and, what is more, they erected statues of Brutus and Cassius in the Agora beside Harmodius and Aristogeiton, the Athenian tyrannicides.⁹³ Raubitschek, recognizing that Brutus' reception was far out of proportion to either his status in September of 44 B.C. or to the treatment of Athens at the hand of Caesar, argued that it was this very reception which first led Brutus to begin thinking of raising an army in the east.⁹⁴ But the evidence for Brutus' reception is not unassailable. Only one group in Athens, the oligarchs who had lost power during the revival of the *demos*, could have benefitted from Caesar's assassination. If these men welcomed Brutus as a liberator, Plutarch's report that

⁹²Plutarch, *Brutus*, 24. Geagan suggests that Brutus' control of the grain supply might have influenced the Athenians.

⁹³Dio 47.20.4.

⁹⁴Raubitschek, "Brutus in Athens," *Phoenix* 11 (1957) pp. 1-11. E.J. Owens, "Increasing Roman Domination of Greece in the Years 48-27 B.C.," *Latomus* 35 (1976) p. 718, argues that Brutus and not Caesar instituted the democratic reforms which have been inferred from the formulae for constitutional practices which appear in several decrees from this period. This suggestion derives from Accame but cannot be supported by the chronological evidence (see Appendix A.2).

the Athenians thronged to greet Brutus may be only an exaggeration.⁹⁵ It is important to note in this context that the Athenian tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton, whose statues graced the Athenian Agora, were heroes of the aristocratic clan of the Gephyraioi. The erection nearby of statues of Brutus and Cassius, therefore, associated the Roman tyrannicides with an Athenian clan rather than with the Athenian *demos*.⁹⁶ While he was in Athens Brutus studied at the Lyceum with the Peripatetics. Like many leading Romans, most notably Cicero, Brutus might have eschewed the Garden for its philosophy of non-involvement in politics, but we have also seen above that there is reason to believe that several leading Epicureans had aligned themselves with Caesar and Antony.⁹⁷

The years between 43/2-40/39 B.C. are difficult to interpret from the prosopographical evidence. The years following the assassination of Julius Caesar until the clear emergence of Octavian and Antony as the major antagonists were tumultuous ones in terms of Roman politics, and it is not surprising to find that the Athenian evidence for magistrates in office during these years is inconclusive. Some of the individuals attested in these years of transition are tantalizingly obscure. ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΟΣ ΕΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ, for example, was a *theoros* and *hieromnemon* in a procession to Delphi in 42/1 B.C. He would have been accompanied by ΕΥΚΛΗΣ, who is first attested in this year as life-long priest of Apollo, but is otherwise unknown. ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΕΙΟΣ held an unknown, but possibly senior, Delian magistracy in 44/3 and 43/2 B.C.

⁹⁵We do not know if the statues were ever actually put up (cf. Broneer, *AJA* 36, 1932, p. 396). Statue bases have been found for Brutus at Athens and Delos, but at this time it was very common for old statues to be rededicated. There were already two pairs of statues of the Tyrannicides in the Agora (cf. Pausanias 1.8.5). It is possible that one of these pairs was temporarily rededicated in the name of Brutus and Cassius (an observation also made by Raubitschek, *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigraphia greca e latina*, Rome, 1959, p. 21).

⁹⁶Two moneyers chose the tyrannicides as their symbols on an issue of silver tetradrachms during the second century B.C. (Thompson, *ANSSC*, p. 371).

⁹⁷See above on ΑΥΕΙΑΔΗΣ, archon in 51/0 B.C.

He served as *epimeletes* of Delos about the same time. He is probably descended from a cleruch family from Delos which is otherwise entirely unattested in civic offices, for he may plausibly be identified as a descendant of the family of ΑΔΑΜΑΣ, ΔΙΟΝΤΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ and ΜΟΞΙΩΝ, sons of ΑΔΑΜΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. This was a family of sculptors which resided on Delos in the last decades of the second century B.C. A certain ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ was archon in 41/0 B.C. Although he is not attested in any other capacity, we may conjecture that his son, ΠΟΛΥΤΑΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΥ, became archon in 14/3 B.C., suggesting perhaps that ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ and his family were able to emerge from the 40s and 30s B.C. with their wealth and standing intact.⁹⁸ A different situation can be postulated for the family of ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ. He was a secretary of the ephebes in 41/0 B.C. His son ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ served as an ephebe between 39/8-35/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1961). The family is descended from ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ, who is only attested between 130-120 B.C. as a liturgist (*I.G.* II² 1939), and apparently is not attested after the domination of Antony. Similarly, ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ, who was archon in 40/39 B.C., is related to an ephebe from 98/7 B.C., and he too is otherwise unattested.⁹⁹ He is an obscure individual, but the kind of magistrate who might be expected to hold an archonship in a year of great uncertainty. In contrast, ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ, the archon in 42/1 B.C., is descended from a family which produced two ephebes in the second generation, although he is the first member of the family attested in a civic magistracy. Under Augustus his son, also named ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ, served as a *proedros* (*I.G.* II² 1069). ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ himself went on to become herald of the Areopagus.¹⁰⁰ The offices of ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ also date to this period. He was priest of an association for the

⁹⁸I attribute ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ and ΠΟΛΥΤΑΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΥ to the same family because the name ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ is relatively rare during the first century B.C.

⁹⁹Although he could be identified as ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 278).

¹⁰⁰Sometime between 38/7-18/7 B.C. The year is important for understanding the significance of ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ' career. I prefer to date his heraldship to sometime after 30 B.C. when ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ would have been in his 50s.

Soteiria between 42/1-39/8 B.C., in 37/6 B.C. a treasurer of the same association and then, in 36/5 B.C., *archeranistes*.¹⁰¹ He is otherwise unattested and did not hold any offices under Augustus. *ZHNION ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* served as *archeranistes* of another association, the Heroistai, in 57/6 B.C. He is the son of an ephebe from 102/1 B.C. A relative was *polemarchos* in 102/1 B.C.¹⁰² *ΑΡΟΠΙΟΣ ΣΕΛΑΕΥΚΟΤ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ* was treasurer of the Heroistai in 57/6 B.C. His family too belonged to the governing elite in the second generation. Neither of these families are attested after 57/6 B.C. The activities of the Soteriastai and Heroistai at this time seem to be related to a similar emergence of aristocratic *gene* under Antony. These associations, therefore, might have thrown their support to Antony.

The events following the arrival of Brutus and Cassius in the east and later the emergence of M. Antony as the Roman dynast of the eastern Mediterranean, as least as far these events pertain to Athens, are largely unknown. But when Antony resided in Athens in the winters of 39/8 and 38/7 B.C., his stay seems to coincide with several changes in Athenian society. Dio Cassius tells us explicitly that Antony introduced oligarchic regimes in the Greek world¹⁰³ and this statement is corroborated by the few decrees which are extant from this period.¹⁰⁴ The *genos* of the Gephyraioi were active in Athens during Antony's domination. In 36 B.C. the clan exchanged letters with the Delphic

¹⁰¹*I.G. II*² 1343.

¹⁰²See Chapter 5.

¹⁰³Dio 38.39.2.

¹⁰⁴*I.G. II*² 1043 and 1051 (with *Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 12). Ambassadors were usually elected but in *I.G. II*² 1051 the three ambassadors were the hoplite general, the herald of the Areopagus and the herald of the *boule* and *demos*. This last office was a professional post. The oligarchic nature of this decree is indicated by the dispatch of these officials, in an *ex officio* capacity, as ambassadors. A fourth man is named to accompany them but he is not specifically called an ambassador and there is no record of a vote having been taken.

Amphictyony.¹⁰⁵ And it is possible that a change in the census was also carried out at this time. In 38/7 B.C. the Athenian ephebic corps comprised only 53 members, less than half the usual contingent in the second and first centuries B.C. Under Augustus the corps would return to an above average contingent of 134 members. Finally, several magistrates and families which are attested in the 50s B.C. reappear in the brief period of Antony's domination at Athens. Although *ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ*, for example, was a *kleidouchos* and *pyrphoros* of Asclepius in 62/1 B.C.,¹⁰⁶ his son *ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ* was *kosmetes* of the ephebes in 38/7 B.C. Similarly, a member of the political elite named *ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ*, who was *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C., had a son who was also an ephebe in 38/7 B.C. *ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ* was prytany-secretary in 52/1 B.C. Possibly the prytany-secretaryship indicates some political involvement on the part of *ΓΑΙΟΣ*. His son also served as an ephebe between 39/8-36/5 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1961). *ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ*, a son of the *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ* who moved from Delos after 88/7 B.C., is attested in 59/8 B.C. as a *paidotribes* at Athens and served as an orator in 52/1 B.C. His family was a member of the cultural-educational elite for several generations, and a son, *ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ*, was ephebic *paidotribes* sometime between 39/8-36/5 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1961). None of these individuals or families are attested under Augustus.¹⁰⁷

The apparently obscure archons under Caesar, finally, give way in the early 30s B.C. to several archons who can be identified with more prominent families. The archon in 39/8 B.C. was *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ*, a nephew of *ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ* and a grandson of *ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ*, both prominent members of an

¹⁰⁵ Oliver, *Hesperia* 49 (1980) pp. 40-1.

¹⁰⁶ See above for the possibly democratic affiliations of this cult during the 40s B.C.

¹⁰⁷ The families of two ephebic instructors, in contrast, would survive. *ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ* was a *hoplomachos* in 46/5 B.C. His son *ΑΙΕΞΙΝΗΣ* served as a *prytanis* in either 19/8 or 18/7 B.C. *ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΣ* was a *paidotribes* in 55/4 B.C. His son, *ΦΙΛΙΟΣ*, himself served as a *paidotribes* in 23/2 B.C. The family is descended from *ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ*, an ephebe in 117/6 B.C.

oligarchic faction which dominated Athenian politics in the decades before the sack of the city by Sulla.¹⁰⁸ His name in the archon list makes an obvious contrast with that of *ἈΠΟΛΗΕΙΣ*, the son of *ἈΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos, from only a few years earlier, and he is the last member of this notorious family to be attested in a civic magistracy. *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ* also held the hoplite generalship. The year is unknown, although it is unlikely it could have been later than the mid-thirties B.C.¹⁰⁹ *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ*, the archon who succeeded *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ* in 38/7 B.C., is the son of an ephebe from 102/1 B.C. and a grandson of *ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝ*, a liturgist between 130-120 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1940). His son *ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ* became archon under Augustus sometime after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3176), having served as *prytanis* between 50-40 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 280) and as herald of the *boule* in the early years of Augustus' reign (*I.G.* II² XII.8.26). *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* *ΕΤΝΑΡΟΜΟΡ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ*, archon in 37/6 B.C., served as herald of the *boule* and *demos* between 45-35 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 282). He too served as hoplite general in an unknown year, although it was probably held under Augustus. His son would become king-archon before 22/3 B.C., and the family survived into the Roman Empire.¹¹⁰ *ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ*, finally, became archon in 36/5 B.C. and his son, *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ*, became hoplite general in the last years of the reign of Augustus (*I.G.* II² 4478). The family is not well-attested after 167/6 B.C.,¹¹¹ although a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. may be assigned to it. The archons between 38/7 and 36/5 B.C., therefore, all belong to obscure families which flourished under Augustus.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸*PA* 10098.

¹⁰⁹Plutarch, *Vitae Orat.* 893b.

¹¹⁰The family is attested in political office as early as the fourth century although a stemma cannot be traced back that far (*PA* 13038 and *PA* 7988).

¹¹¹But the family can be traced back to the third century (Sundwall, *NPA*, p. 95).

¹¹²Two identifiable but obscure Delian magistrates may also be mentioned here. *ΕΥΘΥΔΙΚΟΣ* *ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ* was a magistrate on Delos in 37/6 B.C. He may be related to *ΕΥΝΟΜΟΣ* *ΕΥΘΥΔΙΚΟΥ* who was a *theoros* in 98/7 B.C. but is otherwise unattested. Similarly, *ΝΙΚΟΚΛΗΣ* *ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ* held the same Delian magistracy in 33/2 B.C. He might be descended from [] *ΓΟΡΑΣ* *ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ* *ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ*, priest of Hestia, Demos and Roma on Delos in 159/8 B.C.

The contrast between the fortunes of *MENANΔΡΟΣ* and *ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* with *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ* might suggest that the Antonian faction at Athens only enjoyed a year or two of power. Finally, *ΚΛΕΙΔΑΜΟΣ*, archon in 33/2 B.C., could be a grandson of *ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΚΛΕΙΔΑΜΟΤ ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΑΙΕΤΣ*, who was pythaist *pais* in 128/7 B.C., ephebe in 119/8 B.C. and *agoranomos* on Delos in 103/2 B.C. A namesake held a mint magistracy in the second century B.C.¹¹³ These are the only magistrates who can be identified prosopographically to the end of the 30s B.C.¹¹⁴

It is impossible to say what happened to men like *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ*, who had supported Caesar, during the brief period of oligarchic or aristocratic government. A fragmentary decree concerning the Athenian cleruchy on Lemnos and perhaps dating to 34/3 B.C. names a general, either the hoplite general or the general on Lemnos.¹¹⁵ Only the name *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* is extant. It is unlikely, however, that *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* was still active at this late date.¹¹⁶ But because most Athenian generals served in their 40s, or in any case about ten years after their archonship, and because *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* had served as archon in 44/3 B.C., his name could be restored in the text by understanding the name *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* as the patronymic rather than the name of the general. If *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* served as a general on Lemnos, it is possible he

¹¹³PA 8488-89.

¹¹⁴Note that [] *ΝΕΥΣ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΥΔΑ* [] could be identified as archon in 35/4 B.C. although the name *ΑΡΧΩΝ* occurs in the deme Kydathenaion (but since [] *ΝΕΥΣ* is named in the genitive, we would then expect to find the definite article before his patronymic). This individual could be a descendent of *ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ*, who was *epimeletes* of Delos after 167/6 B.C. (*I.D.* 1805). In this case the magistracy held by [] *ΝΕΥΣ* in 35/4 B.C. is unknown. I examined this text at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens with the director Mrs. Peppa-Delmouzou. *ΚΥΔΑ* is now only legible as *ΚΥΑ* and could have stood for *ΚΥΩΝ*. In this case it would form the name of a second individual (note the plural *αὔροις*).

¹¹⁵*I.G.* II² 1051. For the date see Appendix A.2. I examined this inscription at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. The extant text is a tantalizingly fragmentary decree concerning some kind of land dispute.

¹¹⁶Dow and Sarikakis, however, both equate him with the *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* who was general in 60/59 B.C. (*The Hoplite General at Athens*, p. 61). *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* is first attested as life-long priest of Apollo in 42/1 B.C. His son and grandson both inherited the same office. If *ΕΤΚΛΗΣ* too inherited the office from *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* this would suggest that *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ* was already deceased by 42/1 B.C. at the latest.

went there after Antony arrived in Athens. But he would return. In 30 B.C., the year following the battle of Actium, the Athenians sent a religious procession to Delphi. *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* attended as priest of Apollo. He would eventually attain the hoplite generalship, although only late in life, and his sons would become more firmly established as members of the Athenian elite. His family will constitute one of the new political families under Augustus.

Chapter 7

Conclusion:

The Governing Class Under Augustus

The entire period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14 was increasingly dominated by events in the Roman world in which Athens became either a spectator or a victim. When Athens recovered the island of Delos in 167 B.C., the pro-Roman governing elite at that time had acted on the vain pretence that Athens was an autonomous Greek *polis* and a sovereign ally of Rome. In the century and a half following the acquisition of Delos, however, the political status of Athens had gradually eroded until, by A.D. 14, Athens had been formally incorporated into the province of Achaia.¹ By this time the governing class had ceased to be a traditional aristocracy based on the civic life of a small Greek *polis* and was in the process of becoming a member of those provincial elites which competed with and eventually succeeded in replacing the old Italian aristocracy in governing the Roman Empire.² Exactly when Athens, or rather the *mentalité* of the Athenian governing class, ceased to be focused on the *polis* and became provincial in outlook, is difficult to specify, although the process by which Athens evolved from

¹When food riots broke out, threatening order in the city, a legate of the new emperor Tiberius quickly suppressed the disturbance (V. Ehrenberg, "Legatus Augusti et Tiberii," *Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday*, Vol. II, eds. G.E. Mylonas and D. Raymond, St Louis, 1953, pp. 438-44 and Papalas, "Roman Athens," pp. 58-61). Ste. Croix regards the revolt of c. A.D. 13 as another manifestation of the revolution of 88/7 B.C. (*Class Struggle*, p. 526). But it seems to have had more in common with the frequent slave revolts of the late second century B.C. The revolution of 88/7 B.C., we have seen, was a result of demographic pressure from an expanding peripheral class and the emergence of a narrow oligarchy. As far as we know the slave revolts and the revolt in c. 13 A.D. had no real program or leaders.

²G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965, pp. 140-2, argues that under Augustus the elites of the Greek east and Roman west began to merge into a single governing class.

a *polis* to a provincial town probably began to some extent at least from the very acquisition of Delos at the beginning of our period.³ Roman influence on the institutions and population of Delos first becomes perceptible after c. 130 B.C. and coincided there with the dissolution of the cleruchy as a separate Athenian community.⁴ The sack of the city of Athens in 86 B.C. was quickly followed by a noticeable Roman flavour in many of the formerly characteristic aspects of *polis* life. Traditional festivals, for example, were named after Roman dynasts or celebrated in their honour,⁵ Roman coins first appeared in the Athenian agora, and Roman names became more common among the civic population.⁶ It was also during the period after 86/5 B.C. that the number of civic magistracies were reduced, and several priesthoods which were formerly annual offices now appear as life-long positions. Other civic magistracies at this time became no more than sinecured liturgies.⁷ Archaeological evidence also provides an indication of changes in the nature of Athenian public life at this time. The Athenian agora was the scene of extensive rebuilding under Augustus. What was formerly an open place of assembly surrounded by administrative buildings, functionally and symbolically democratic in nature, became crowded with buildings and statues,

³Mossé regards the public munificence of the elite in the second century as an indication of the decline of the traditional *polis*. Originally liturgies had been private expenditure for the common good, but in the Hellenistic Age the state often assumed such burdens. Now liturgies were becoming ostentatious display aimed, Mossé suggests, at winning election to magistracies which were no longer assigned by sortition (*Athens in Decline*, p. 145).

⁴By c. 130 B.C. the cleruchy had become absorbed by a population largely composed of foreigners and Romans. Ferguson has enumerated several areas in which Roman influence on the island may be detected after c. 130 B.C. (*HA*, pp. 383-4; see also note above).

⁵The celebration of festivals honouring the Attalids or a festival such as the Ptolemaia, in contrast, are not entirely comparable since these festivals were in honour of men who were supposedly the eponymous heroes of two Attic tribes. (See Ferguson, *Klio* 8, 1908, p. 339). The Sylleia and the Antoneia, on the other hand, mark a new stage in the debasement of the *polis*.

⁶See Chapter 1.

⁷See Chapter 2.

many of which were associated with the imperial cult.⁸ After this building program was completed, it was no longer even physically possible for the population to assemble in the agora as before.⁹ In addition, with the Roman agora emerging nearby as the new commercial center of Athens, commerce and politics were becoming separated for the first time in Athenian history.

Augustus was also indirectly responsible for several social reforms at Athens which had a profound impact on the future of the Athenian elite. In the late 20s B.C., for example, a reform of the traditional *gene* was carried out for the purpose of introducing pre-selection (or *destinatio*) of candidates for the elective magistracies.¹⁰ This reform preceded a similar measure at Rome.¹¹ Augustus also seems to have reformed or revived the Athenian jury system, and we find *epimeletai dikasterion* attested during this period.¹² It has also been observed that under the Roman Empire the Areopagus became virtually the equivalent of a

⁸Geagan, *ANRW* II.7.1, 1979, pp. 278-83 and L. Shear, "Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town," *Hesperia* 50 (1981) pp. 356-77, suggest that the old Athenian agora and even possibly the new Roman agora became the center of the imperial cult in Athens. The assimilation of members of the imperial family to traditional civic deities whose worship was largely associated with the old agora began under Augustus and continued long past his reign. Livia, for example, was honoured after A.D. 14 as Artemis Boulaia in a statue base found near the Metroon (*Hesperia* 6, 1937, n. 12). Claudius was assimilated to Apollo Patroos (*I.G.* II² 3274). Several altars to Augustus have also been found in the Athenian agora. On the imperial cult at Athens see also Geagan, *Transactions of the International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, 3-9 October, 1982, pp. 76-7.

⁹Although the assembly regularly met in the Theatre of Dionysus during this period, AΘHNIONN's speech upon his return to Athens from the court of Mithridates VI was delivered from the Bema in the Agora.

¹⁰Oliver, "From Gennetai to Curiales," *Hesperia* 49 (1980) pp. 30-56.

¹¹Several of Augustus' reforms first appear in the Greek east and were then introduced in the west. The imperial cult, for example, first appears in the east and was not formally introduced to the west until 12 B.C. The *concilium Galliarum* was an imitation of Greek *koina*. Also, in 27 B.C. Augustus established a *consilium senatus*, a "cabinet" consisting of 15 senators selected by lot for a six month session. Sortition was a Greek custom. Perhaps Augustus had received the idea for a *consilium* during his campaign in Greece?

¹²Geagan, *ANRW* II.7.1, 1979, p. 379.

municipal *ordo decurionum*. The date of this change has remained open¹³ although it seems reasonable to see it as a natural consequence of the new system of *destinatio*. Recruitment of the Areopagus was now closely controlled, even though the formal and traditionally democratic nature of the Athenian constitution was preserved. This was a typically Roman solution and fully consistent with the fiction that Augustus himself had restored the Roman Republic in 27 B.C. The use of the traditional *gene* as a means of social control and reform is also consistent with Augustus' experience of Athens. In two visits to Athens during his reign, in 31 B.C. and again in 21 B.C., Augustus was initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries.¹⁴ It was after his first initiation that Augustus was honoured at Eleusis as *euergetes*.¹⁵ In 30/29 B.C. the first Dodecade was dispatched to Delphi. The personnel of the Dodecades are predominantly members of the hereditary *gene* (for example, *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*). Whenever Augustus visited Athens, therefore, he was always closely involved with gentile families and institutions. It was a natural solution to adapt these *gene*, through a renewal of their membership, in order to indirectly control the membership of the governing class.¹⁶

The prosopography of magistrates and their families attested under Augustus reflects the changes which have been mentioned above. A large number of families which managed to attain the archonship under Augustus and thereby

¹³Geagan, "Ordo Areopagitarum Atheniensium," *Phoros: Tribute to B.D. Meritt*, eds. D.W. Bradeen and M.F. McGregor, New York, 1974, pp. 51-6. Solution depends on whether Cicero's phrase "in ordo decurionum atque Areopagitarum" is to be taken literally or figuratively. Geagan suggests that the *ordo* eventually became fixed at 100 members even though this exceeded the number of ex-archons (*ibid.*, p. 53).

¹⁴R. Bernhardt, "Athen, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien," *AM* 90 (1975) pp. 233-7, argues that the Athenians used the initiation of Augustus as a means of appeasement.

¹⁵E. Vanderpool, "Three Inscriptions from Eleusis," *AD* 23 (1968) pp. 7-9.

¹⁶Some of the *gene* might have supported Antony (see Chapter 6). Possibly the reform of the *gene* also involved a purge? The *genos* of the Theoinidai is also attested under Augustus (see E. Vanderpool, "The *Genos* Theoinidai Honours a Priestess of Nympe," *AJP* 100 (1979) pp. 213-6).

join the Areopagus are known from this period. In order to analyse the composition of the Areopagus under Augustus, "old" families which are first attested before 88/7 may be distinguished from "new" families which are first attested after 88/7 B.C. Forty-seven magistrates attested in office under Augustus (c. 35 B.C.-A.D. 14) belong to "old" families which may be identified as members of the governing class before the revolution of 88/7 B.C. (Table 7.1).

Table 7-1: Members of "Old" Families Related to Areopagites
in Office Under Augustus

	Areopagites	Non-Areopagites	Total
First generation: 167/6-c. 130 B.C.	2	6 (9)	17
Second generation: c. 130 -88/7 B.C.	12	23 (32)	67
Third generation: 86/5 -c. 35 B.C.	7 (4)	3 (4)	18
Fourth generation: c.35 B.C.-A.D. 14	21 (20)	4 (2)	47

Note: Table 7.1 indicates the number of individuals in office under Augustus belonging to families which may be traced to a magistrate or priest before 88/7 B.C. The number of individuals belonging to such families are indicated for each of the four generations between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14 according to their status as Areopagites or Non-Areopagites. Members of "old" families which have a member attested in the Areopagus for the first time after 88/7 B.C. are given in parentheses.

Forty-one of these magistrates are archons. In addition to these Areopagite families under Augustus, sixty-five non-Areopagite magistrates who served under Augustus also belong to families attested before 88/7 B.C. (Table 7.2). The majority of these families are not identifiable as members of the Areopagus before 86/5 B.C. and most held low-ranking civic magistracies. These "old" families, therefore, are largely descended from families of the peripheral governing class.

Table 7-2: Members of "Old" Families Related to Non-Areopagites in Office Under Augustus

	Non-Areopagites	Areopagites	Total
First generation: 167/6-c. 130 B.C.	10 (1)	0 (1)	12
Second generation: c. 130 -88/7 B.C.	69 (12)	0 (4)	85
Third generation: 86/5 -c. 35 B.C.	8 (2)	1 (3)	14
Fourth generation: c.35 B.C.-A.D. 14	61 (4)	0	65

Note: Table 7.2 indicates the number of individuals in office under Augustus belonging to families which may be traced to a magistrate or priest before 88/7 B.C. The number of individuals belonging to such families are indicated for each of the four generations between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14 according to their status as Areopagites or Non-Areopagites. Members of "old" families which have a member attested in the Areopagus before c. 35 B.C. but not under Augustus are given in parentheses.

Only nine families, for example, managed to remain part of the governing elite from the late second century B.C. down to the reign of Augustus. Two of these families are attested in the ranks of the governing class in each of the three generations from the late second century B.C. to the reign of Augustus. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ served as a *thesmothetes* between 31/0-15/4 B.C. (I.G. II² 1720) and was a *hierokerux* in 20/19 B.C.¹⁷ He is related to ΑΓΑΘΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, who was ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. and *epimeletes* of Delos in 49/8 B.C. A grandfather was a member of the Areopagus during the second generation and several other members of the family

¹⁷This is a conjectural career. The *thesmothetes* is only attested as ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜ[_].

are attested in office at that time. Similarly, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΥ* was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 18, pp. 289-90) and was elected archon in the 20s B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 302). In 20/19 B.C. he served as *hymnagogos*, also for the *genos* of the Kerykes. His father had been a pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C. and an uncle, *ΑΡΔΗΑΣ*, served as a *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 267). His grandfather was also member of the Areopagus during the second generation.¹⁸ *ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΥΣ* served as a *thesmothetes* after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1722). A homonymous ancestor had been archon in 137/6 B.C. and hoplite general in c. 130 B.C. (Orosius 5.9) and his son served as a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C., going on to hold the archonship in 97/6 B.C. *ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ* was a very prominent magistrate under Augustus. He founded the sitonic fund, served twice as *sitonis*, and then held the hoplite generalship four times (none of his offices can be dated; *I.G.* II² 3504). His homonymous grandfather had been a *thesmothetes* and temple administrator during the second generation. Similarly, *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΥΚΟΝΟΥΣ* was archon in c. 30 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 4714). He served as a herald of the Areopagus between 31/0 B.C. and 14/3 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1720 and 1721), was priest of the Bomos in 20/19 B.C. and later held the hoplite generalship a minimum of two times (*I.G.* II² XII.8.26). His grandfather had been a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. and his great-grandfather was a member of the Areopagus during the second generation. *ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΞΕΝΩΝΟΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΥΣ* served as hoplite general between 10/9-3/2 B.C. (*Hesperia* 44, 1975, p. 207). He is related to *ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ*, the archon in 87/6 B.C., whose family boasts several magistrates including an Areopagite during the second generation. A *thesmothetes* who held office during the reign of Augustus, known only as [] [] *ΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥΣ*

¹⁸For the offices held by these families at that time, see Chapter 5. Although *ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ* is not attested as a member of the Areopagus under Augustus, he should probably be included in this category. In 34/3 B.C. he served as *leitourgos epi ten Skiada*. In 20/19 B.C., like *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΗΜΟΣ*, he was a *hymnagogos* of the Kerykes. His grandfather was a Delian ephebe in 126/5 B.C., a boy-gymnasiarch between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595), *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. and temple administrator in 101/0 B.C. A brother, *ΠΥΘΩΝ*, was also a boy-gymnasiarch between 128-122 B.C. (*I.D.* 2595), then *hieropoios* in 127/6 B.C. and nauarch in 102/1 B.C. Their father is also attested on Delos but in a private capacity.

(*I.G.* Π² 1719), may also be related to a family which belonged to the Areopagus during the second generation. The family of ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ must also be mentioned here. ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ enjoyed one of the most varied and important careers under Augustus. In c. 27/6 B.C. (*I.G.* Π² 3493) he was *agoranomos*. He went on to become hoplite general (*I.G.* Π² 3173), priest of Roma and Augustus (*I.G.* Π² 3173), gymnasiarch (*I.D.* 1956), life-long priest of Apollo (*I.D.* 2515) and finally, exegete of the *genos* of the Erysichthonidai (*I.G.* Π² 3523). His family was part of the governing elite before 88/7 B.C. and also produced an archon in 83/2 B.C.¹⁹ Two other "old" families reveal a similar history. ΔΗΜΕΑΣ, the archon in 19/8-18/7 B.C., for example, had a cousin or uncle who also served as a *prytanis* in the mid-40s B.C. (*Agora* XV, 278). The family had last placed a member in the Areopagus in the first generation (ΔΗΜΕΑΣ, temple administrator in 146/5 B.C.). In the second generation it was less successful. A son of the archon, ΔΗΜΕΑΣ, was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. and another son, ΔΗΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ, was a *theoros* in 128/7 B.C. A son of the latter was ephebe in 98/7 B.C. The family was evidently not part of the governing elite during this generation, although ΔΗΜΕΑΣ might have served as *epimeletes* of the Peiraieus in 103/2 B.C.²⁰ In any case, it was he who proposed the decree in 87/6 B.C. restoring the "democracy" after the revolution. ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΘΡΑΣΤΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ served as *polemarchos* between 37/6-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* Π² 1718) and was *mantis* on at least two occasions (*F.D.* III, 2 59 and 61). One of his sons is attested as a *prytanis* in c. 30 (*Hesperia*, 47, 1978, n. 21, pp. 293-4), and another son as a *hieromnemon* in 30/29 B.C. A cousin also served as a *mantis* in the Dodecades to Delphi in honour of Apollo (*F.D.* III, 2 nn. 59, 62, 64, 63). The family had been part of the Areopagus at the very beginning of our period through ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΧΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ, who served as temple administrator in 158/7 B.C. and *hieropoios* on Delos in 149/8 B.C. The family is not known to have held any intervening offices. The "old" families which placed

¹⁹See Chapter 5.

²⁰See Chapter 5.

a member in the Areopagus under Augustus, therefore, do not form a homogeneous group. Only a few can be said to have been prominent in the generation preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C. Several of these families, as we have seen, were prominent only in the period of the first generation, and several others were involved in the restoration of democracy after 88/7 B.C. But these families all survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and managed to rejoin the Areopagus under Augustus. Virtually all of these families may be identified as gentile; several of their members under Augustus are seen to have participated in activities of the traditional *gene*, through which, as has been argued above, aspirants to the elected magistracies were screened.

In contrast to the families discussed above, the majority of families which survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and placed a member in the Areopagus under Augustus are nonetheless of rather obscure origin. *ΗΠΑΚΑΕΙΔΗΣ ΗΠΑΚΑΕΙΔΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΤΣ*, for example, was *polemarchos* in 14/3 B.C. His great-grandfather had been a liturgist in 130-20 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1939) and a *hippeus* in 128/7 B.C. His grandfather had been an ephebe in 119/8 B.C. but first appears as a civic magistrate when he was a *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. *ΜΕΝΝΕΑΣ ΖΩΠΥΡΟΥ*, furthermore, served as an archon between 37/6-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1718). His family can be traced back to two pythaists in 98/7 B.C. but he is the first to be attested in civic magistracies.²¹ *ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos was a prominent figure in the revolution of 88/7 B.C., and he seems to have been adopted into a family from the deme of Oion. The family is unattested in civic magistracies before the revolution of 88/7 B.C. During the first century B.C. it produced three archons by the name of *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ*, the first during the 40s B.C. when

²¹*ΘΕΩΡΙΚΟΣ ΣΤΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΣ* was a *thesmothetes* around the beginning of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1727). His brother, *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ*, was herald of the *boule* in 32/1 B.C. A relative was a gymnasiarch and *agonothetes* during the reign of Augustus (*I.G.* II² 2999) (*Hesperia* 11, 1942, n. 50, p. 29). The family produced several ephebes, a secretary and a pythaist *pais* during the second generation, but *ΘΕΩΡΙΚΟΣ* is the first attested member of the Areopagus.

Caesar was dominant in Greece, the other two under Augustus.²² Another family can also be shown to have emerged after the revolution into the ranks of the Areopagus. *MENEKAEIDΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ* served as a *hierophantes* under Augustus (*I.G.* II² 3512) and in 13/2 B.C. was *kosmetes* of the ephebes. Although he is not attested as a member of the Areopagus, it seems reasonable to assume that he held an archonship early in the reign of Augustus. In any case, his father had been archon in 61/0 B.C. and herald of the Areopagus in 56/5 B.C. He is the first member of the family attested in such senior political offices, although in the second century B.C. members of the family are attested as *prytanis* and gymnasiarch as well as *hierophantes*. *ΦΙΛΩΤΑΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ* was a *thesmothetes* after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1722). His father was priest of Asclepius in 62/1 B.C. and an uncle(?), *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ*, was an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. The family is not known to have held any civic magistracies during the second generation, although an ancestor, *ΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ*, was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 163/2 B.C. Another relative, *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ*, served as a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), indicating that the family started out on Delos.

Other cleruch families from the second century B.C. are attested down to the reign of Augustus. *ΛΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ*, was archon in 12/1 B.C. and a herald of the Areopagus after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1722). He went on to become hoplite general (*Hesperia* 33, 1964, n. 60, p. 188) and served twice as gymnasiarch (*I.G.* II² 2998). He is descended from a family which belonged to the Delian cleruchy during the first and second generations with members attested in several liturgical and priestly offices but no civic magistracies. Interestingly, a branch of the family seems to have remained at Delos, for a *ΛΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ* served as a *zakoros* on Delos under Augustus (*BCH* 51, 1927, p. 45). *ΔΩΡΙΩΝ ΑΡΕΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ* was a *thesmothetes* in a year between 36/5-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1718). His father was an archon of the *genos* of the

²²See Kapetanopoulos, *Athenaeum* 1974, pp. 343-7 and Reinmuth, *BCH* 90 (1966) pp. 93-101.

Amyndridai in a year between 27/6-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 2338) and was eponymous archon in the same year. An ancestor, *ΑΡΕΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ*, was a Delian cleruch during the first generation. The family is not known to have held any intervening magistracies. A family with more recent magistracies to its name is that of *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ*. He was *epimeletes* of Delos sometime after his archonship in 9/8 B.C. (*I.D.* 2509). His father was a *kleidouchos* on Delos in c. 50 B.C. (*I.D.* 1876) and in the third quarter of the first century is attested several times as exegete of the Eumolpidai (*F.D.* III, 2 63). Two uncles were *prytaneis* in the 40s B.C. (*Agora* XV, 278). A grandfather had been treasurer of the stratiotic fund in c. 150 B.C. (*SIA* n. 25) and orator in 127/6 B.C. *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ* was *thesmothetes* in a year between 31/0-15/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1720). An uncle, *ΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ*, was *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. (*Agora* XV, 267). His grandfather, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ*, was an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. (with a brother) and a female member of the family served as *ergastina* in 103/2 B.C.²³

Other families belonging to the Areopagus under Augustus are from more obscure families which can only be tentatively identified with an individual who served as a magistrate or priest during the generation preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C. *ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ*, a *thesmothetes* at the beginning of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1729), for example, is probably related to a homonymous *hippeus* in 106/5 B.C. (the demotic is not recorded). Similarly, *ΑΓΝΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΧΑΡΟΥΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ*, *thesmothetes* in 14/3 B.C., must be a descendant of *ΦΙΛΟΧΑΡΗΣ*, a *prytanis* in 135/4 B.C. *ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΝΕΣΤΟΡΟΣ*

²³*ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΓΩΝΟΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ* was *thesmothetes* in the first years of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1727). A relative, *ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ*, was a *theoros* in 42/1 B.C. An ancestor had been a cleruch on Lemnos in c. 150 B.C. and served as an ambassador to the *polis* (*I.G.* II² 1053).²⁴ This is a very rare instance in which a cleruch from a colony other than Delos can be identified prosopographically. A female member of this family also served in c. 100 B.C. as an *ergastina* (she also served as a *kanephoros*) (*F.D.* III, 2 30 and *I.G.* II² 1034).

²⁴The ambassador is known only as [] *ΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΓΩΝΟΣ*.

ΦΑΤΕΤΣ, a *prytanis* in the early years of Augustus' reign and a *thesmothetes* at the beginning of the first century A.D. (*Agora* XV, n. 303 and *I.G.* II² 1729), is possibly a descendant of a mint magistrate named ΝΕΣΤΩΡ from the second century B.C.²⁵ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ, who also became a *thesmothetes* at the beginning of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1729), is related to a man who served as flutist in 14/3 B.C. A grandfather was ephebe in 98/7 B.C. and a relative, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ, served as a *prytanis* between 148/7-135/4 B.C. (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 6, pp. 204-6). Similarly, ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ was a *thesmothetes* in the early years of the first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1729). His family produced three ephebes during the second generation and is attested in several Delian priesthoods. This, too, was a cleruch family of which ΕΤΝΟΜΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ, a *pompostolos* on Delos in c. 150 B.C. (*I.D.* 2609), is an ancestor.²⁶ The family of ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ is less well-known. He served during the reign of Augustus as a general on Lemnos (*I.G.* II² XII.8.26). He seems to be related to the father of an *ergastina* attested in c. 100 B.C. (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 18).

Several other prominent families under Augustus also can be traced to ancestors who are attested in office before 88/7 B.C. Two families which belonged to the governing elite under Augustus had already placed a member in the Areopagus in the preceding generation. Both families, moreover, may be traced to a member of the governing class during the second generation. ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ, for example, was a *prytanis* in the 40s B.C. (*Agora* XV, 280). Under Augustus he served as herald of the *boule* (*I.G.* II² XII.8.26) and sometime after 9/8 B.C. became eponymous archon (*I.G.* II² 3176). His father had already been an archon in 38/7 B.C. A grandfather was an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. and a great-grandfather served as a liturgist in 130-20 B.C. (*I.G.* II²

²⁵ΝΕΣΤΩΡ is not a common name at Athens. Might our new Areopagite be related to ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΝΕΣΤΟΡΟΣ, an Athenian sculptor active during the first century B.C.?

²⁶The family might also be related to the well-attested family of sculptors from Marathon which alternated the names ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ-ΑΡΧΙΑΣ over six generations.

1940). $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\phi\iota\alpha\omicron\varsigma \Theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\tau \beta\eta\varsigma\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ was hoplite general in the first years of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 4478). He would have served as archon already and his father was epōnymous archon in 36/5 B.C. A relative is attested as a pythaist *pais* in 138/7 B.C. Another particularly important family is that of $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\phi\iota\alpha\omicron\varsigma \Delta\iota\omicron\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\tau \alpha\alpha\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\varsigma$, who served as hoplite general in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 21, pp. 293-4), archon in 11/0 B.C. and finally, *epimeletes* of the Prytaneion around the turn of the century (*I.G.* II² 2877). His brother, $\Delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma \Delta\iota\omicron\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\tau$, also became a member of the Areopagus. He began his career as an ephebe between 39/8-35/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1961). He then served, in succession, as priest of the Palladium in 36/5 B.C., as exegete elected by the *demos* in 30/29 B.C., as archon in the 20s B.C. (*I.G.* II² 4465), and, in 20/19 B.C., as the orator in the decree of the Kerykes praising Themistocles, partly for his role in the reform of the *genos*. $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\phi\iota\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ and his brother are both descended from an important family in the second generation. $\phi\iota\alpha\alpha\nu\theta\eta\varsigma$, who served as archon in 87/6 B.C., is also a ancestor. Another family with two Areopagites under Augustus is that of $\Delta\omicron\varsigma\iota\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\alpha\pi\alpha\theta\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$. $\Delta\omicron\varsigma\iota\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ served as priest of the Lithoforos in 20/19 B.C. as a member of the *genos* of the Kerykes, and after 11/0 B.C. held the king-archonship (*I.G.* II² 1727). His brother, $\mu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$, was also king-archon between 10/9-3/2 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1727) and his son, $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$, became *thesmothetes* before A.D. 22/3 (*I.G.* II² 1730). This family, therefore, produced three Areopagites in two generations. The family is descended from a family which is well-attested in the second generation but which held few public offices. The family of $\epsilon\tau\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma \eta\pi\omega\delta\omicron\tau \mu\alpha\pi\alpha\theta\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ must be considered one of the most important Athenian families under Augustus. This illustrious family can only be traced to a *phylarchos*, $\epsilon\tau\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma$ (tribe X), who served in 106/5 B.C. $\epsilon\tau\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma$ ' career, which was described in the preceding chapter, began with his archonship in 44/3 B.C. and included the offices of life-long priest of Apollo, general on Lemnos, hoplite general, overseer of public works associated with Caesar's Roman agora, and ambassador to Augustus. He must be regarded, because of his age and his offices, as one of the most senior, if not the

senior, statesman at Athens during the reign of Augustus.²⁷ His son, ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ, would also become archon before 22/3 B.C. and eventually serve as herald of the Areopagus (I.G. II² 1730 and 1728).

The individuals and families mentioned above have been distinguished from families which belonged to the Areopagus before 88/7 B.C.; although several of these families are attested in activities of the traditional *gene* during the reign of Augustus, the majority of the forty-one archons in office under Augustus who belonged to "old" families are descended from families which were only peripheral or obscure before 88/7 B.C. Several other families which belonged to the Areopagus before 88/7 B.C., in contrast, are not known to have retained that status down to Augustus. ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, for example, served as a *prytanis* at the end of the first century B.C. (Agora XV, 303). His father had been *epimeletes* of Delos in 54/3 B.C. and a pythaist *pais* in 98/7 B.C. His grandfather was archon in 110/9 B.C. and also served, in 99/8 B.C., as *epimeletes* of Delos. ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ was priest of Asclepius in 51/0 B.C. and possibly a magistrate in c. 30 B.C. (Hesperia 47, 1978, n. 20, pp. 292-3). He is descended from a large well-attested family from the generation preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C. which might have placed at least one member in the Areopagus.²⁸ Other members of the family are attested in the *ephebeia* as well as in liturgical and religious offices. The family also had a connection with the cleruchy on Delos (the first attested member of the family served there as *hieropoios* in 144/3 B.C.). This family was evidently well-off during the second generation. Although at least one branch managed to survive the revolution of 88/7 B.C., no members of the family are attested under Augustus. ΕΡΩΤΔΟΜΟΣ ΠΑΝΤΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ was an ephebe between 39-34 B.C. (I.G. II² 1961). He is the son of an ephebe from between 80/79-78/7 B.C. and is a descendant of a temple

²⁷ ΕΥΚΛΗΣ, however, cannot be considered to number among the ranks of Augustus' foreign *clientelae*, which did include a number of prominent Greeks from other cities.

²⁸ ΠΑΛΕΙΣΤΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ was an ephebe in 128/7 B.C. Since this is an unusual name, he could be the temple administrator attested in 109/8 B.C. as ΠΑΕ[].

administrator in 141/0 B.C. Similarly, $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \Sigma\alpha\tau\tau\rho\omicron\tau$ was an ephebe with $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$. An ancestor, $\Sigma\alpha\tau\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$, is only attested as an orator in 98/7 B.C. $\Phi\iota\lambda\omega\eta\nu \omicron\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\tau$, a *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C., may be related to $[_]\Phi\iota\lambda\omega\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma \kappa\eta\phi\iota\varsigma\iota\epsilon\tau\varsigma$, an orator in 161/0 B.C. $\Phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma \Sigma\omega\sigma\omicron\tau \Phi\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, a *prytanis* in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 20, pp. 292-3), is the grandson of a *thesmothetes* in 100/99 B.C. $\Pi\alpha\tau\rho\omega\eta\nu \alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\lambda\alpha\omicron\tau \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\theta\omicron\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, a gymnasiarch under Augustus (*I.G.* II² 3002), is related to $\Pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\eta\nu \Pi\alpha\tau\rho\omega\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma$, *epimeletes* of Delos in 121/0 B.C., whose son, $\Pi\alpha\tau\rho\omega\eta\nu$, became a *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. Similarly, $[_]\omega\eta\nu \heta\delta\alpha\omicron\tau \lambda\alpha\mu\iota\tau\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ served as a *prytanis* at the turn of the century (*Agora* XV, n. 299). He is related to $\heta\delta\alpha\omicron\varsigma \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\omega\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma \lambda\alpha\mu\iota\tau\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\varsigma$, an ephebe in 117/6 B.C., who became *kosmetes* of the ephebes between 80/79-78/7 B.C. $\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\eta\nu \Pi\omicron\varsigma\epsilon\omicron\tau\varsigma \Phi\alpha\lambda\eta\rho\epsilon\tau\varsigma$, finally, was a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 273) and in the mid-30s B.C. (*Agora* XV, 289). His uncle had been an ephebe in 102/1 B.C. and his father had served as *thesmothetes* in 86/5 B.C. In the last three examples, we find families which, having survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C., nonetheless enjoyed only a temporary prominence. All of these families share similar characteristics. None can be identified as *gennetai* although all have members attested in senior offices before the reign of Augustus. But as far as the evidence will allow, these families may be said to have declined by the reign of Augustus and must be distinguished from the families which survived and prospered in the early years of the Roman Empire.

The historical and prosopographical evidence does not, in general, allow us to identify the reasons for the decline or disappearance of a family. But one factor in the social mobility of Athenian families during this period must have been political. The survival of a family as a member of the governing class under Augustus indicates that somehow the family managed, by luck or design, to weather the vicissitudes of Athenian politics between c. 100 and c. 30 B.C. Just as the ephebic list from between 80/79-78/7 B.C.²⁹ was important evidence for

²⁹See Chapter 5.

the survival and emergence of families of the peripheral governing class after the revolution of 88/7 B.C., the ephebic list from 38/7 B.C., when Antony was residing at Athens, might offer prosopographical evidence for the fate of a few families which were caught up in the events of the civil wars. Only fifty-three ephebes are attested in the official list for this year. This represents a dramatic decrease in size compared to the last decades of the second century B.C. when ephebic classes as large as one hundred and forty ephebes are recorded. Six individuals who are known to have served as ephebes in this year belong to families which can be traced to before 88/7 B.C. None of these ephebes or their descendants are attested at Athens during the reign of Augustus.³⁰ In contrast to these six ephebes, four other ephebes who served in 38/7 B.C. belong to families which are attested under Augustus. ΑΠΟΜΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΟΤΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ, for example, went on to be *hypopaidotribes* in 23/2 B.C. and *paidotribes* after 8/7 B.C. (I.G. II² 2997). ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ, a *paidotribes* in 38/7 B.C., would serve as a *prytanis* between 19/8-18/7 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 293).³¹ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΥ ΦΛΕΥΣ is related to two ephebes, ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΥ and ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ, who served around the turn of the century (I.G. II² 1962).³² ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΥΣ would serve as a secretary in 20/19 B.C. His father had been a gymnasiarch in 55/4 B.C. [__]Σ ΝΙΚΟΦΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ, finally, served as an ephebe in 38/7 B.C. A brother would be a *prytanis* in 32/1 B.C. It is important to note, however, that the families of these five ephebes are uniformly obscure. It might be members of the *ephebeia* who served in 38/7 B.C., the year in which the Panathenaia was temporarily renamed the Antonieia, did not do well under Augustus.

In contrast to the forty-one archons under Augustus who can be traced to

³⁰ ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ served as *hoplomachos* during this year. His grandfather was also a *hoplomachos*, in 119/8 B.C. A son of ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ is attested as a *prytanis* in c. 30 B.C. (Agora XV, n. 288) but the family is otherwise unattested.

³¹ His cousin, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ, was an ephebe in 38/7 B.C.

³² ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ also served as a *prytanis* (Agora XV, n. 303).

"old" families which belonged to the first or second generations of the governing class (between 167/6 and 88/7 B.C.), the remaining twenty-four archons who held office under Augustus belong to families which are "new", that is, they are either unattested before this generation or can only be traced to a relative who served as a magistrate or priest after 86/5 B.C. In addition to these archons, seventy-eight

Table 7-3: Members of "New" Families in Office Under Augustus

	Non-Areopagites	Areopagites	Total
86/5- c. 35 B.C.	2 (15)	3 (1)	21
c. 35 B.C.-A.D. 14	8 (70)	24	102

Note: Table 7.3 shows the category in which members of these families are attested in the period between 86/5 B.C. and A.D. 14 (members of families which are not known to have been part of the Areopagus under Augustus are indicated in parentheses).

other magistrates attested under Augustus also belong to "new" families. These twenty-four archons and seventy-eight other magistrates who did not belong to the Areopagus can be assigned to families which cannot be traced to a member of the governing class before 86/5 B.C. (Table 7.3). Many of these Areopagites might be, if I may borrow a Roman concept, "new men" who were the first members of their families to become members of the Athenian governing elite. Only two archons under Augustus from families first attested after 88/7 B.C., for example, are known to belong to families which were part of the governing elite in the period between 86/5-c. 35 B.C.³³ *APXITIMOS APXITIMOT ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ*, archon in 30/29 B.C. early in the reign of Augustus and in the year in which a Dodecade was sent to Delphi, was the son of a *thesmothetes* in 56/5 B.C. Similarly, *ΠΟΛΥΤΑΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΣΟΡΝΙΕΥΣ*, who was archon in 14/3 B.C., is the son of

³³In contrast to the forty-one archons belonging to "old" families (which placed eleven members in the Areopagus in the same period).

the eponymous archon of 41/0 B.C. $\Phi\Lambda\iota\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma \Phi\Lambda\iota\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\tau \epsilon\tau\omicron\tau\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ became archon between 31/0-15/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1720). He must have been about fifty years of age in his archonship (unless the archon was his son), for his father was an ephebe between 80/79-78/7 B.C. A number of other entirely "new" families may also be identified during the reign of Augustus.³⁴ $\text{ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΥΓΕΙΤΩΝΟΣ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ}$, for example, was a *thesmothetes* sometime after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1722). He is the first attested member of his family. His son served in the *prytaneia* (*Agora* XV, n. 307). $\text{ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΟΡΒΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ}$ was a *prytanis* in 19/8-18/7 B.C. His son ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ seems to have become a *thesmothetes* in 14/3 B.C. $\text{ΙΣΙΔΟΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΤΗΤΟΣ}$ served as a *thesmothetes* between 36/5-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1718). His nephew, ΣΩΣΙΒΙΟΣ , served as an ephebe in the first decades of the first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1964). The [] $\text{ΕΥΡΥΜΑΧΟΣ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ}$, who was a *thesmothetes* in c. 30 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1719) could be a son of ΕΥΡΥΜ[] , who was a magistrate on Delos in 38/7 B.C.³⁵ $\text{ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΘΕΜΙΣΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΥΣΤΙΟΣ}$ was a *thesmothetes* in the beginning of the first century A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1729). His brother, ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ , was a *prytanis* between 19/8-18/7 B.C., a *thesmothetes* after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1722) and *astynomos* around the turn of the century (*I.G.* II² 2878).³⁶ $\text{ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ}$ was a *prytanis* in 34/3 B.C. His son, ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΟΣ , was a *prytanis* with his father, and his other son, ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ , also served as *prytanis* in c. 30 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 285). A grandson, ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ , was *thesmothetes* in 14/3 B.C. and *kosmetes* a few years later (*I.G.* II² 1964). $\text{ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΣ ΗΡΟΔΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ}$ was treasurer of the *boule* in 34/3 B.C.

³⁴Another member of the Areopagus might be identified as a representative of a "new" family; $\text{ΔΗΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΥΘΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ}$ is attested as king-archon in the late first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² XII.190). He cannot be securely identified, but ΠΥΘΟΓΕΝΗΣ is not a common name at Athens. A contemporaneous sculptor went by the name ΜΙΚΙΩΝ ΠΥΘΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ and could be related (*I.G.* II² 4144).

³⁵This is a conjectural family stemma, but the combination of letters ΕΥΡΥΜ is not common in Athenian names.

³⁶He was adopted by $\text{ΚΙΝΕΑΣ ΚΤΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ}$, who is otherwise unknown.

He or his grandson became a *thesmothetes* before 22/3 A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1730). ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ, his brother, would serve as a *prytanis* in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 21, pp. 293-4). One other family which participated in the *prytaneia* at this time also placed a member in the Areopagus. ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ was twice *prytanis*, in 32/1 B.C. and c. 30 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 288). His cousin, ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ, also served as a *prytanis* in 32/1 B.C. A relative, ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΥΡΩΝΟΣ, would enter the Areopagus after serving as a *thesmothetes* in 14/3 B.C.

In addition to the "new" families which have been described above, a number of individual Areopagites may also be identified at this time as possibly "new men": ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΕΤΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ, for example, in a pattern which we have already seen above, first served as a *prytanis* in c. 50 B.C. (*Agora* XV, 280 and *Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 17, pp. 287-89), becoming a *thesmothetes* in c. 30 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1719).³⁷ Other junior magistrates can also be identified as future Areopagites and this makes their careers particularly interesting: ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ was a *paredros* of the *polemarchos* in c. 30 B.C. (*Hesperia* 15, 1946, n. 45, pp. 217-19). He would himself become *polemarchos* sometime after 11/0 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1727); similarly, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΔΗΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ served as herald of the archon between 38/7-18/7 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1718). He must have been elected archon sometime before his year as *epimeletes* of Delos at the turn of the century (*I.D.* 1624). Other *thesmothetai* whose family origins remain unknown are attested in at least one other office during their careers: thus, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ, who served in c. 6 B.C. as *epimeletes* of Delos (*I.D.* 1626) could be the ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ Α [] who was a *thesmothetes* around the end of the first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1728);³⁸ ΖΗΝΩΝ

³⁷The *thesmothetes* might only be a relative and not the same man. He is identified as [] ΕΤΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ.

³⁸This is a conjectural collation, but the *epimeletes* must have been an archon to have entered the Areopagus, and the fragmentary archon list on which the name of the *thesmothetes* appears could easily have dated to before c. 6 B.C.

ΑΕΤΚΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ served as archon in 13/2 B.C. and became life-long priest of Asclepius, Hygeia and Augustus after 9/8 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 3176); *ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ* was a *thesmothetes* in the last years of the first century B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1719). He is not attested in any other offices although he was honoured with a statue for some kind of service.³⁹ The presence of several Roman names among these "new men" also suggests that it may have been in this generation that Roman citizens at Athens or Athenians who began to receive the Roman franchise first joined the Areopagus.⁴⁰ The career of *ΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ*, who served as hoplite general and as *agonothetes* of games, for example, is consistent with this pattern, for apart from *ΑΠΕΛΛΙΚΩΝ* of Teos, who served as a "general" in extreme circumstances, *ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ* is the first naturalized Athenian to attain such high office.⁴¹ The family of *ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ*, in contrast, provides an example of a "new" Athenian family which was native-born. *ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ* served as herald of the Areopagus under Augustus (*I.G.* II² 1723 with *AE* 1972, pp. 55-7). His son, also named *ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ*, was archon in the following generation and his grandson, Tiberius Claudius *ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ*, would become herald of the Areopagus in 61/2 A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1990, 3185, 3449 and 3538). Here is an example of a powerful family, first attested during the reign of Augustus, which, like the family of *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* and *ΗΡΩΔΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ*, would eventually attain Roman citizenship.⁴² Two other "new" families must also be mentioned here. *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΦΑΥΕΥΣ* held at least seven hoplite generalships under

³⁹*Hesperia* 23 (1954) n. 37, p. 255. The name of the *thesmothetes* in this case is also fragmentary ([_]ΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ). But the collation is plausible, and in any case the *thesmothetes* must belong to the same family.

⁴⁰See Chapter 1 for citizenship.

⁴¹On Julius Nikanor see C.P. Jones, "Three Foreigners in Attica," *Phoenix* 32 (1978) pp. 222-34 and A.E. Raubitschek, "The New Homer," *Hesperia* 23 (1954) pp. 317ff.

⁴²Although it must be emphasized that Athenian families were slow to win this status or to even become members of the Roman Senate (Cf. G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, pp. 30-41). On the Roman citizenship at Athens see Chapter 1.

Augustus.⁴³ Although he is not known to have held any other offices, he is attested as an orator in a decree of 22/1 B.C. establishing the celebration of Augustus' birthday as a public holiday at Athens. Both his son and his grandson would also join the Areopagus. The career of *ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ ΣΤΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΕΙΟΣ*, finally, is in many ways an archetype of the pattern which we have found for the careers and offices of "new men" and their families. He was herald of the *boule* and *demos* in c. 40 B.C. (*Agora* XV, n. 282). He became archon in 37/6 B.C. and, like *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* of Marathon, held the hoplite generalship late in life (*I.G.* II² 3500). His son would become king-archon before 22/3 A.D. (*I.G.* II² 1730) and descendants are attested at Athens into the later Roman Empire.

A large number of archons have been identified as members of either "new" families or families which might not have been able to attain the archonship during the preceding generations. It seems reasonable to explain this feature of the prosopographical evidence as a result of the introduction of *destinatio* at Athens. If the Areopagus was coming to resemble an *ordo decurionum* at this time, Augustus or his advisors could have elevated "new" families to the archonship in order to renew the governing class with suitably pro-Roman families. The families which placed a member in the Areopagus, consequently, would have been the beneficiaries of the *gene*-based system of designation introduced by Augustus, and their families, through the election of an archon, joined the governing elite at Athens. It is tempting to speculate that such families would retain that status in the following generations. Unfortunately the prosopographical evidence for Athenian magistrates, and in particular archons, is very poor for the first century A.D. Nonetheless, several archons from this century may be identified as the sons or grandsons of an Areopagite under

⁴³Geagan, "The Third Hoplite Generalship of Antipatros of Phlya," *AJP* 100 (1979) pp. 59-68.

Augustus.⁴⁴ If this was a consistent pattern, we may conclude that for the first time in several generations the recruitment of the Athenian governing elite was becoming increasingly and primarily hereditary.

Despite the wealth of prosopographical evidence for the Athenian governing class during the reign of Augustus, these years are relatively barren in terms of other documentation. Apart from Augustus' brief sojourn at Athens in 31 B.C. and again in 21 B.C. few other specific events are known at Athens. Our knowledge about Athens under the reign of Augustus is dominated by religious activities. Although it did not lead to a revival of the traditional cults of the *polis*, over eighty shrines were restored during this period.⁴⁵ Many cults, as we saw above, were assimilated to the imperial cult. Other events at Athens were religious and political in nature. A decree was passed in about 22 B.C. establishing the celebration of Augustus' birthday at Athens, and a decree of the *genos* of the Kerykes from 20/19 B.C. provides a glimpse into the reform of the *gene*. Both of these events are probably associated with Augustus' second visit. The last attested Pythaid took place in 42/1 B.C. The Pythaid was succeeded by a similar but less extravagant procession to Delphi called the Dodecade,⁴⁶ which was celebrated in the archonships of *APXITIMOS* (30/29 or 26/5 B.C.), *ΑΠΟΛΗΕΙΣ* (II) (20/19 B.C.), *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* (11/0 B.C.), *ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ* and *ΑΠΟΛΗΕΙΣ* (III) (dates uncertain).⁴⁷ The first two Dodecades are probably associated with

⁴⁴In addition to the sons or grandsons of *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΦΑΙΕΤΕΣ*, *ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΕΣ* and *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΕΙΟΣ*, we may add the family of *ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΕΣ*. *ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ* served as *thesmothetes* between 31/0-15/4 B.C. (*I.G.* II² 1720). He is related to an *epimeletes* of Delos in 54/3 B.C. A hoplite general under Claudius is a descendant (*I.G.* II² 3242). This was not a "new" family, however, for an ancestor had been a member of the Areopagus during the second century B.C.

⁴⁵*I.G.* II² 1035. See now G.R. Culley, "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: *I.G.* II² 1035," *Hesperia* 44 (1975) pp. 207-23 (and 46, 1977, pp. 282-98).

⁴⁶Cf. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, pp. 139-45 and Daux, *F.D.* III, 2, pp. 62-70.

⁴⁷For the dates of these archons see Appendix A.2.

Augustus' first and second visits to Greece.⁴⁸ During his second visit in the years 22-19 B.C., as was noted above, Augustus was initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁴⁹ The celebration of the Mysteries, in fact, was postponed in 19 B.C. in order to allow Augustus to participate, and it has been suggested that the initiation of Augustus was an attempt to influence him politically.⁵⁰ It may be no coincidence that a Dodecade was also celebrated around this time. A treasurer is attested for only the Dodecade of 20/19 B.C., something which might suggest that this celebration was more lavish than the others or that the funding was based on public subscriptions as in 98/7 B.C.⁵¹ The four Pythaid and the first Dodecade in 30/29 B.C. were celebrated in the month of Thargelion while the two Dodecades attested after 14 A.D. were celebrated in Boedromion.⁵² The month in which the intervening Dodecades were celebrated is unknown but the Dodecade of 20/19 B.C. was the first to be celebrated after the Athenians voted to honour Augustus' birthday as a public holiday in the month of Boedromion. Possibly the

⁴⁸ Graindor (*ibid.*, p. 141) suggests that the Dodecade reverted to the ancient custom by which a Pythaid was sent whenever the Pythaistai observed lightning over north-western Attica (see A. Boethius, *Die Pythais*, pp. 1-2). Augustus was favourable towards Delphi and the Dodecade could be seen as an effort by the Athenians to share in that favour (cf. Boethius, *ibid.*, p. 125).

⁴⁹ Dio reports an initiation in 31 and 19 B.C. Although some scholars have rejected Dio's testimony, Graindor argued that there were two initiations for Augustus, the second involving the higher grade of initiation. Bernhardt, however, argues that Dio's testimony does not support the nuance sought by Graindor and accepts two initiations for Augustus both, presumably, in the Greater Mysteries (for previous scholarship on this problem see Bernhardt, *AM* 90, 1975, pp. 234-5).

⁵⁰ Bernhardt, *ibid.*, p. 233-4 (Dio 54.9.10).

⁵¹ Graindor assumes that the treasurer mentioned in 20/19 B.C. was a regular official for all the Dodecades (*Athènes sous Auguste*, p. 145). But a treasurer is only explicitly attested for 20/19 B.C. and is named in the text from that year, *F.D.* III, 2 n. 61, before the flutist. In later texts he does not appear even though a flutist is usually named (in *F.D.* III, 2 n. 59 and 60, the flutist is omitted). The evidence, therefore, suggests that a treasurer served only in 20/19 B.C. although one cannot be ruled out for the first Dodecade.

⁵² After *ΑΠΟΛΛΗΙΣ* (III) a Dodecade is not attested until the reign of Domitian. It would not be until Hadrian that an emperor was again initiated in the Mysteries. Athenian efforts to win over Augustus through the manipulation of their religious festivals failed and this might explain why the Dodecade was suspended for so long after 14 A.D.

date of the Dodecade was changed in 20/19 B.C. to coincide with the birthday of the emperor who claimed descent from the god Apollo.⁵³ Athens also honoured Augustus in other ways. After he became *pontifex maximus*, altars were set up to him by the Athenians,⁵⁴ and other members of the imperial family or imperial entourage were also honoured at Athens on various visits to the city.⁵⁵ In general, however, the years between 31 B.C. and 13 A.D. present a uniform aura of tranquility and stability at Athens.⁵⁶ Ostensibly Augustus was unremittingly hostile to Athens and yet, as we have seen, a large number of Athenian families flourished under his regime. Somehow these families were able to benefit despite Augustus' formal hostility.⁵⁷ A further paradox is that although a large number of magistrates' names are known to us, few magistrates can be securely dated during this period.⁵⁸ A total of 145 inscriptions providing the names of numerous

⁵³ Augustus' visit to Greece might have made a strong impression on him, for in 17 B.C. the Saecular Games were celebrated at Rome on a grand scale. On this occasion the games were largely devoted to Apollo and Diana rather than the traditional Dis Pater and Proserpina. Note also that Delos (the sacred island of Apollo) indirectly figures in the court literature of the Augustan age (Tibullus' Delia, for example, and Horace's Cynthia are examples of such allusions in the literature).

⁵⁴ BCH 85 (1961) pp. 69-97.

⁵⁵ W.B. Dinsmoor, "The Monument of Agrippa at Athens," *AJA* 24 (1920) p. 83; A. Benjamin and A.E. Raubitschek, "Arae Augusti," *Hesperia* 28 (1959) pp. 65-85; J. Oliver, "Livia as Artemis Boulaia at Athens," *CP* 60 (1965) p. 179; A.E. Raubitschek, "Octavia's Deification at Athens," *TAPA* 77 (1946) pp. 146-50; and D. Peppas-Delmouzou, *AJP* 100 (1979) pp. 125-32.

⁵⁶ J. Oliver, "Roman Emperors and Athens," *Historia* 30 (1981) pp. 412-23, suggests that Athens was eclipsed during the Julio-Claudian period by more favoured Greek communities (such as Augustus' Nicopolis). Athens would only emerge from the sidelines as a cultural capital and a focus of imperial interest under Hadrian.

⁵⁷ Not all Athenian families, of course, would have benefited from Augustus' regime. It may be inferred that in the revision of the rolls of the *gene* (see above) some families were deprived of their gentile status. In 22/1 B.C., on the eve of Augustus' second visit to Athens, a statue of Athena on the Acropolis was said to have turned and spat blood (Dio 54.7.3). Bowersock attributes this omen to enemies of Augustus, without identifying who these might have been (*Augustus and the Greek World*, p. 106). The reform of the *gene* took place between 27/6 and 22/1 B.C. The miracle might be attributed to opposition from some quarters to tampering with the membership of the gentile clans.

⁵⁸ See Appendix A.

magistrates are datable to the period between 35/4 B.C. and A.D. 14, but only 25 of these inscriptions may be dated with precision to a particular year. Consequently, although the names of many archons in office during this period are known, the archon list remains very fragmentary.⁵⁹

Another important aspect of the emergence of a provincial as opposed to a *polis*-based *mentalité* at Athens is the absence of datable decrees from this period. It may be inferred from this evidence that the politics and administration of Athens have changed.⁶⁰ Civic life seems to have flourished, but the politics of governing a *polis* may have become less immediate as Athenian families gradually began to arrange themselves under the watchful eye of Rome into an increasingly stratified and permanent governing class. Important magistrates under Augustus, for example, held more offices for longer periods of time than for any preceding period. Frequently, an individual iterated in offices such as the hoplite generalship, liturgies such as the gymnasiarchy, or in religious offices such as priests and seers. This indicates that the elites of the governing class were becoming more exclusive and permanent in their membership. The governing elite at this time was also becoming increasingly oligarchic. While a large number of archons are known to have held office under Augustus, only a few individuals and their families may be identified as members of the governing oligarchy. Members of families which placed a member in the Areopagus were far more likely than non-Areopagites to be attested in two or more offices (including the frequent iterations among the personnel of the Dodecades) during the reign of

⁵⁹See Appendix C.

⁶⁰Augustus also seems to have deprived Athens of the right to mint her own coinage. The autonomous imperial bronze coinage of Athens had been attributed to the reign of Augustus (J.P. Shear, "Athenian Imperial Coinage," *Hesperia* 5, 1936, pp. 285-332) on stylistic criteria. More recently, on the basis of hoard evidence, the coinage has been redated to the period between A.D. 124/5-267 (J.H. Kroll, "The Eleusis Hoard of Greek Imperial Coins and Some Deposits from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 42, 1973, pp. 312-33).

Table 7-4: The Monopolization of Offices Under Augustus
by Families of the Governing Elite

no. of offices	Areopagites	Non-Areopagites
11	1*	
10		
9	1*	
8	1	
7	1	1*
6	2*	
5	1	
4	3*	1*
3	10 (50%)	4 (12%)
2	21 (22%)	21 (11%)
1	50 (27%)	129 (67%)
	185 (100%)	193 (100%)

Augustus (Table 7.4).⁶¹ Unlike the Pythaiids of the generation preceding the revolution of 88/7 B.C., the personnel of the five Dodecades under Augustus remained virtually unchanged.⁶² Only two non-Areopagite participants, who appear in the righthand column, are known (*ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΑΙΣΤΙΟΣ*, who served as *mantis* four times, and *ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΙΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ*, who was priest of Hermes Patroos five times in addition to holding two other unrelated offices during his career). The other four officials of the Dodecades are known to have been members of the Areopagus.⁶³ Even if these offices associated with the

⁶¹Their monopolization of offices is illustrated by Table 7.4 (the magistrates who served as the officials of the five Dodecades are indicated by an asterix).

⁶²See Appendix A.

⁶³They are: *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ*, *ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ*, *ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΘΡΑΣΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ* and *ΛΥΣΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΥ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ*.

Dodecade were excluded from consideration, members of the Areopagus and their families would still be more likely than non-members to serve in two or more offices.

The prosopographical evidence suggests that the governing class under Augustus was composed of generally "new" families. It has been observed above that twenty-four members of the Areopagus under Augustus belonged to families which cannot be identified as part of the governing class before 88/7 B.C. In addition, many of the remaining forty-one Areopagites, although members of families which can be identified as part of the governing class before 88/7 B.C., were nonetheless descended from low-ranking families at that time. What was the decisive factor in the recruitment of families into the Areopagus under Augustus? A parallel may be drawn to the decade between 140 and 130 B.C., which was shown in Chapter 4 to be an important turning point in the transition from the first to the second generation of the governing class, as established families of the pro-Roman aristocracy began to be replaced in the governing elite by families of more recent prominence. Only a handful of prominent families before 88/7 B.C. remained part of the governing elite during the reign of Augustus. This suggests that the major transitional period for the families of the governing class under Augustus was not the Roman civil wars, which culminated in Octavian's victory, but the more distant and more devastating revolution of 88/7 B.C. While seven individuals belonging to families attested before 88/7 B.C. held more than four offices under Augustus, only one individual from the "new" families (families first attested after 88/7 B.C.) is attested in more than four offices (Table 7.5).⁶⁴ These are the individuals, in fact, who formed the personnel of the five Dodecades under Augustus. The leading families at Athens under Augustus, therefore, may be identified by their offices and their role in the Dodecades; they largely derive their origin from the families of the peripheral class which, it was shown in Chapter 5, seems to have benefited the most from the outcome of the revolution

⁶⁴Table 7.5 compares the number of offices held by magistrates under Augustus who belong to families which are attested before 88/7 B.C. or only after that year.

Table 7-5: Number of Offices Held by Individuals Belonging
To Families First Attested Before or After 88/7 B.C.

No. of Offices	Before 88/7 B.C.	After 88/7 B.C.
11	1	
10	1	
9		
8		1
7	2	
6	2	
5	1	
4	2	2
3	3 (13%)	13 (12%)
2	11 (12%)	29 (21%)
1	68 (75%)	93 (67%)
	91 (100%)	138 (100%)

of 88/7 B.C. The revolution may have been not only the most prominent watershed in Athenian history after 167/6 B.C. but also the most important factor in the composition of the governing class under Augustus.

* * *

The history of the Athenian governing class between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 13/4, to conclude, falls into four distinct periods. These periods correspond partly to the political history of Athens and partly to the availability or nature of the prosopographical evidence, but are also based on differences in the types of families, the numbers of families and the kinds of political careers attested for

each period.⁶⁵ The first of the three periods which have been set out in the preceding chapters extends from the acquisition of Delos in 167/6 B.C. to the decade between 140-30 B.C., when Athens began to lose her autonomy in the administration of the colony on the island. The second period, beginning with the generation first attested as either *paides* or ephebes in the Pythaiids of 138/7 and 128/7 B.C., saw the emergence of newer families into an integrated Athenian-Delian governing class and was dominated by events at Athens: in the religious sphere by the four great Pythaiids sent to Delphi, and in the political sphere by political and social conflict culminating in the anarchy and civil war of 88/7 B.C. The decades following the restoration of Roman hegemony over Greece in 86/5 B.C. are poorly attested, but the period beginning in about 60 B.C. and ending with the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. forms a third coherent period, during which political events in the Roman world are reflected in factional strife within the Athenian governing class. The fourth and final period began with the triumph of Octavian, the heir of Julius Caesar, as the ultimate victor in the Roman civil wars. The reign of Augustus ended several decades of strife and provides the evidence for the best attested generation of the governing class at Athens since the revolution of 88/7 B.C. It was during this generation that the membership of the Areopagus was regulated through a reform of the traditionally hereditary *gene* of the religious elite.

Politics, literally "affairs pertaining to the *polis*", may be defined in the Greco-Roman context as the issues about which men disagree and over which

⁶⁵Other accounts of Athens follow a similar periodization, although all are based on political events. Ferguson's *HA* and Mossé's *Athens in Decline* both cover the period down to c. 80 B.C., but discuss only the most important families. MacKendrick's *The Athenian Aristocracy* covers the entire period from 332 B.C. to 31 B.C., but discusses only gentile families. MacKendrick claims that gentile families were prominent from 166 to 146 B.C., fell into eclipse until 129/8 B.C., and then revived following the defeat of Tiberius Gracchus at Rome (*ibid.*, pp. 53-4). This is the first event in Roman politics which has been said to have had an impact on Athenian society. Graindor says very little about Athenian families under Augustus. Touloumakos gives a thumbnail sketch of Athenian prosopography from c. 300 B.C. to Augustus, but relies entirely on Ferguson ("Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten," pp. 77-101).

they have the power of decision.⁶⁶ An important part of the political struggle in any society is that of propaganda. Our sources for Athenian politics in the period of the civil wars have provided a few details about the symbolic level on which the conflict was waged in Athens, and this has been important for understanding how Augustus employed propaganda to conceal his manipulation of Athenian institutions in the effective dismantling of the instruments of democracy. We have already seen in Chapter 6 that one faction at Athens appealed to the memory of the Athenian tyrannicides, the heroes of the clan of the Gephyraioi, in honouring Brutus and Cassius. Sometime after 27 B.C., the Athenians voted to celebrate Augustus' birthday on the 12th day of the month of Boedromion.⁶⁷ It may not be entirely coincidental that this was also the day, as we learn from Plutarch, on which the Athenians celebrated the return of Thrasybulus in 403/2 B.C. and the restoration of democracy after the rule of the thirty oligarchs.⁶⁸ It was in 27 B.C. that Augustus claimed to have restored the Roman Republic, and perhaps his Athenian supporters made a similar claim after the period of oligarchic domination under Antony. This is especially plausible if we accept that Augustus was identified in the imperial cult at Athens with *Democratia*, the personification of Athenian democracy.⁶⁹ In each of these symbols, the tyrannicides and the return of Thrasybulus, the Athenians were interpreting their present circumstances in terms of the past. The days when Athens counted as a force to be reckoned with were, of course, long past in the annals of Mediterranean history, although the Athenians seem to have allowed themselves a certain indulgence during the first century B.C. Two specific incidents are

⁶⁶Cf. Finley, *Politics in the Ancient World*, p. 52. Politics may ultimately be a struggle for power or survival, but the existence of a political struggle implies freedom and is always waged over specific issues.

⁶⁷*Hesperia* 26 (1957) n. 98, pp. 246-78. The text is dated by G.A. Stamires to c. 22 B.C.

⁶⁸Plutarch, "De Gloria Atheniensium," 7.349ff. Oliver, *Democratia, the Gods and the Free World*, Baltimore, 1960, pp. 105-6, suggests that a sacrifice to *Democratia* regularly took place on the 12th day of Boedromion.

⁶⁹On the cult of *Democratia* at Athens see Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 31 (1962) p. 238ff.

recorded. When Caesar met the Athenian spokesmen on the second day after the battle of Pharsalus, we are not told what they said, although Caesar's response may be sufficient indication: "How often," Caesar is reported to have asked, "will your ancestors have to save you from self-destruction?"⁷⁰ In an identical situation a generation earlier in 87 B.C., Sulla showed less grace when he replied to Athenian envoys, "I have come to punish rebels not to learn ancient history."⁷¹ The events of the first century B.C. provided the Athenians with ample opportunity for political disagreement. The anarchy of the civil wars might even have given them the transitory notion that they could decide their own fate. Their past, to be sure, gave them the symbols for their propaganda. But it was only a dangerous illusion. Although the governing class would remain as the elite of Athenian society, Athenian politics came to an end with the fall of the Roman Republic.⁷²

⁷⁰Appian, *BC*, 2.88. The orators might have reminded Caesar that Sparta had spared Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War because of her illustrious past.

⁷¹Plutarch, *Sulla*, 13.

⁷²A.H.M. Jones, "The Greeks in the Roman Empire," *DOP* 17 (1963) pp. 3-19, observes that while Roman provincial administration always remained based on the city rather than the province as an administrative unit, the civic life of the *polis* had been fundamentally changed. The change in the nature of the governing class can be illustrated by the prosopographical problems faced by historians who study Athens under the Empire. See Follett, *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle av. J.C.*, pp. 14-5.

Appendix A

Fasti Magistratum Atheniensium

A.1. Introduction

Because most Athenian magistracies were held for one year or for part of one year, the Athenian civic year (which straddles our Julian year and so must be expressed, for example, as 167/6 B.C.) forms a natural unit for the dating of Athenian magistrates in a sequential table.¹ The various magistrates of the prytany, of course, held office for only part of one year although they did serve as *bouleutai* for the entire year. Ambassadors and envoys were chosen on an ad hoc basis. Similarly, liturgical positions and the magistrates responsible for the celebration of games, cannot strictly be regarded as annual magistrates. The ephebic year, furthermore, ran from September to September, and the ephebic instructors' term in office would have straddled the civic year. A similar difficulty occurs with the long-term or life-long priesthoods and magistracies. I enter these in this annual table and regard their term in office as a series of annual tenures. The annual magistrates and priests of Delos, finally, present one

¹At Delphi, on the other hand, documents can often only be grouped by the alternating colleges of priestesses (G. Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 20-1). S. Follett bases her chronological discussion on the more certain foundation of Athenian synchronisms with Roman chronology (*Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle av. J.C.*, p. 19). In the case of Athens for the period under study here, however, neither method is appropriate. Apart from the list of proxenies, which itself is of only limited chronological usefulness, Delphi is remarkably devoid of diachronic lists (Daux, *ibid.*, pp. 17-8). The sequence of Delphic archons within each priesthood, therefore, is often unknown. Between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14, however, there are few "synchronisms" to Roman consuls or dates in the epigraphical evidence for Athens. On the other hand, the Athenian evidence from this period, unlike at Delphi, is well-supplied with annual diachronic lists which cover, with several rather large lacunae, the entire period. These lists are the primary basis for the reconstruction of Athenian chronology during this period.

additional difficulty. There is reason to believe that the civic year on Delos did not coincide with the Athenian civic calendar, at least for the first decades of the cleruchy. The priests, moreover, might have taken office at the time of the festival of their cult. Consequently, their term in office might not have coincided with the civic year, and we do find, for example, two priests of Apollo on Delos in 99/8 B.C. The most that can be claimed for an index of this kind, therefore, is that each magistrate and priest listed here held office for at least part of the year under which he is entered (although in some cases his actual tenure of the office might have straddled either the preceding or the following years).

Reconstructing the chronological order of events, documents or magistrates involves the establishment of a relative sequence of events and a fixed or absolute date by which the entire relative sequence may be dated. For the purpose of dating the magistrates named on an inscription a distinction may be made between the "textual" date of an inscription (the date it was composed) and the "reference date" (the date to which the text refers).² In *I.D.* 1947, for example, a dedication by a former priest of a deity on Delos, the text was composed and set up in the archonship of *ΑΗΝΑΙΟΣ*. But the dedication is made by a priest who had served nine years before in the archonship of *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΔΗΣ*. The palaeographical study of inscriptions introduces a third factor in dating the magistrates named in an inscription which may be termed the "palaeographical date".³ Occasionally it can be determined that a particular reference in an

²Dating an inscription and dating the magistrates named in the text are not the same thing. Most of the criteria for dating an inscription such as letter forms, disposition on a *stèle*, place of discovery, format, and orthography (A.G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*, Cambridge, 1959, pp. 52-66, G. Klaffenbach, *Griechische Epigraphik*, Munich, 1966, pp. 96-99, W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*, Munich, 1914, pp. 177-9 and 181-6 and G. Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 73-93) are not sufficient in themselves for dating a particular magistrate.

³*I.G.* II² 1335 is a list of *eranistai* of the association of the Sabaziasitai which was drawn up in the archonship of *ΘΕΟΚΛΗΣ* but not actually inscribed until two years after the text was composed. This is a rare instance where an epigraphical text refers to its own date of inscription. The distinction between the textual date and the palaeographical date is usually unimportant for historical purposes (but see Appendix A.2 for the discussion of the date of *I.G.* II² 1714).

inscription was actually inscribed several years after the individual held office.⁴ A single inscription, therefore, may refer to several magistrates, all dating to different years, and may present several different chronological relationships.

To establish the chronological list of all datable Athenian magistrates between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 14, or the *Fasti magistratum Atheniensium* presented here, the magistrates have been assigned to their proper place in the list strictly on the basis of chronological evidence.⁵ All magistrates named in a group of inscriptions who served in the same year are entered in the *Fasti* together.⁶ Fixed sequences such as diachronic lists allow a large number of associated

⁴S. Tracy, for example, has been able to determine that in *F.D.* III, 2 n. 30, a list of *kanephoroi* from 106/5 B.C., the name *APXIIIH ΔΠΟΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ* was not actually inscribed until 98/7 B.C. (*The Lettering of an Athenian Mason*, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, Princeton, 1975, p. 68). A more striking example is provided by another participant in a Pythaid. The name of *ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ* was not inscribed on *F.D.* III, 2 n. 12 until thirty years after he had participated in the Pythaid of 138/7 B.C. (Tracy, *BCH* 99, 1975, p. 191).

⁵It is not necessary to be too technical about the terminology or methodology. Homolle, for example, in the late 19th century employed the concepts of fixed sequences of texts and horizontal synchronisms without employing a formal terminology (*BCH* 10, 1886, pp. 6-38; *BCH* 17, 1893, pp. 145-79). When Notopoulos speaks of "chain reactions", of inscriptions attracting one another and of the "synthetic use of ephebic and prytany lists", he is attempting somewhat unsuccessfully to arrive at a formal methodology ("Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire," *Hesperia* 18, 1949, pp. 1-57). Perhaps the only concepts which require definition are "fixed and unfixed synchronisms", diachronic lists and "fixed and unfixed sequences". Multiple references to a single magistrate are known as a synchronism, and these synchronisms can either be fixed by reference to a diachronic list or dated sequence of magistrates or remain undated. If two or more magistrates named on one inscription served in different years, and those years are known, their tenure will fall into a fixed sequence or interval. The interval is unfixed if one or more of these magistrates cannot be dated with precision.

⁶An indirect or obscured synchronism between two magistrates might be overlooked and they would then be dated in error to different years (cf. Follett, *Athènes au IIe et IIIe siècle av. J.C.*, pp. 8-9).

magistrates to be dated with precision.⁷ Once the magistrates who can be dated by the certain evidence of diachronic lists are entered in the list in their proper years, other magistrates may be dated by the tribal rotation of prytany-secretaries, the priests of Asclepius, and several priesthoods on Delos. These tribal cycles generally followed fixed sequences for the twelve Athenian tribes, although irregular interruptions in the cycles often cause difficulties in using the cycles for chronological purposes. Apart from diachronic lists and tribal cycles, magistrates may be also dated by other, albeit less precise, means.⁸ Occasionally a group of magistrates are known to belong to the same year, for example, although none of the magistrates can be dated by means of a diachronic list or cycle. These magistrates can only be dated to a year in which all the magistracies in which they served are vacant.⁹ Finally, since an undated magistrate must date

⁷None of the diachronic lists from this period are straightforward annual lists. *I.D.* 2589 presents some kind of irregularity in the mid-140s B.C. with important consequences for the archon list. *I.D.* 2632, on which at least one archon is not represented, seems to preserve a relative sequence of magistrates although the sequence is not "closed", and a year must be inserted somewhere in the sequence. *I.G.* II² 1343, on the other hand, preserves a closed sequence although one archon is listed out of order. *I.G.* II² 1713, a fragmentary archon list spanning more than a century also presents difficulties (see Appendix A.2).

⁸The exception is the Delian temple accounts. These accounts are coterminus with *I.D.* 2589, a diachronic list of gymnasiarchs spanning the first years of the Athenian administration down to about 135 B.C. The temple accounts indirectly present a diachronic sequence of magistrates and priests which can only be recovered by reconstructing the sequences of colleges of temple administrators. Several colleges, however, can be dated through synchronisms with Athenian archons or Delian gymnasiarchs. The remaining colleges can be fitted into the sequence by means of deduction from the relative order of the accounts. Whereas Roussel and Launey only provide *termini ante quem* for most of the magistrates named on the accounts, I have attempted to date administrators and occasionally priests named in the accounts to more specific years.

⁹List vacancies such as this only provide exclusive dates, unlike tribal cycles, for example, which provide inclusive dates. This is an important distinction because the less well-attested a particular magistracy is, the larger the number of available years on the basis of list vacancies. Sometimes even the tribal cycles will provide several vacant years for an undated priest. List vacancies are only helpful, therefore, when the magistracy in question is well-attested or is synchronized with such a magistracy.

to at least sometime before the text on which he is named,¹⁰ a *terminus ante quem* may be determined for many magistrates. Their names, however, cannot be entered in this list.¹¹ By means of tracing out the synchronisms and relative sequences of all known Athenian magistrates and priests for this period based on the absolute dates established for the most part by previous scholars, it has been possible to offer in these *Fasti* a list of every magistrate, civic official and priest who can be dated with some precision to a particular year. The majority of senior magistrates and many of the less important ones who held office between 167/6 B.C. and A.D. 13/4 are named in these *Fasti*. The dates which have been established for their tenure in office provide the fixed points of reference around which careers and family stemmas can be reconstructed. The chronological notes

¹⁰Exceptions to this are very rare. *I.G.* II² 1046 is a decree granting permission for a priest to carry out repairs on the temple of the deity. The priest is described as "priest-designate" for the coming year. In addition the archon ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ mentioned in the temple account *I.D.* 1444 (Aa59), could be the archon who held office two years after the administrators responsible for the account themselves held office. The temple accounts seem to have taken a long time to prepare and "late transmissions" between colleges of administrators are often recorded. But despite exceptions such as this, the archon ΑΝΔΡΕΑΣ, who is named in a temple account composed by the administrators in the archonship of ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ (145/4 B.C.), must be dated to before that year. Since 146/5 B.C. is tentatively occupied and 150/49-147/6 B.C. are filled, he must date to the 150s B.C. In the *Fasti* he is dated to 154/3 B.C. (the years 153/2-151/0 B.C. being occupied by other archons). Habicht (*AM* 97, 1982, pp. 175-84) dates ΑΝΔΡΕΑΣ to 154/3 B.C. at the earliest and probably before 150 B.C. rather than after. But the "window" is considerably narrower than Habicht seems to allow.

¹¹Chronological *termini* such as this are indicated where possible in Appendix A.3.

presented in Appendix A.2 are limited to salient problems in the chronology of this period.¹²

A Note on Prosopographical and Epigraphical References

In this Appendix the reader will find the names and references for all magistrates and office-holders whose year of tenure can be dated to a specific year. Names have all been converted to nominative form, but within this standard convention I have tried to present as accurately as possible the textual or philological support for a name. The restorations and readings are those provided in the published texts, which are indicated for each name with superscripted footnotes (e.g. $\Delta H[MHT]PIO\Sigma^1$). In the case where several texts allow us to establish the correct or full form of a name, the name is presented as a collation. In such instances, if the name is completely or largely restored in a particular document, square brackets enclose the superscripted number of the inscription (e.g. $\Delta HMHTPIO\Sigma^{1,[2],3}$). The purpose of this index is to assist the reader's evaluation of the prosopographical evidence for this period. For that reason I have presented the names as they appear in the inscriptions without supplying additional information based on what must always be conjectural career collations or family attributions.

¹²The chronological problems of the second century have been discussed extensively in previous scholarship. The most relevant recent scholarship which must be mentioned are the following: Roussel, *DCA*; W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, New York, 1939 and *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931; W.K. Pritchett and B.D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940; and Meritt, "Athenian Archons 347/6-48/7 B.C.," *Historia* 26 (1977) pp. 161-191. For the first century, Dow established many of the dates and even the correct names of several Athenian archons ("Archons of the Period After Sulla," *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, pp. 116-25). Mention must also be made here of Notopoulos, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) pp. 1-57. Many chronological problems remain unresolved, especially for the first century B.C.: Notopoulos writes, "The question also arose of the continuity of the tribal cycles after Sulla and their convergence with tribal cycles in the second century after Christ. It is hoped that sufficient progress has been made on this problem to encourage others who, through glimpses of order in the previously chaotic chronology of the first century before Christ, can make more progress in the chronology of this period" (*ibid.*, p. 1).

167 B.C.

archon: ΝΙΚΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ^{1,2,4}

*secretary of the prytany: ΜΝ or ΜΑ[.....]³

*treasurer of the *boule*: [.....] ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ³

prytany-secretary: [.....] Μ[Η]Ρ[ΙΝ]Ο[Υ]Τ[Ε]Ι[Ο]Σ²

*herald of the *boule* and *demos*: [ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΥΣ]³

*flutist: ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ³

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ^{[8],9}

epi ta hiera?: ΜΙΚΙΩΝ⁵

priest of Sarapis: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ^{[6],7}

*these magistrates could date to 165/4 B.C.

¹ *I.G.* II² 951

² *Agora* XV, n. 215

³ *Agora* XV, n. 217

⁴ *Hesperia* 16 (1947) n. 64, pp. 164-8

⁵ *I.D.* 1403

⁶ *I.D.* 1416

⁷ *I.D.* 1417

⁸ *I.D.* 1950

⁹ *I.D.* 2589

166/5 B.C.

archon: ΑΧΑΙΟΣ¹, [2,3], 4, 5, 6, [7]

treasurer of the prytany (X): Θ[ΗΡ]ΕΥΣ [.....] ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ⁵

priest of the Eponymous Hero: ΑΛΕΞΙ[ΩΝ] ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁵

prytaneis:⁵

proedroi: [] ΠΤΕΛΕΑΣΙΟΣ¹

ΕΥ[] Χ]ΟΛΑΡΓΕΥΣ²

ΣΩ[] Σ ΦΛΕΥΣ³

[Θ]ΕΟΞΕ[ΝΟΣ] [] ΕΩ[.] ΡΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ⁵

[.....] ΝΙΚ[]⁶

orators: ΔΙΟΧΑΡΗΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΒΕ[ΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ]¹

[] Σ ΧΑΙΡΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ [Σ]ΚΑ[ΜΒ]ΩΝΙΔΗΣ²

ΑΛΚΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΦΙΛΛΟΥ³

ΤΙΜΩΝ Α[]⁴

[Θ]ΕΟΞΕ[ΝΟΣ] [] ΕΩ[.] ΡΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ⁵

ΘΕΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ ΑΙΓΙΑΛΕΥΣ⁸

secretary of the boule and demos:

ΘΕΟΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ [Σ ΕΠ]ΑΜΕΙΝΟΝΟΣ [ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ]⁵

prytany-secretary: ΗΡΑΚΛΕ[ΩΝ] ΝΑΝ(Ν)ΑΚΟΥ ΕΥΠ[ΤΡΙΔΗΣ]^{1,2,[3],5,6}

undersecretary: [ΜΝΗΣΑΡΧΟΣ] ΕΠΑΜΕΙΝΟΝΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ⁵

herald of the boule and demos: [ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ] ΤΡΙΝΕΜ[Ε]ΥΣ⁵

flutist: [ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ]⁵

treasurer of the boule: ΕΡ[Μ]ΟΚΛΗΣ [Σ] Ι[ΕΡ]ΟΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ [ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ]⁵

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ΣΑΤΥ]ΡΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹⁰

epi ta hiera: ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ⁸

ΑΓΝΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ⁸

priest of Sarapis: ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΚΥΔΑΝΤΙΔΗΣ⁹

¹*I.G.* II² 946

²*I.G.* II² 947

³*I.G.* II² 948

⁴*I.G.* II² 954 (with *Hesperia* 41, 1972, pp. 46-9)

⁵*Agora* XV, n. 216

⁶*Hesperia* 23 (1954) n. 10, p. 240

⁷*Hesperia* 3 (1934) n. 20, pp. 27-31 (with *Hesperia* 26, 1957, p. 73)

⁸*I.D.* 1403

⁹*I.D.* 1416

¹⁰*I.D.* 2589

165/4 B.C.

archon: ΠΕΛΟΥ^{1,2,9}

*secretary of the prytany:

*treasurer of the *boule*:

prytany-secretary: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΕΚΑΛΗΘΕΝ¹

*herald of the *boule* and *demos*:

*flutist:

proedros: ΡΗΞΙΩΝ ΔΑΜΑΤΡΙΟΥ ΘΟΡΑΙΕΥΣ¹

orators: ΑΡΧΙΠΠΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΟΥ ΒΑΤΗΘΕΝ¹

ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥΣ¹

ΑΙΣΧΕΑΣ ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ²

ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ⁹

demarchos: ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥΣ¹

priest of Asclepius: ΠΡΩΤΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΝΙΚΗΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΓΑΣΗΘΕΝ²

epi ta hiera (responsible for *I.D.* 1403?):

ΦΕΡΕΚΛΗΣ^{3,4,[5],6,7,8}

ΘΗΡΟΜΑΧΟΣ^{3,4,6,7,8}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ZH]NOΔΟΤΟΣ ΑΡΕΩΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹⁰

*see 167/6 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 949

²Hesperia 28 (1959) n. 7, pp. 185-6

³I.D. 1408

⁴I.D. 1428

⁵I.D. 1430

⁶I.D. 1432

⁷I.D. 1443

⁸I.D. 1450

⁹I.D. 1497

¹⁰I.D. 2589

164/3 B.C.

archon: ΕΤΕΡΓΕΤΗΣ^{1,[2],4,5}

treasurer of the prytany (I): ΚΑΡΙΠΟΣ [.....]ΑΤΟΡ [.....]²

secretary of the prytany (I): [.....]ΩΝΑ[...]²

treasurer of the prytany (V): [.....]³

secretary of the prytany (V): [.....]ΑΙΝΕΤΟΡ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΥΣ³

priest of the Eponymous Hero (V): [.....]³

prytaneis (V):³

proedroi: ΕΥΘΙΑΣ ΝΟΤΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΥ¹

ΜΝΗΣΙΓΕΝ[ΗΣ] Μ[ΝΗ]Σ[ΙΓΕΝΟΥ] ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥ²

[ΕΡ]ΑΚΛΕΙ[ΤΟΥ]²

orator: ΑΓΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΜΗΔΟΥ ΚΤΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ¹

secretary of the *boule* and *demos*: [.....]ΗΝ²
[.....]³

undersecretary: [.....]ΤΕΑ²

prytany-secretary: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ^{1,2,[4]}

treasurer of the *boule*: [..]ΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ^{[2],3}

herald of the *boule* and *demos*: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΥΣ^{2,3}

flutist: ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΥΣ^{2,3}

ephebes:⁵

epi ta hiera: ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥΣ⁶
ΖΩΠΥΡΟΥΣ⁶

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ΔΙΟ]ΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥΣ⁷

¹ *Agora* XV, n. 219

² *Agora* XV, n. 220

³ *Agora* XV, n. 221

⁴ *Hesperia* 28 (1959) n. 1, pp. 273-4

⁵ *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 19, pp. 88-91

⁶ *I.D.* 1408

⁷ *I.D.* 2589

163/2 B.C.

archon: ΕΡΑΣΤΗΣ^{[1],2,3}

proedros: ΖΩΙΛΟΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΥ ΦΛΕΤΕΥΣ¹

orator: ΑΥΚΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΑΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΥΣ¹

prytany-secretary: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΞΕΝΩΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΟΥΣ^{1,3}

epi ta hiera: ΗΓΙΑΣ^{4,5,6}
 ΛΓΣΙΘΕΟΣ^{[4],5,6}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [Κ]ΡΑΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΤΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ⁸

priest of the Great Gods: ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ⁷

¹I.G. II² 783

²I.G. II² 2323

³Hesperia 3 (1934) n. 20, pp. 27-31

⁴I.D. 1408

⁵I.D. 1441

⁶I.D. 1450

⁷I.D. 1981

⁸I.D. 2589

162/1 B.C.

archon: ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,4,5}

treasurer of the prytany (II): [ΑΒΡΩΝ ΚΑΛ]ΛΙΟΥ ΒΑΤΗΘΕΝ²

kosmetes: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΠΟΛΟ[]³

epi ta hiera: ΦΙΛΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ⁶
 ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΟΤΟΣ⁶

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΜΕΝΕΚΛΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ⁸

priest of the Great Gods: ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁷

¹I.G. II² 2323

²I.G. II² 2864

³Hesperia 2 (1933) n. 16, pp. 503-5

⁴Hesperia 16 (1947) n. 64, pp. 164-8

⁵I.D. 1408

⁶*I.D.* 1413⁷*I.D.* 1498⁸*I.D.* 2589

161/0 B.C.

archon: *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΛΑΣ*^{1,3,[4,5],6,7,[8],9,[10]}treasurer of the prytany (II): [.....]*ΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*⁴secretary of the prytany (II): *ΚΛΕ[ΑΙ]ΝΕΤΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΝΟΡ[ΟΣ]*⁴priest of the Eponymous Hero (II): [..]*ΣΙΝ ΕΚ ΚΟ[ΛΩΝΟ]Υ*⁴proedroi: [*ΣΤΡ[ΑΤΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΙΞΩ[ΝΕΤΣ]*]⁴
*ΣΩΣΟΣ ΙΩΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΤΣ*⁶orator: [..... *Φ[Ι]ΛΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ*]⁴undersecretary: *Λ[...]*⁴prytany-secretary: *ΒΑΚΧΥΛΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ*^{4,[6]}herald of the *boule* and *demos*: *ΕΥΚ[ΛΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΤΣ]*⁴flutist: [*ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ*]⁴phylarchos: *ΑΡΑΤΙΩΝ ΣΙΜΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ*¹taziarchos (VIII): *ΑΝΤΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΡΕΙΟΥ [.....]ΕΤΣ*¹taziarchos (XII): *ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΑΠΩΝΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΕΤΣ*¹lampadarchos: *ΚΑΙΡΙΟΣ [ΤΕΛΩΝΟΣ]*¹lampadarchos (VI): [*ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟ[Σ] ΕΥΚΤΑΙΟΥ*]¹lampadarchos (II): [*ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ*] *ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ [ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ]*¹agonothetes of the Theseia: *ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*¹leitourgoi:⁶

priest?: [] ΕΠΙΤΡΙΔΗΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΦΙΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ¹⁰

ΜΕΝΕΘΑΛΗΣ¹⁰ (or ΜΕΝΕΚΛΗΣ)

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΠΑΡΜΕΝΕΙΔΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ¹²

priest of Asklepius on Delos: ΕΥΒΟΤΑΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹¹

¹ *I.G.* II² 956

² *I.G.* II² 957

³ *I.G.* II² 2323

⁴ *Agora* XV, n. 222

⁵ *Hesperia* 2 (1933) n. 16, pp. 503-5

⁶ *Hesperia* 16 (1947) n. 64, pp. 164-8 (with *Hesperia* 53, 1984, n. 4, pp. 374-7)

⁷ *I.D.* 1408

⁸ *I.D.* 1439

⁹ *I.D.* 1441

¹⁰ *I.D.* 1450

¹¹ *I.D.* 1498

¹² *I.D.* 2589

180/59 B.C.

archon: ΤΥΧΑΝΔΡΟΣ^{1,3,[4,6]}

prytaneis:⁴

proedroi: [] ΔΙΟΖΟΤΟΥ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ¹

ΑΚΤΑΙΟΣ ΣΙΜΩΝΟΣ Α[ΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ]⁶

orators: [ΑΝΤΙΔΗΜΟΣ ΚΛΕΙΠΠΙΔΟΥ]²

ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΣΚΟΥ ΘΟΡΑΙ[ΕΤΣ]¹

prytany-secretary: ΣΩΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ^{1,6}

epi ta hiera: ΛΥΚΟΦΩΝ⁵

ΤΙΜΑΝΘΗΣ⁵

ambassador to King Pharnaces: ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ⁶

epimeletai for the erection of statues:

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ⁶

ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ⁶

ΛΕΩΝ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ⁶

paidotribes: ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΣ ΤΒΑΔΗΣ³

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΕΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ⁹

priest of Dionysus on Delos: ΕΥΒΟΤΑΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁷

priest of the Great Gods: ΗΡΑΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ⁸

¹I.G. II² 953

²I.G. II² 956

³I.G. II² 2981

⁴Agora XV, n. 223

⁵I.D. 1450

⁶I.D. 1497b

⁷I.D. 1498

⁸I.D. 1898

⁹I.D. 2589

159/8 B.C.

archon: ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΧΜΟΣ^{[1],5,[9]}

pytany-secretary: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΔΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ¹

orator: ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ⁵

[_] ΦΑΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ¹

kosmetes: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΦΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹

hierokeryx: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΝΘΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΤΣ¹¹

epimeletes of Delos: [.....]ΟΥ []ΙΛΙ[....]ΛΓ[]
ΙΩΝΧ[]ΙΛΙ ΑΡ⁹

epi ta hiera: []ΗΠΟΥ ΕΡΙΚ[ΕΤΣ]¹¹
[]ΤΟΥ ΚΑΛΙΚΑ[ΕΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΠ]ΑΤΙΟΥ¹¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ¹⁰

public banker? on Delos: ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥ^{2,3}

presbeis: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ⁵
ΑΝΘΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ⁵
ΞΕΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΥ⁵

priest of Apollo on Delos: []Σ ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝ[ΟΥ ΕΞ Ο]ΟΥ¹¹

priest of Hestia, Demos and Roma []ΠΟΡΑΣ ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ[Σ]¹¹

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:
ΜΙΚΙΩΝ ΑΚΡΙΣΙΟΥ ΣΗΜΑΧΙΔΗΣ¹¹

priest of Zeus Soter, Athena Soteira, Zeus Polieus
and *Athena Polias*: ΕΦΟΡΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ ΠΤΕΛΕΑΣΙΟΥ¹¹

priest of Artemis on Delos: [ΑΘΗ]ΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΑ[ΓΟΥ]ΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹¹

priest of the Great Gods, Dioskourii
and *Cabeires*: ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΠΕΡΓΑΣΗΘΕΝ¹¹

priest of Dionysos, Hermes and Pan: [ΕΥΜ]ΕΝΗΣ ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΥ¹¹

priest of Asklepius on Delos: ΗΧΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΥΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ¹¹

priest of Anios: ΝΟΥΤΜΗΝΙΟΥΣ ΕΥΘΙΟΥ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΥ¹¹

mantis: [ΟΛ]ΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΡΩΜΑΧΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ¹¹

flutist on Delos: [Π]ΕΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΦΩΚΙΩΝΟΥΣ ΕΥΠΤΡΙΔΗΣ¹¹

kleidouchos: [ΝΥ]ΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΝΥΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ¹¹

priest of Sarapis: ΚΤΗΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΕΤΣ^{3,4}
ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΣ^{2,4,6,7,8,11}

¹I.G. II² 1027 (with S.E.G. XVI.98)

²I.D. 1415

³*I.D.* 1416⁴*I.D.* 1417⁵*I.D.* 1498⁶*I.D.* 2137⁷*I.D.* 2138⁸*I.D.* 2139⁹*I.D.* 2565¹⁰*I.D.* 2589¹¹*I.D.* 2605

158/7 B.C.

archon: ΠΥΡΡΟΣ⁷epimeletes of Delos: ΗΓΗΣΙΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΘΥΜΑΙΤΑΔΗΣ⁵epi ta hiera (responsible for *I.D.* 1415):ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{3,5}ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΧΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ^{[3],4,5}gymnasiarch on Delos: ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΗΣ⁶priest of Apollo: ΑΡΕΤΗΣ ΑΡΕΩΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΗΣ⁵*priest of Sarapis: ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΣ²

*from tribe X (Aiantis) by the tribal cycle?

¹*I.D.* 1415²*I.D.* 1416³*I.D.* 1421⁴*I.D.* 1422⁵*I.D.* 1898⁶*I.D.* 2589⁷Meritt, *Athenian Year*, p. 184

157/6 B.C.

archon: ΑΝΘΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ^{1,2,4,[7],8}

orator: [..]ΜΙΑΔΗΣ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΣ⁷

agnothetes of the Theseia: ΘΕΟ[]¹

phylarchoi: ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ¹
ΔΗΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ¹

hipparchoi: ΝΙΚΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ^{1,3,7}
ΟΦΕΛΑΣ ΑΒΡΩΝΟΣ ΒΑΘΘΕΝ^{1,7}

lampadarchoi: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΜΕΝΟΥΣ¹
ΔΕΞΙΦΩΝ ΚΑΛΛΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥΣ^{4,5}
ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥΣ^{4,5}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΘΕ[Ο]ΦΙΛ[Ο]Υ ΚΙΚΤΙΝΝΕΥΣ⁶

¹I.G. II² 957

²I.G. II² 2323

³Hesperia 29 (1960) n. 155, pp. 78-80

⁴I.D. 1416

⁵I.D. 1421

⁶I.D. 2589

⁷Habicht, AM LXXVI (1961) pp. 141-3

⁸Meritt, Athenian Year, p. 184

156/5 B.C.

archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ^{2,3,4,5,[10]}

orator: ΔΗΜΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΠΥΘΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΙΓΙΑΛ[ΕΥΣ]¹

hieropoioi for the Athenaia:²

epi ta hiera: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΘΡΑΣΙΠΠΟΥ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{5,[6],7,10}
ΕΦΙΑΛΤΗΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΣΥΒΡΙΔΗΣ^{5,7,10}

agoranomoi on Delos: []ΙΜ[]ΝΙ[]Δ[]¹⁰

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟ[Υ] ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ¹¹

priestess of the Thesmophorion: ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΙΑ^{5,8,9}

¹*I.G.* II² 957

²*I.G.* II² 1937

³*I.G.* II² 2323

⁴*I.D.* 1416

⁵*I.D.* 1417

⁶*I.D.* 1418

⁷*I.D.* 1421

⁸*I.D.* 1426

⁹*I.D.* 1442

¹⁰*I.D.* 1837

¹¹*I.D.* 2589

155/4 B.C.

archon: ΜΝΗΣΙΘΕΟΣ^{2,3,[4]}treasurer of the prytany (III): ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΕΥΒΟΤΑΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ³secretary of the prytany (III): ΣΙΑΗΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ³priest of the Eponymous Hero (III): ΝΙΚΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΤΕΛΕ[] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΣΙΟΣ³prytaneis (III):³proedros: ΑΓΓΑ[...] ΣΩΣΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ³
[] [] ΤΑ ΑΛΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹orator: [] ΡΙΝΟΥ ΙΦΙΣΤΙΑΔΗΣ¹
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΦΛΗΕΥΣ³secretary of the boule and demos: [ΧΑ]ΡΕΔΗ[Μ]ΟΣ [ΛΑΜΠ]ΤΡΕΥΣ³undersecretary: ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ³prytany-secretary: ΦΙΛΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΡΑΤΗΤΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{1,3,[4]}treasurer of the boule: [ΛΕ]ΑΓΡΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΑΠΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ³herald of the boule and demos: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΥΣ³flutist: ΤΕΧΝΩΝ ΦΗΓΑΙΕΥΣ³epi ta hiera: ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ^{5,6,7}
ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{7,[8]}gymnasiarch on Delos: ΦΩΚΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ^{12,13,14,15}*priest of Sarapis: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΑΜΠΙΤΡΕΥΣ^{9,10,11}

*dated by tribal cycle; less likely are 143/2 or 145/4 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 979⁹I.D. 2098

²*I.G.* II² 2323³*Agora* n. XV, 225⁴*Hesperia* 10 (1941) n. 25, pp. 60-1⁵*I.D.* 1421⁶*I.D.* 1422⁷*I.D.* 1429⁸*I.D.* 1464¹⁰*I.D.* 2118¹¹*I.D.* 2203¹²*I.D.* 2589¹³*I.D.* 2590¹⁴*I.D.* 2591¹⁵*I.D.* 2592

154/3 B.C.

archon: *ANΔPEAΣ*^{1,2,3,6}*hieropoioi*:⁶*epi ta hiera*: *ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΣ*³
*ΕΥΜΗΛΟΣ*³public banker on Delos: *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*³gymnasiarch on Delos: *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΡ ΦΑΥΕΥΣ*^{[4],5}¹*I.G.* II² 2444²*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 51, p. 252³*I.D.* 1421⁴*I.D.* 1951⁵*I.D.* 2589⁶*AM* 97 (1982) pp. 172-3

153/2 B.C.

archon: ΣΠΕΤΣΙΠΠΟΣ¹

prytany-secretary: []ΝΟΣ ΦΛΥΕΤΣ¹

**epi ta hiera*: ΓΛΑΤΚΙΑΔΗΣ²
ΞΕΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ²

gymnasiarch on Delos: [Α]ΡΙΣΤ[ΟΜ]ΑΧ[Ο]Σ ΑΓΣΙΟΥ [ΕΓ] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ³

*priestess of the Thesmophorion: ΝΙ[]²

*152/1 B.C. is also possible

¹Agora XV, n. 228

²I.D. 1426

³I.D. 2589

152/1 B.C.

archon: ΜΙΚΙΩΝ¹

**epi ta hiera*:

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΕΤΣ Α[ΡΕ]ΩΣ ΚΗΦ[Ι]ΣΙΕΤΣ²

priest of the Great Gods: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΣ¹

*see 153/2 B.C.

¹*I.D.* 1899

²*I.D.* 2589

151/0 B.C.

archon: ΖΑΛΕΤΚΟΣ^{2,3,4}

**proedros*:

**prytany-secretary*:

**orator*:

epimeletes of Delos: ΠΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΚΟΛΩΝΟΥ³

epi ta hiera: [] ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ ΠΙΘΕΥΣ¹
 colleague unknown

agoranomoi on Delos: ΣΗΡΑΜΒΟΣ ΗΡΑΙΠΠΟΥ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥΣ^{2,4}
 ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{2,4}
 ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ ΣΩΤΑΔΟΥ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΥΣ^{2,4}

secretary of the agoranomoi: ΜΕΝΕΚΛΗΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΛΑΙΕΥΣ^{2,4}

demosios?: [] ΡΑΤΩΝ¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: [] ΔΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΛΑΥΕΥΣ⁵

 *see 139/8 B.C.

¹*I.D.* 1432

²*I.D.* 1500

³*I.D.* 1618

⁴*I.D.* 1833

⁵*I.D.* 2589

150/49 B.C.

archon: ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ^{1,2,3,4,5}

agonothetes of the Theseia: ΜΙΑΤΙΑ[ΔΗΣ] ΖΩΙΛΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

taxiarchoi (II): ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΗΓΙΟΥ ΚΟΜ[ΥΤΕΥ]Σ¹

(XII): [Τ]ΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΙΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ Α[ΓΝ]ΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

hipparchos (IV): ΦΕΙΔΤΑΜΟΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΟΣ Α[ΙΘ]ΑΜΙΔΗΣ¹

tarantinarchoi (X): ΠΟΛΥΝΙΚΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

ΕΥΘΟΙΝΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

lampadarchoi (IV): ΑΘΗΝΟΒΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ¹

(XI): ΕΥΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ ΑΝΔΡΕΟΥ¹

epimeletes of Delos: [] Π[Υ]ΡΡΟΥ ΑΑΜΠ[Τ]ΡΕΥΣ²

epi ta hiera: [] ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΥΣ²

colleague unknown

secretary of the epi ta hiera?:

[] ΤΑΡΧΟΥ ΠΟΡΙΟΥΣ²

gymnasiarch on Delos {....}[Τ].]ΛΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ⁸

priest of Artemis: ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ^{3,7}

*priests on Delos: ΔΡΑΚΩΝ ΦΛΕΤΕΥΣ³ (Great Gods?)

ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ³

ΑΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΥΣ^{3,6} (Sarapis?)

ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ³

ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ³

ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ³

ΛΕΟΝΤΙΧΟΣ ΔΕΚΕΛΕΥΣ³ (Aesclepius?)

ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ³

*see Appendix A.2

¹I.G. II² 958

²I.D. 1432

³I.D. 1499

⁴I.D. 1519

⁵I.D. 1520

⁶I.D. 2083 (with ZPE 58, 1985, pp. 117-8)

⁷I.D. 2374

⁸I.D. 2589

149/8

archon: ΛΤΣΙΑΔΗΣ^{2,3,4,7}

orators: ΚΟΝΩΝ ΚΟΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ¹
 ΑΜΤΝ[ΟΜΑΧΟΣ] ΕΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³
 [Φ]ΛΟΚΑΗ[Σ ΛΥΚ]ΙΣΚΟΥ Α[ΤΗΝΕΥΣ]⁶

prytany-secretary: ΔΙΟΔΩ[ΡΟΣ _]⁴

hierophantes: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔ[ΗΣ]³

hieropoioi:²

epi ta hiera [_Π]ΠΟΥ ΕΡΙΚΙΕΥΣ⁵
 (colleague unknown)

secretary of the administrators: ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΝ[_]⁵

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ΠΟ]ΛΥΞΕΝΟΣ ΑΝ[ΤΙΟ]ΧΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹⁰

*priest of Sarapis (2nd time): ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ^{8,9}

 *ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ served as priest in 159/8 B.C. If he is to be identified with this priest, he could have served in 149/8 B.C. or 147/6 B.C. according to the tribal cycle

¹*I.G.* II² 958²*I.G.* II² 1938³*Hesperia* 11 (1942) n. 58, pp. 293-8⁴*Hesperia* 34 (1965) n. 2, pp. 89-90⁵*I.D.* 1432⁶*I.D.* 1499⁷*I.D.* 1505⁸*I.D.* 2068⁹*I.D.* 2069¹⁰*I.D.* 2589

148/7 B.C.

archon: *APXΩN*^{1,3,4,5,7,8}proedros: *ΠΤΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘ[ΟΙΔΗ]Σ*⁵orators: *ΠΕΛΩΨ ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΕΥΣ*³[] *ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ*⁴*ΝΙΚΟΚΛΗΣ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*⁵epi tois sitonikois: *ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΗΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*¹epi ta hiera: *ΓΟΡΓΙΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*^{3,4}*ΝΙΚΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΥΣ*^{2,3,4}gymnasiarch on Delos: *ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ*^{6,8,9,10}agoranomoi on Delos: [] *ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ*⁷*ΣΩΤΗΡ ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ*⁷secretary of the agoranomoi: *ΔΙΟΓΕΙΤΩΝ ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΥ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ*⁷didaskalos?: *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ[Σ] ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ[ΟΥ]Σ*⁵ephebe:⁸

¹*I.G.* II² 968

²*I.D.* 1442³*I.D.* 1501⁴*I.D.* 1502⁵*I.D.* 1503⁶*I.D.* 1504⁷*I.D.* 1505⁸*I.D.* 1952⁹*I.D.* 1979¹⁰*I.D.* 2589

147/6 B.C.

archon: *ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ*^{1,2,3}

archon on ? : [_ Ο] *ΙΝΑΙΟΣ*¹

orator: *ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΑΛΗΣΙΓΕΝΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ*^{2,3}

prytany-secretary: *ΞΕ[Ν_] ΣΥΠΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ*²

secretary of the *epimeletes* on Delos: *ΜΝΗΣΙΦΙΛΟΣ*³

ambassadors sent by the Athenians on Delos to Athens:³

epi ta hiera on Delos: *ΑΜΦ[_]ΗΘΕΝ*²
*ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ Ε[ΚΑΛΗΘ]ΕΝ*²

gymnasiarch on Delos: [_] *ΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ*⁴

*priest of Sarapis:

*see 149/8 B.C.

¹*Hesperia* 37 (1968) n. 12, p. 273

²*I.D.* 1504

³*I.D.* 1505

⁴*I.D.* 2589

146/5 B.C.

*archon?:

orator: []ΙΔΟΥ ΑΙΜΟΤΕΙΟΣ¹

*epimeletes on Delos?:

epi ta hiera: ΔΗ[Μ]ΕΑΣ²
(colleague unknown)public banker?: ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝ²gymnasiarch on Delos: []Σ Θ[ΡΑ]ΣΕΟΥ Π[ΑΙΑ]ΝΙΕΥΣ⁵sitonis?: ΠΤΘΑΓΟΡΑΣ²magistracy unknown: ΠΤΘΕΑΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ²overseer of the Metroon: ΔΗΜΟΤΕ[ΛΗΣ]²under-priestess of Artemis: ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΗ ΑΝΤΙΦΩΝΤΟΣ
ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ^{2,3,[4]}-----
*see 142/1. Note also that ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ could date to this year (see Appendix C)-----
¹*Hesperia* 37 (1967) n. 12, p. 273²*I.D.* 1442³*I.D.* 1443⁴*I.D.* 1444⁵*I.D.* 2589

145/4 B.C.

archon: ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ^{1,2,4,5}

treasurer of the prytany (I): [.....]²

proedros: ΤΙ[ΜΤΑΛ]ΟΣ ΤΙΜΤΑΜΟΤ ΕΡΧΙ[ΕΤ]Σ¹

orators: ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΕΠΗ[ΡΑΤΙΔ]Ο[Τ] ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ¹
ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΤ ΕΡΜΕ[ΙΟ]Σ⁴

undersecretary: [.....]²

prytany-secretary: ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥ^{1,[2]}

herald of the *boule* and *demos*: [ΕΤΚΛΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΤΣ]²

flutist: [ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ]^{?2}

treasurer of the *boule* [.....]²

antigrapheus: ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΤ ΚΤΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ^{1,[2]}

epi ta hiera responsible for I.D. 1442: (names unknown)

gymnasiarch on Delos: [..]·[] Σ[Ο]Τ[Η]Ν[Ι]ΕΤΣ⁶

epimeletai of the Emporion: ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ⁵
ΝΥΜΦΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁵
ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΠΑΙΑ[Ν]ΙΕΤΣ⁵

priestess of Aphrodite: ΙΩΝΙΣ³

*priest of Sarapis:

priestess of the Thesmophorion: ΜΕΓΑΚΛΕΙ[Α]³

priest on Delos: ΣΩΤΗΡ³

*see 155/4 B.C.

¹*Agora XV*, n. 238

²*Agora XV*, n. 239

³*I.D.* 1442

⁴*I.D.* 1506

⁵*I.D.* 1507

⁶*I.D.* 2589

144/3 B.C.

*archon: ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ^{1,5} (compare Ε[]³)

proedros: ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΑΛΗΣΙΓΕΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ³

orator: [ΑΘ]ΗΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΥΝΟΜΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ³

magistracy unknown: ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΗΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΣΑΤΥΡΙΩΝ Π[] (demotic?)^{[2],3}
ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ^{2,3}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΛΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ^{4,5}

ambassadors sent by the Athenians on Delos to Athens:³

list of Delian hieropoioi, gymnasiarchs and uncertain officers responsible for the celebration of the Apollonia:⁵

ephebes:⁵

priest of the Great Gods: ΠΑΡ[]⁵

demios on Delos: ΠΕΡΙΤΑ[Σ]²

*the successor to ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ (145/4 B.C.) is recorded in *I.D.* 1507 as Ε[]. When ΑΝΔΡΕΑΣ was assigned to this year, the reading had to be rejected outright. But if his successor was ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ, the dotted initial epsilon could plausibly have been a misreading of the correct initial theta. Note also that ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ is only one letter longer than ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ, one of the former restorations. I examined *I.D.* 1507 on Delos. The lettering is cursive in form and uniform in size. A poorly preserved theta could have been misread as epsilon.

Unfortunately, as reported in the commentary to *I.D.* 1507, the relevant portion of the inscription is now worn away.

¹*I.G.* II² 968

²*I.D.* 1442

³*I.D.* 1507

⁴*I.D.* 2589

⁵*I.D.* 2593

143/2 B.C.

archon: *APICTOΦΩN*^{[1],3}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [*ME*]*NAN*[*ΔP*]*ΟΣ MENANΔPOT MEΛITETΣ*²

*priest of Sarapis:

 *see 155/4 B.C.

¹*I.G.* II² 2323

²*I.D.* 2589

³Philodemos, *Ind. Acad.* 80 O.21

142/1 B.C.

*archon: *ΔIONTEΙOΣ*⁴

agnothetes of the Great Panathenaia: *ΜΙΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*¹

kanephoros: daughter of *ΜΙΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*¹

**epimeletes* of Delos: ΕΤΑΓΙΩΝ ΑΛΚΕΤΟΥ ΚΟΘΩΚΙΔΗΣ⁴

gymnasiarch on Delos: [] ΟΣ ΔΕΞΙΛΑΟΥ ΤΒΑΔΗΣ⁵

epi ta hiera responsible for I.D. 1443: names unknown

***priest* of Artemis on Delos: ΑΡΧΙΑΔΗΣ^{2,3}

priest: ΤΙΜ[]²

*could date to 146/5 B.C.

**compare 141/0 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 968

²I.D. 1443

³I.D. 1444

⁴I.D. 1750

⁵I.D. 2589

141/0 B.C.

proedros: [] ΤΙΜΟΣ ΤΙΜ[]¹

orator: [] ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥ¹

prytany-secretary [] Β|ΟΤΤΑΔΗΣ¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ [] ΙΚΑΡΙΕΥ⁴

epi ta hiera: ΕΥΘΥΔΗΜΟΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΥ^{4,6}
ΕΥΚΤΗΜΩΝ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥ^{4,6}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ΑΠ]ΟΛΛ[ΩΝΙΟ]Σ? ΔΙΑΛΛΑΟΥ ΤΕΙΘΡΑΣΙΟΣ⁷

demosios on Delos: ΠΕΡΙΤΑΣ^{2,4}

**priest* of Artemis on Delos: ΑΡΧΙΑΔΗΣ^{3,4}

priestess of the Thesmophorion: ΜΟΣΧΙΝΗ ΔΗΜΕΟΥ ΑΛΛΙΕΩΣ^{4,5}

*compare 142/1 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 968

²I.D. 1442

³I.D. 1443

⁴I.D. 1444

⁵I.D. 1447

⁶I.D. 1450

⁷I.D. 2589

140/39 B.C.

archon: ΑΓΝΟΘΕΟΣ^{1,[2],3,5,7}

treasurer and secretary of the prytany (XI):

ΕΤΚΤΙΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΤΔΗΜΟΥ ΕΠΕΑΙΟΣ⁵

priest of the Eponymous Hero (XI): ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΣΤΙΟΣ⁵

prytaneis (XI):⁵

proedroi: ΦΙΛ[]²

ΝΙΚΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΤΕΛΕΑΣΙΟΣ⁵

[.....] ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ⁵

orators: ΙΑΣΩ[N]²

ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΦΑΙΔΡΟΥ ΞΥΠΕΤΑΙΩΝ³

[ΕΥ]ΚΤ[] ΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΤΔΗΜΟΥ ΕΠΕΑΙΟΣ⁵

secretary of the boule and demos: ΣΤΡΑΤΙΠΠΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ⁵

undersecretary: ΧΑΙΡΗΤΙΔΗΣ ΚΟΡΥΔΑΛΛΕΥΣ⁵

prytany-secretary: ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΞΕΝΟΥ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ^{1,[2],5}

herald of the *boule* and *demos*: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΥΣ^{4,5}

flutist: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ^{4,5}

treasurer of the *boule*: ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ⁵

epimeletes of Delos: [.....]⁷

epi ta hiera: ΣΩΣ[ΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΣΗΜΑΧΙΔΗΣ]^{6,7}
[ΜΝΗΣΙ]Σ ΠΟΤΑΜΙΟΣ^{6,7}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [ΙΠ]ΠΟΜ[ΕΝ]ΗΣ? Α[]Σ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ⁸

priest of Sarapis: ΤΙΜ[]⁹ (ΚΙΜ[]?)

¹I.G. II² 969

²I.G. II² 970

³I.G. II² 971

⁴Agora XV, n. 239

⁵Agora XV, n. 240

⁶I.D. 1444

⁷I.D. 1450

⁸I.D. 2589

⁹I.D. 2610

139/8 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ^{[1],2}

**proedros*: [.....]ΥΜΟΥ ΧΟΛΑΡΓΕΥ[Σ]¹

**orator*: ΕΥ[.....]¹

**prytany-secretary*: [.....]ΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΗΡΑΓΟΡΑΣ²
ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ²

gymnasiarch on Delos: [..... ΓΗΡΟΣΤΡ]ΑΤΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ⁴

priest of Sarapis: ΔΗΜΟΣ[]⁵

*could date to 151/0 B.C. on the basis of the secretary cycle in which case the archon would have to be restored differently

¹*Hesperia* 29 (1960) n. 154, pp. 76-7 (with *ZPE* 20, 1976, pp. 193-9)

²*I.D.* 1444

³*I.D.* 1445

⁴*I.D.* 2589

⁵*I.D.* 2610

138/7 B.C.

archon: ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ^{[1],2,4,7,[8],11}

proedros: ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΤΙΜ[]¹

orator: ΦΙΛΩ[N ...]ΕΝΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΡΑΦΗΝ[ΙΟΣ]¹

leitourgoi: [ΕΥΧΕΙΡ ΚΡΩΠΠ]ΔΗΣ¹
 ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΦΛΕΥΣ¹
 ΔΗΜΟΣ¹

theoroi:⁷

pythaist paides:⁸

ephebes:⁹

kanephoroi:¹⁰

architheoroi: ΜΕΝΕΜΑΧΟΣ ΠΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ⁷
 ΘΡΑΣΩΝ ΟΥΛΙΑΔΟΥ⁷

didaskaloi of the chorus of the Pythaistai:
 ΕΛΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ⁸
 ΚΛΕΩΝ ΕΥΜΗΛΟΥ⁸

arrephoros: daughter of ΑΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΩΣ²

priest of Asclepius: ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΙΚΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΩΣ^{1,2}

kleidouchos: ΔΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΩΣ²

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΕΥΡΗΜΟΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΣΤΙΟΣ^{3,5}

paidotribes: ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΑΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΩΣ³

priest of Sarapis: (*demosios*?)⁶

¹*I.G.* II² 1019

²*Hesperia* 28 (1959) n. 10, pp. 188-94

³*I.D.* 1953

⁴*I.D.* 1987

⁵*I.D.* 2589

⁶*I.D.* 2610

⁷*F.D.* III, 2 n. 7

⁸*F.D.* III, 2 n. 11

⁹*F.D.* III, 2 n. 23

¹⁰*F.D.* III, 2 n. 29

¹¹*S.I.A.* 4

137/6 B.C.

archon: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ^{1,2}

proedros: [.....] ΕΥΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜΙΔΟΥ¹

orator: ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ [ΔΙΟΚ]ΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘ[ΗΝΑΙΕΩΣ]¹

prytany-secretary: ΔΙΟΝΤΣ[ΙΟ]Σ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΕΩΣ¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: [.]ΕΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΕΙΤΕΑΙΟΥ³

gymnasiarch and *lampadarchos* for the Hermaia:

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΕΛΙΚΩΝΤΟΣ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ²

paidotribes on Delos: ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ²

priests of Sarapis: ΦΑΝΟΒΙΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ⁴
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ (ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ?)⁴

¹*Hesperia* 28 (1959) n. 10, pp. 188-94

²*I.D.* 1948

³*I.D.* 2589

⁴*I.D.* 2610

136/5 B.C.

archon: ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ^{1,[2],4,6}

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΓΓΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ^{3,4}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝ ΣΑΤΤΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ^{4,7}

paidotribes on Delos: ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ⁴

erhebes:⁴

priest of Sarapis: ΑΣΤΙΑΣ ΑΣΤΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ^{5,8}

¹*Agora* XV, n. 243

²*Hesperia* 17 (1948) n. 10, pp. 22-3

³*I.D.* 1445

⁴*I.D.* 1922

⁵*I.D.* 2099

⁶*I.D.* 2566 (with *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 129)

⁷*I.D.* 2589

⁸*I.D.* 2610

135/4 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ^{1,2,[4],6}

treasurer of the prytany (IX): ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΞΕΝΟ[] ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ²

secretary of the prytany (IX): ΑΓΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ²

priest of the Eponymous Hero (IX): ΘΡΑΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΟΥ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΣ²

prytaneis (IX):^{2,3}

proedroi: [] ΔΑΜΟΣ ΘΕΡΣΙΤΕΛΟΥ ΟΗΘΕΝ²
[] ΕΥΣ²

orator: ΘΡΑΣΩΝ ΕΥΘΥΚΑΡΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ²

secretary of the *boule* and the *demos*: ΑΝΘΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ²

undersecretary: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΕΥΣ²

prytany-secretary: ΘΕΟΛΥΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΑΜΦΙΤΡΟΠΗΘΕΝ^{1,2,3,[4]}

herald of the *boule* and the *demos*: ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΑΠΩΝΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΕΥΣ²

flutist: ΗΓΙΑΣ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{[2],3}

treasurer of the *boule*: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΥΣ^{2,3}

antigraphus: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ²

epi ta psephisma: ΔΕΙΝΙΑΣ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΟΣ^{2,3}

epi to aporreton: ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{2,3}

anagrapheus: ΑΓΣΑΝΙΑΣ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΕΥΣ^{2,3}

hyperetes of the prytany: ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΚ ΚΟΙΛΗΣ²

epimeletes of Delos: ΦΙΛΩΝΙΔ[ΗΣ] ΟΤ[] ΕΚ ΚΟΛ[ΩΝΟ]Τ[]⁵

epi ta hiera: Ν[ΙΚ]ΑΡΧΟ[Σ ΚΛΕ]ΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ⁵
[Α]ΙΣΧΙΝΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ⁵

gymnasiarch on Delos: []ΕΙΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΦΑΙΕΤΕΣ⁷

priest of Sarapis: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΕΤΡΗΜΟΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΛΑΣΤΙΟΣ^{5,8}

¹*I.G.* II² 887

²*Agora* XV, n. 243

³*Agora* XV, n. 244

⁴*Hesperia* 17 (1948) n. 10, pp. 22-3

⁵*I.D.* 2042

⁶*I.D.* 2566 (with *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 129)

⁷*I.D.* 2589

⁸*I.D.* 2610

134/3 B.C.

archon: ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ⁴

gymnasiarch on Delos: []Ν ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΕΣ²

priest of Sarapis: ΕΛΛΗΝ ΜΤΙΣΚΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΕΣ^{1,3}

¹*I.D.* 2206

²*I.D.* 2589

³*I.D.* 2610

⁴*Philodemos, Ind. Acad.* 33

133/2 B.C.

archon: ΞΕΝΩΝ^{[1],2,4,6}

*prytany-secretary: [ΑΣΩΠΟΚΛ]ΗΣ ΑΣΩΠΟΚ[ΛΕΟΤΣ ΑΓΡΤΛΗΘΕΝ]¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΩΝ ΔΑΜΩΝΟΣ ΚΟΘΟΚΙΔΗΣ^{2,3,4}

paidotribai: ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΤΣ⁴
 [Σ]ΤΑΣΕΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΤΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ⁴
 ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ²

ephebes:⁴

gymnasiarch for the Hermaia: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ²

**priests of Sarapis: [Κ]ΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ⁵
 ΝΙΚΩΝΥΜΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΟΥ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ⁶

zakoros: ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΚΑΛΧΗΔΟΝΙΟΥ⁶ (patronymic
 or ethnic?)

*this secretary could date to 121/0 B.C. The archon would have to be restored accordingly

**there are two priests of Sarapis named for this year on two different texts. This poses a difficult problem because they are both from different tribes.

¹*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 20, p. 223

²*I.D.* 1949

³*I.D.* 2589

⁴*I.D.* 2594

⁵*I.D.* 2610

⁶*S.E.G.* XXIV. 225

132/1 B.C.

archon: ΕΡΓΟΚΛΗΣ³

gymnasiarch (on Salamis?): ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΣΤΡΟΦΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ³

gymnasiarch on Delos: [.]ΠΕΙΟΣ ΑΓΚΙΝΟΥ ΑΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

priest of Sarapis: [Μ]ΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΗΣ²

¹I.D. 2589

²I.D. 2610

³Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 1

131/0

archon: ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ^{1,2,6}

archon on Salamis: ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ²

treasurer (on Salamis?): ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ²

treasurer of the prytany (XII): [ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ] ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ¹

secretary of the prytany (XII): ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΠΡΟΒΑΛΙΣΙΟΣ¹

proedros: ΔΑΜΩΝ ΣΩΓΕΝΟΥΤΣ []¹

orators: [ΘΟΥ]ΝΟΣ ΘΟΥΙΝΟΥ ΑΘΗΝΕΤΣ¹

ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ²

*prytany magistrate: [ΔΗΜΗ]ΤΡΙΟΣ Δ[]¹

secretary of the boule and demos: ΑΓΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΘΗ[] ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ¹

prytany-secretary: [ΓΟΡΓ]ΙΛΟΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΛΟΥ Α[ΓΓΕΛΗΘΕΝ]¹

**anagrapheus*: []ΝΤΟΥ ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: []ΚΡΑΤΗΣ []ΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ⁵

priest of Sarapis: ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{3,4,7}

***kleidouchos*: ΧΑΡΙΔΑΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁶

*depending on the restoration of the text, the *anagrapheus* could in fact be the flutist in which case ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ could be the magistrate *epi ta psephismata*

**depending on the restitution of the archon's name on I.D. 2601, this magistrate could date to 94/3 as well

¹*Hesperia* 47 (1978) n. 14, p. 286

²*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 1

³I.D. 2141

⁴I.D. 2163

⁵I.D. 2589

⁶I.D. 2601

⁷I.D. 2610

130/29 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ^{1,7}

hieromnemon: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ⁷

presbeis (Athenians?) of the Dionysiac *technitai*:^{1,7}

gymnasiarch on Delos: [Α]ΠΟ[Α]ΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΗΡΑΙΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ⁵

priest of Sarapis: ΝΕΩΝ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ^{2,3,4,6}

¹ *I.G.* II² 1132² *I.D.* 2043³ *I.D.* 2076⁴ *I.D.* 2101⁵ *I.D.* 2589⁶ *I.D.* 2610⁷ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 68

129/8 B.C.

archon: *ΑΤΚΙΣΚΟΣ*^{1,3,9}orator: *ΞΕΝΟ[...]* *ΣΩΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ*⁹pytany-secretary: *ΗΓ[.....]* *ΝΟ[Τ] ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ*⁹treasurer of the *boule*: *ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ*⁹**epimeletes* of Delos: *ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΤΙΟΣ*gymnasiarch on Delos: *ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*^{2,7}priest of Hestia, Demos and Rome: *[...] ΙΩΝ ΑΓΑΣ[...]* *[ΣΟΤ]ΝΙΕ(Τ)Σ*³priest of Sarapis: *ΣΩΚΛΗΣ ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΟΥ ΦΛΕΤΣ*^{4,5,6,8}

**ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ* served as *epimeletes* for the second time in 128/7 B.C. His first term could fall in this year (see *I.D.* 2044).

¹ *I.G.* II² 1713² *I.D.* 1558³ *I.D.* 1877⁴ *I.D.* 2089⁵ *I.D.* 2120⁶ *I.D.* 2142⁷ *I.D.* 2589

⁸I.D. 2610⁹S.E.G. XXI. 469

128/7 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,8,11,12,13,14,17,[18]}king-archon: ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ¹¹polemarchos: ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ ΛΥΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ¹¹thesmothetai: [ΗΡΑΚ]Λ[Ε]ΔΗΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ¹¹[ΕΥ]ΚΤΗΜ[Ο]Ν ΚΑΛΛΙΟΥ¹¹[Β]ΟΥΚΑΤΤΗΣ ΛΗΚΙΝΟΥ¹¹[Μ]ΝΗΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΑΓ[Ν]ΟΥ¹¹ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΥ ΝΙΚΟ[ΚΛΕΟΥ]ΤΟΥ¹¹[]Α[]Α[]¹¹general *epi ta hopla*: ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΟΥ¹⁴general *epi to nautikon*: ΙΠΠΑΡΧΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΟΥ¹⁴general *epi Eleusina*: ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΙΠΠΑΚΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΟΥ¹⁴general *epi ton Peiraea*: ΠΥΡΡΙΝΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΝΤΙΔΗΣ¹⁴herald of the Areopagus: ΜΝΑΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΜΝΑΣΙΚΛΕΟΥ[Σ]¹¹orators: [.....]Υ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ²ΔΑΜΩΝ ΣΙΜΟΥ [ΣΟ]Υ[Ν]ΕΤΟΥ²prytany-secretary: [.....]ΝΟΣ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ²antigraphus: ΗΦΑΛ[ΣΤ.....]ΑΥ[.....]ΙΟΥ²hipparchos: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ^{14,15,17,21}phylarchoi: ΑΓΙΑΣ ΒΟΥΛΩΝΟΣ^{14,15,17,18,[20],21}ΕΡΜΩΝ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ (ΓΟΝΩΙ ΔΕ ΑΝΤΙΦΩΝΤΟΥ)^{14,15,[18,19],21}ΧΑΡΙΚΛΗΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ^{14,18,21}ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ^{14,18,21}

tarantinarchoi: ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΡΟΠΟΥ^{14,18,21}

ΛΥΣΩΝ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ^{14,18,21}

kosmetes: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ<N>ΙΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ^{2,14}

paidotribes: (foreigner)^{2,14}

hoplomachos: (foreigner)^{2,14}

hypohoplomachos: (foreigner)¹⁴

akontistes: ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕΤΣ^{2,14}

toxotes: Μ(Π?)ΥΣΤΙΛΟΣ ΝΙΚΙΔΟΣ ΟΗΘΕΝ^{2,14}

aphetes: ΠΕΔΙΕΤΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ²

secretary of the ephebes: ΘΑΡΡΙΝΟΣ ΘΑΡΡΙΚΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΤΣ^{2,14}

hyperetes: ΙΕΡΩΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΑΝΑΓΤΡΑΣΙΟΣ^{2,14}

ephebes:^{2,14}

epi tas aparchas: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ²¹

priest of Apollo: ΕΤΜΗΛΟΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ¹⁴

ezegetes: ΟΦΕΛΑΣ ΑΒΡΩΝΟΣ ΒΑΤΗΘΕΝ¹⁴

hieromnemon: [..]ΟΣ[]¹¹

theoroi:^{12,22,23}

pythaist paides:¹³

hippeis:¹⁵

conveyor of the sacred tripod: ΑΛΚΙΔΑΜΟΣ ΕΥΦΑΝΟΥΣ¹⁶

agonothetes: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ^{17,[18]}

epimelites of Delos: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ^{4,5,6}
(second time)

epi ta hiera: ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ⁴
[]ΕΙΔΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ⁴

gymnasiarch on Delos: []ΟΥ ΧΟΛΑΡ[Γ]ΕΥ[Σ]⁹

priest of the Great Gods: ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ³

priest of Sarapis: ΕΤΘΥΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΡΓΟΧΑΡΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ^{4,5,6,7,10}

¹ I.G. II² 1713

² *Hesperia* 24 (1955) pp. 228-32

³ I.D. 1900

⁴ I.D. 2044

⁵ I.D. 2143

⁶ I.D. 2144

⁷ I.D. 2145

⁸ I.D. 2226

⁹ I.D. 2589

¹⁰ I.D. 2610

¹¹ F.D. III, 2 n. 3

¹² F.D. III, 2 n. 8

¹³ F.D. III, 2 n. 12

¹⁴ F.D. III, 2 n. 24

¹⁵ F.D. III, 2 n. 27

¹⁶ F.D. III, 2 n. 33

¹⁷ F.D. III, 2 n. 34

¹⁸ F.D. III, 2 n. 35

¹⁹ F.D. III, 2 n. 36

²⁰ F.D. III, 2 n. 39

²¹ F.D. III, 2 n. 46

²² F.D. III, 2 n. 47

²³ F.D. III, 2 n. 50

127/6 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΔΗΣ^{1,2,3,4,6,7,10}

proedroi: []ΗΣ ΕΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ [Ε]ΠΤΡΙΔΗΣ³
 ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ [ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΒΟΥΤΑΔΗΣ]³

orator: ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ]³

prytany-secretary: ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΥΦΡΟΝΙΟΥ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΥ^{3,4}

paidotribes: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΑΛΙΜΟΤΣΙΟΥ²

ephebes:²

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΗΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΤΣΙΟΥ^{5,9,10}

hieropoioi on Delos:¹⁰

priest of Dionysos, Hermes and Pan: ΜΗΤΡ[Ο_]ΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ⁶

kanephoros: ΒΙΟΤΗ ΜΗΤΡ[Ο_]ΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ⁶

priest of Sarapis: ΑΥΚΙΣΚΟΣ ΠΑΤΕΑΝΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ^{8,11}

*priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

*kanephoros:

*see 100/99 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1713

²I.G. II² 2982

³Hesperia 24 (1955) p. 228

⁴Hesperia 34 (1965) n. 4, pp. 92-5

⁵I.D. 1579

⁶I.D. 1907

⁷I.D. 1947

⁸I.D. 2146

⁹I.D. 2589

¹⁰I.D. 2596

¹¹I.D. 2610

126/5 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ^{[1],2,3,7,8,14}

prytany-secretary: ΣΤ[]¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ^{4,5,6,7,14}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ ΙΑΣΩΝΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ^{7,8,13}

paidotribes on Delos: ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ⁷

ephebes:^{7,8}

priest of the Great Gods: ΣΩΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΣΩΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΚΟΙΛΗΣ¹⁴

priest of Sarapis: ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ^{9,[10],11,[12],15}

¹I.G. II² 1016

⁹I.D. 2047

²I.G. II² 1713

¹⁰I.D. 2048

³*Hesperia* 33 (1964) n. 42, p. 193

¹¹I.D. 2147

⁴I.D. 1645

¹²I.D. 2207

⁵I.D. 1646

¹³I.D. 2589

⁶I.D. 1806

¹⁴I.D. 2597

⁷I.D. 1923

¹⁵I.D. 2610

⁸I.D. 1923b

125/4 B.C.

archon: ΙΑΣΩΝ^{1,2,3,4}

proedroi: ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ [ΑΝ]ΤΙΓΟΝΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥ[Σ]³
 ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣ[ΙΕΥΣ]⁴

orator: [ΚΑΡΑ]ΧΟΣ ΚΑΡΑΙΧΟΥ Α[ΛΑΙΕΥΣ]³

prytany-secretary: ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΝΑΞΙΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ^{[3],4}

*epimeletes of Delos: [ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ]⁵

gymnasiarch on Delos: Α(Τ)ΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΚΥΛΗΘΕΝ⁷

**priest of Sarapis: [ΚΑ]ΕΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ⁸

hoplophoros: ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΣ⁶

 *this name is restored by the editors of I.D. 1807

**according to the tribal cycle his tribe must be Hippothontis (ΙΧ)

¹I.G. II² 1332

²*I.G.* II² 1713

³*Agora* XV, n. 249

⁴*Agora* XV, n. 250:

⁵*I.D.* 1807

⁶*I.D.* 2423

⁷*I.D.* 2589

⁸*I.D.* 2610

124/3 B.C.

archons: *NIKIAS*^{1,[2],3,5} and *ΙΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ*^{1,3,4,5,7}

proedros: *ΑΡΧΙΔΑΜΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΔΑΜΟΥ ΟΥΡΥΓΓΙΝΕΤΣ*²

orator: *[ΕΠΙΓΕΝ]ΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ*²

pytany-secretary: *[_ ΑΝ]ΔΡΩΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΤΣ*²

epimeletes of the Emporion: *ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΥΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ*³

gymnasiarch on Delos: *ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ ΚΟΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ*^{9,[10]}

agoranomoi on Delos: *[Κ]ΑΛΛΙΦΩΝ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ*⁴
*ΘΡΑΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΚΑ[Λ]ΔΙΟΥ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΣ*⁵

ephebes:¹⁰

priest of Sarapis: *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΗΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*^{6,7,8,11}

¹*I.G.* II² 1713

²*Agora* XV, n. 251

³*I.D.* 1647

⁴*I.D.* 1648

⁵*I.D.* 1649

⁶*I.D.* 2049

⁷*I.D.* 2075

⁸*I.D.* 2148

⁹*I.D.* 2589

¹⁰*I.D.* 2603¹¹*I.D.* 2610

123/2 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ^{1,2,3}kosmetes: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ²paidotribes: ΤΙΜΩΝ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΒΟΤΤΑΔΗΣ²hoplomachos: ΣΑΤΤΡΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ²akontistes: ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΕΠΙΩΝΤΙΜΕΥΣ²toxotes: ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ²katapultaphetes: ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΚΑΛΧ[Η]ΔΟΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟ[Ι]Δ[ΗΣ]²hyperetai: ΣΑΤΤΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΛΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΣ²
ΙΕΡΩΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΑΝΑΓΓΡΑΣΙΟΣ²
ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ²ephebes:²epimeletes of Delos: ΚΑΡΑΙΧΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³gymnasiarch on Delos: ΣΩΝΙΚΟΣ ΣΩΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ^{3,5}paidotribes on Delos: ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΣ³
(his colleague a foreigner)priest of Sarapis: ΔΗΜΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ^{4,6}¹*I.G.* II² 1713²*Hesperia* 41 (1972) pp. 185-91 (with *I.G.* II² 1006)³*I.D.* 1924⁴*I.D.* 2076⁵*I.D.* 2589

⁶*I.D.* 2610

122/1 B.C.

archon: ΝΙΚΟΔΗΜΟΣ^{1,2,[3],4,5,6}

epimeletes on Haliartus: ΑΝΤΑΓΟΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΑΓΟΡΟΣ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΥΣ²

proedroi: ΤΙΜΩΝ ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{[3],5}
ΘΕΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΕΤΚΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ⁵

orator: ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΟΣ ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ^{3,5}

prytany-secretary: ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΕΝΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ^{1,3,4,5}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΔΑΥΡΟΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ^{7,10}

priest of Sarapis: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΤΥΡΜΕΙΔΗΣ^{8,9,11}

¹*I.G.* II² 1005

²*I.G.* VII 2850

³*Agora* XV, n. 252

⁴*Hesperia* 10 (1941) n. 26, pp. 61-2

⁵*Hesperia* 41 (1972) pp. 185-91 (with *I.G.* II² 1006)

⁶*I.D.* 1777

⁷*I.D.* 1941

⁸*I.D.* 2102

⁹*I.D.* 2149

¹⁰*I.D.* 2589

¹¹*I.D.* 2610

121/0 B.C.

archon: ΕΥΜΑΧΟΣ^{1,[2]}

*prytany-secretary:

epimeletes of Delos: ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ^{1,2}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³

priest of Sarapis: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΕΡΓΑΣΗΘΕΝ⁴

*see 133/2 B.C.

¹I.D. 1808

²I.D. 1809

³I.D. 2589

⁴I.D. 2610

120/19 B.C.

prytany-secretary: [_ Δ]ΟΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΜΕΕΥ[Σ]¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΣΩΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΥΣ⁵

priest of the Great Gods: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΥΜΟΣ ΚΑ[....]ΟΥ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΥΣ^{2,[3]}

priests of Sarapis: ΔΑΜΩΝ ΤΙΜΩΝΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ^{4,6}
[Τ]ΗΛΕΦΟΣ ΟΥΡΥΝΕΥΣ⁶

¹I.G. II² 1018

²*I.D.* 1808³*I.D.* 1809⁴*I.D.* 2121⁵*I.D.* 2589⁶*I.D.* 2610

119/8 B.C.

archon: ΠΠΑΡΧΟΣ^{1,2,3,10}archon on Salamis: [Π]ΥΘΕΑΣ¹proedros: [.....] ΟΛΥΜΠΙΧΟΣ ΚΕΙΡΙΑΔΗΣ²orator: ΠΠ[.....]²prytany-secretary: ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ²kosmetes: ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ¹paidotribes: ΑΥΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΛΕΙΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ¹hoplomachos: ΝΙΚΑΔΑΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹akontistes: [ΕΡΩ]Ν ΗΡ[Α]ΚΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΑΝΑΓΥΡΑΣΙΟΣ¹toxotes: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝΟΠΕΙΘΟΣ ΚΟΛΩ[ΝΗ]ΘΕΝ¹aphetes: ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΚΑΛΧΗΔΟΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ¹secretary of the ephebes: ΜΕΝΕΚΛΗΣ ΑΠ[ΟΛΛΩ]ΝΙΟΣ ΚΥΔΑΝΤΙΔΗΣ¹hyperetes: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ [Θ]ΕΟΤΕΙΧΟΣ ΕΠΙΤΥΡΙΔΗΣ¹ephebes:^{1,10}gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ^{9,10}hieropoioi on Delos:¹⁰

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΑΥΚΟΦΩΝ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ³

hoplophoros: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ³

priest of Sarapis: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ^{4,5,6,7,8,11}

¹*I.G.* II² 1008

²*Hesperia* 47 (1978) n. 15, pp. 286-7

³*I.D.* 1897

⁴*I.D.* 2050

⁵*I.D.* 2051

⁶*I.D.* 2052

⁷*I.D.* 2077

⁸*I.D.* 2150

⁹*I.D.* 2589

¹⁰*I.D.* 2598

¹¹*I.D.* 2610

118/7 B.C.

archon: ΑΗΝΑΙΟΣ^{1,[2],3,6,[7],8,9,14}

proedroi: ΖΩΠΥΡΟ[Σ] ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟ[Τ] ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ¹
 ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΠΑ[Τ]ΣΙΑΠΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ¹
 [.....]ΚΩΝΟΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ³

orators: [Φ]ΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΗΝΙΟΧΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜΙΟΣ¹
 ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ^{1,3}

prytany-secretary: ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{1,3}

epimeletes of Delos: ΞΕΝΩΝ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟ[Σ]^{4,5,10,14}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ^{6,7,8,15}

paidotribai on Delos: ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ^{6,8}
 ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ⁷

ephebes:⁷

priest of Hagne Aphrodite: []N¹⁴

*priest of Sarapis: ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ^{[9],10,11,12,13,[16]}

*Kolonos is a "split" deme but according to the tribal cycle his tribe must be Leontis (tribe IV)

¹I.G. II² 1008

⁹I.D. 2053

²I.G. II² 1017

¹⁰I.D. 2054

³Agora XV, n. 253

¹¹I.D. 2122

⁴I.D. 1652

¹²I.D. 2123

⁵I.D. 1878

¹³I.D. 2164

⁶I.D. 1925

¹⁴I.D. 2227

⁷I.D. 1926

¹⁵I.D. 2589

⁸I.D. 1947

¹⁶I.D. 2610

117/6 B.C.

archon: ΜΕΝΟΙΤΟΣ^{1,2,[3,4],5,6,7}

prytany-secretary: []ΑΔΗΣ ΑΤΤΑΛΟΥ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ⁴

kosmetes: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΟΥΛΙΑΔΟΥ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ¹

paidotribes: ΑΡΕΣΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

hoplomachos: ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΕΠΤΑΙΟΣ¹

akontistes: ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕ[ΥΣ]¹

toxotes: ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΡΙΚΕΕΥΣ¹

aphetes: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΑΙΓΙΛΕΥΣ¹

hyperetes: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΧΕΡΔΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

secretary of the ephebes: ΑΝΤΙ[ΔΟΥ]ΤΟΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΗΘΕΝ¹

ephebes:¹

priest of the Dionysiac Technitai: ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ ΙΚΕΣΙΟΥ³

epimeletes of Delos: ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ^{6,7}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΥΣ⁸

priest of Sarapis: ΙΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΙΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΦΛΥΤΕΥΣ^{6,7,9}

kanephoros: ΜΥΣΤΙΟΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΩΣ^{6,7}

¹ *I.G.* II² 1009 (with *Hesperia* 16, 1947, n. 67, pp. 170-2)

² *I.G.* II² 1010

³ *I.G.* II² 1134 (= *F.D.* III, 2 n. 69)

⁴ *Hesperia* 45 (1976) n. 3, pp. 287-8

⁵ *I.D.* 1609

⁶ *I.D.* 2055

⁷ *I.D.* 2056

⁸ *I.D.* 2589

⁹ *I.D.* 2610

118/5 B.C.

archon: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ^{1,2,3}

proedroi: [ΔΙ]ΟΣΚΟΥΤ[ΙΔΗ]Σ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ¹
ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΦΛΥΤΕΥΣ¹

orator: [Ε]ΞΑ[ΚΩ]Ν ΕΞ[Α]ΚΩΝΤΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ¹

prytany-secretary: ΣΟΦΟ[ΚΛ]ΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤ[ΡΙΟΥ]Τ ΙΦΙΣΤΙΑΔΗΣ¹

treasurer of the stratiotic fund: ΔΗΜΟΣ [ΒΕΡ]ΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ¹

leitourgoi on Salamis: ΧΑΡΙΚΛΗΣ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ²

ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ²

ΑΙΣΧΡΩΝ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ²

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΝΕΩΝΟΣ^{4,9}

priests of Sarapis: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{5,6,7,,10}
ΣΤΡΑΤΟΔΑΜΟΣ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΣ¹⁰

¹*I.G. II*² 1009 (with *Hesperia* 16, 1947, n. 67, pp 170-2)

²*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 2

³*I.D.* 1513

⁴*I.D.* 1560

⁵*I.D.* 2057

⁶*I.D.* 2058

⁷*I.D.* 2078

⁸*I.D.* 2090

⁹*I.D.* 2589

¹⁰*I.D.* 2610

115/4 B.C.

archon: ΝΑΤΣΙΑΣ^{1,4}

epimeletes of Delos: ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΡΟΠΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΑΡΧΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΑΡΧΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ¹
ΜΝΗΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΣΩΔΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΤΙΟΣ¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΣ⁶

overseer of the Nymphaion: ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ¹

priest of Sarapis: ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ^{2,3,4,5,7}

¹*I.D.* 1839

²*I.D.* 2072

³*I.D.* 2073

⁴*I.D.* 2079

⁵*I.D.* 2091

⁶I.D. 2589⁷I.D. 2610

114/3 B.C.

archon: [...]ΡΑΤΟΥ⁷epimeletes of Delos: ΙΠΠΑΡΧΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ^{1,6,7}epi ta hiera: [...] ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕΤΣ⁷gymnasiarch on Delos: ΑΡΧΙΑΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ^{2,8}

priest of the Great Gods, Dioskouri and Kabeires:

ΜΟΣΧΟΣ ΜΑΝΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ¹priest of Sarapis: ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ^{3,4,5,7,9}

¹I.D. 1901²I.D. 1942³I.D. 2059⁴I.D. 2103⁵I.D. 2151⁶I.D. 2165⁷I.D. 2208⁸I.D. 2589⁹I.D. 2610

113/2 B.C.

archon: ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΣ^{[1],3,6}

epimeletes of Delos: ΖΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ³

epi ta hiera: [_] ΟΙΤ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΟ[Σ]³
[_] ΟΤΡΥΝΕΤΣ³

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ¹⁰

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΧΑΡΜΙΚΟΣ ΑΙΝΗΣΙΟΥ ΚΙΚΤΝΝΕΤΣ^{3,4,5}

zakoros or kleidouchos: [_] [Χ]ΑΡΜΙΚΟΥ³

priests of Sarapis: ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ¹¹

ΚΑΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΕΡΟΙΑΔΗΣ¹¹

kanephoros: ΗΔΗΑ ΣΩΣΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΥ⁶

*priest of Syrian gods: ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ^{2,[7],8,9,12}

*kleidouchos: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ⁷

*dated by Roussel to this year (see *DCA*, p. 264)

¹*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 28, p. 229

²*I.D.* 1800

³*I.D.* 1879

⁴*I.D.* 1880

⁵*I.D.* 1881

⁶*I.D.* 2061

⁷*I.D.* 2228

⁸*I.D.* 2261

⁹*I.D.* 2285

¹⁰*I.D.* 2589

¹¹*I.D.* 2610¹²*I.D.* 2626

112/1 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,11,[15]}*proedros*: ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ¹orator: ΡΗΣΟΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ¹pytany-secretary: ΛΑΜΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΤΧΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ^{1,15}*epimeletes* of Peiraieus: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ¹*nomophylax*: ΕΤΝΙΚΟΣ []ΣΙΟΣ³ambassadors: ΘΕΟΦΙΛΙΣΚΟΣ ΟΛΓΜΠΙΧΟΣ¹⁵ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ ΔΗΜ[...]¹⁵Α[]¹⁵ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ¹⁵treasurer of the Naukleroi and Emporoi: ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ¹*proxenos* of the Naukleroi and Emporoi:ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ¹*epimeletes* of Delos: ΔΡΑΚΩΝ ΟΦΕΛΟΣ ΒΑΤΗΘΕΝ^{4,8,11,12}*epi ta hiera*: ΑΡΚΕΤΗΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ^{8,11,12}ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ^{8,11,12}gymnasiarch on Delos: ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹³priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ^{11,12}*kleidouchos*: ΕΥΚΛΕΩΝ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙ[ΔΗΣ]¹²priest of Sarapis: ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ^{5,6,7,8,9,10,14}

- | | |
|--|--|
| ¹ <i>I.G.</i> II ² 1012 | ⁹ <i>I.D.</i> 2152 |
| ² <i>Hesperia</i> 10 (1941) n. 27, p. 62 | ¹⁰ <i>I.D.</i> 2166 |
| ³ <i>Hesperia</i> 30 (1961) n. 28, p. 229 | ¹¹ <i>I.D.</i> 2229 |
| ⁴ <i>I.D.</i> 1653 | ¹² <i>I.D.</i> 2248 |
| ⁵ <i>I.D.</i> 2060 | ¹³ <i>I.D.</i> 2589 |
| ⁶ <i>I.D.</i> 2085 | ¹⁴ <i>I.D.</i> 2610 |
| ⁷ <i>I.D.</i> 2091 | ¹⁵ <i>F.D.</i> III, 2 n. 70 |
| ⁸ <i>I.D.</i> 2092 | |

111/0 B.C.

archon: *ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ*^{1,2,3}

pytany-secretary: { } *ΡΟΣ ΚΡΙΝΕΥΣ*¹

paidotribes: *ΝΕΩΝ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ*²

ephebes:²

epimeletes of Delos: *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ*^{4,5,7}

priest of *Sarapis*: *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ*^{6,7,8}

zakoros: *ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝ*^{6,7}

kanephoros: *ΔΩΡΟΘΕΑ ΑΡΧΕΛΛΑΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ*⁷

¹*I.G.* II² 1135

²*I.G.* II² 2983

³*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 29, p. 230

⁴*I.D.* 1531

⁵*I.D.* 1959

⁶*I.D.* 2070

⁷*I.D.* 2125

⁸*I.D.* 2610

110/9 B.C.

archon: ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ^{1-8,10,11,[20],24}

epimeletes of Delos:

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ^{4-6,[7],8-13,19-20,[21],22,25,27}

epi ta hiera: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΡΟΔΙΠΠΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ^{19,[20],21,[22],23,25}

ΝΑΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΝΑΥΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ^{19-20,[21],22,[23],25}

priest of Anios?: ΣΑΤΥΡΙΩΝ ΚΑΛΛ[]¹²

priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

ΔΗΜΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΕΥΡΗΜΟΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΑΥΣΤΙΟΣ^{19,20,22,[23],24,27}

kleidouchos: ΗΡΑΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ^{20,21,[22]}

*priest of Sarapis: ΣΩΣΙΩΝ ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ^{13-18,26}

*Oinoe is a "split" deme; according to the tribal cycle his tribe is Antiochis (tribe XII)

¹I.G. II² 1014

²I.G. II² 1944

³I.G. II² 2870

⁴I.D. 1551

⁵I.D. 1654

⁶I.D. 1810

⁷I.D. 1811

⁸I.D. 1812

⁹I.D. 1813

¹⁰I.D. 1814

¹¹I.D. 1815

¹²I.D. 1911

¹³I.D. 2038

¹⁴I.D. 2061

¹⁵I.D. 2062

¹⁶I.D. 2063

¹⁷I.D. 2064

¹⁸I.D. 2126

¹⁹I.D. 2220

²⁰I.D. 2221

²¹I.D. 2222

²²I.D. 2228

²³I.D. 2230

²⁴I.D. 2231

²⁵I.D. 2342

²⁶I.D. 2610

²⁷I.D. 2627

109/8 B.C,

archon: ΙΑΣΩΝ^{1,2,6,8,9}proedroi: []ΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ⁹
ΔΕΞΙΧΑΡΙΣ ΦΙ[]¹orator: Α[]ΡΙΟΥ ΕΠΙΕΙΚΙΔΗΣ⁹prytany-secretary: ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ^{1,9}antigraphus?: [ΣΤΡΑ]ΤΙΟΣ ΦΗΓΑΙΕΥΣ¹secretary of ?: [ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ] ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ¹priest of Aesclepius: ΝΙΚΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ²epimeletes of Delos: [Π]ΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΥΣ⁵epi ta hiera: []ΟΥ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ^{4,5}
ΠΑΕ[]⁵

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥΣ^{3,[4],5,6}hoplophoros: ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΥΣ⁶office unknown: []ΑΣΕΟΥ ΑΑ[]⁵zakoros: ΝΙΚ[ΗΦΟΡΟΥΣ]⁵underpriest of Sarapis: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ^{7,8}

¹I.G. II² 1014²I.G. II² 1944³I.D. 1887⁴I.D. 1888⁵I.D. 1889⁶I.D. 2423⁷S.E.G. XVI, 452

⁸*S.E.G.* XVI, 453⁹*BCH* 59 (1935) n. 3

108/7 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ^{1,[2],9}proedros: [] [Τ]ΜΥΛΛΟΥ ΕΡΟΙΑΔΗΣ¹orator: [] [Μ]ΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ¹pytany-secretary: [] ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΚΥΛ[ΗΘΕΝ]¹paidotribes: ΜΙΚΤΛΟΣ ΚΟΠΡΕ[Ι]ΟΣ²ephebes:²agonothetes of the Panathenaia: ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛ[ΗΣ]¹epimeletes of Delos: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΤΜΟΥ ΔΕΚΕΛΕΥΣ⁸epi ta hiera: ΦΑΕΝΝΟΣ ΔΙΩΝΟΣ ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ⁸
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΣΙΟΣ⁸priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΡΕΤΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΥΣ^{[3],4-6,9}archizapphos: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ^{7,9}demosios: ΕΤΤΥΧΙΔΗΣ⁹zakoros: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ⁹

¹*I.G.* II² 1036²*I.G.* II² 2981³*I.D.* 2250⁴*I.D.* 2251⁵*I.D.* 2252⁶*I.D.* 2262⁷*I.D.* 2274

⁸I.D. 2615⁹I.D. 2628

107/6 B.C.

archon: ΑΡΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΣ^{1,6}proedros: ΣΤΡΑΤΟΦΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ¹orator: ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ¹pytany-secretary: ΤΕΛΕΣΤΗΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ¹kosmetes: ΕΥΔΟΞΟΣ ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ ΑΧΕΡΔΟΥΣΙΟΥΣ¹paidotribes: ΣΠΟΥΔΙΑΣ ΚΑΦΙΣΙΟΥ ΟΗΘΕΝ¹hoplomachos: ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΕΠΤΕΑΙΟΥΣ¹akontistes: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥΣ ΣΦΑΙΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ¹aphetes: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΑΙΓΙΛΙΕΥΣ¹toxotes: ΜΕΝΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΥΣ¹secretary of the ephebes: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΔΗΣ ΕΡΜΑΓΟΡΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ¹hyperetes: ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ¹ephebes:¹epimeletes of Delos: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΣΙΟΥΣ^{6,8}epi ta hiera: ΣΩΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΥΣ^{6,8}ΙΑΣΩΝ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ^{6,8}priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ
ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ^{6,7,9,11}kleidouchos: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ^{6,8}kanephoros: ΖΩΙΑ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΩΣ^{6,8}

zakoros: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ^{6,8,9,10}

demosios: [ΕΤΤΥΧΙΔΗΣ]⁹

priest of Sarapis: ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ^{2,3,4,5,12,13,14}

kanephoros: ΘΕΟΦΙΛΗ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ^{2,3,5,14}

¹*I.G.* Π² 1011

²*I.D.* 2087

³*I.D.* 2088

⁴*I.D.* 2160

⁵*I.D.* 2211

⁶*I.D.* 2232

⁷*I.D.* 2233

⁸*I.D.* 2249

⁹*I.D.* 2250

¹⁰*I.D.* 2254

¹¹*I.D.* 2286

¹²*I.D.* 2617

¹³*I.D.* 2618

¹⁴*I.D.* 2619

106/5 B.C.

archon: ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ^{1,3,5,8,14,19,20,24}

herald of the archon: ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΘΗΝ[]¹³

general *epi ta hopla*: [ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟ]Σ [ΔΗ]ΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ¹⁴

herald of the Areopagus: [ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤ]ΡΙΔ[ΗΣ]¹³

proedroi: ΑΠΕΛΛΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝΤΟ[Σ] ΑΓΓΕΛΗΘΕΝ¹
 ΗΛΙΟ[ΔΩΡΟ]Σ ΦΙΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ[]ΔΗΣ¹
 ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ²⁶

orators: ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ^{1,24}
 ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΤΜΟΣ ΦΑΝΙΟΥ ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΟΥ¹
 ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ²⁶

prytany-secretary: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΞΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ^{1,24}

epi tas prosodous: ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΥ^{14,[22]}

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ] ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ¹⁴

kosmetes: [Θ]ΕΟΤΙΜΟΤ ΚΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΥ¹⁹ (with BCH 99, 1975, pp. 207-8)

paidotribes: ΝΕΩΝ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ³

paideutai: ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ¹⁹

ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΕΙΚΑΔΙΟΥ¹⁹

ΟΝΗΣΙΦΙΛΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ¹⁹

ΣΠΑΡΤΑΚΟΣ ΣΠΑΡΤΑΚΟΥ¹⁹

ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΕΠ[ΒΟ]ΤΑ[ΛΟΥ]_]¹⁹ (with BCH 99, 1975, PP. 207-8)

ΑΝΤΙΜΟΧΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ¹⁹

ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ¹⁹

ephebes:^{3,19}

hieropoioi:²²

hipparchos: ΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ²⁰

phylarchos (V): ΗΡΑΚΩΝ ΧΑΡΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ²⁰

phylarchos (X): ΕΤΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ²⁰

tarantinarchos: ΑΤΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΓΛΑΤΚΟΥ²⁰

secretary of the *hippeis*: ΛΕΩΝ²⁰

hippeis:²⁰

epi tas aparchas: ΑΜΦΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ¹⁶

priest of Apollo: ΑΥΣΙΑΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ¹⁴

ezegetes appointed by the god: ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ ΑΤΤΑΛΟΥ¹⁴

ezegetes appointed by the people: ΚΑΛΜΙΑΣ ΑΒΡΩΝΟΣ¹⁴

hieromnemon: ΑΣΚΛΑΠΙΩΝ ΚΙΤΤΟΥ¹⁴

mantis: ΧΑΡΜΥΛΟΣ ΧΑΡΜΥΛΟΥ¹⁶

architheoros: ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ^{3,13,15,17}

theoroi:¹⁵

Pythaistai:^{16,17}

pythaist paides:^{13,18}

kanephoroi:^{4,21}

hestiator: ΤΕΙΣΑΝΩΡ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΙΦΙΣΤΙΑΔΗΣ^{2,17}

priest of Athena: ΧΡΥΣΙΣ ΝΙΚΗΤΟΥ²³

epimeletes of Delos: ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΣΤΠΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ⁸

epi ta hiera: ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΗΘΕΝ⁸
ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΦΛΕΤΥΣ⁸

priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΖΩΙΑΟΣ ΖΩΙΑΟΥ ΦΛΕΤΥΣ^{8,9,10,[11,12]}

kanephoros: ΔΩΡΟΘΕΑ ΑΡΧΕΛΑΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ⁸

kleidouchos: ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ⁸

archizapphos: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ¹¹

zakoros: ΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ¹¹

demosios: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΔΗΣ^{8,9,10,11}

priest of Sarapis: ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ^{5,6,7}

¹ *I.G.* II² 1011

² *I.G.* II² 1941 (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 14)

³ *I.G.* II² 2984

⁴ *I.D.* 1871

⁵ *I.D.* 2067

⁶ *I.D.* 2127

⁷ *I.D.* 2154

⁸ *I.D.* 2234

⁹ *I.D.* 2251

¹⁰ *I.D.* 2252

¹¹ *I.D.* 2253

¹² *I.D.* 2254

¹³ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 4

¹⁴ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 5

¹⁵ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 9

¹⁶ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 13

¹⁷ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 14 (*I.G.* II² 1941)

¹⁸ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 15

¹⁹ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25

²⁰ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 28

²¹ *F.D.* III, 2 n. 30

²² *F.D.* III, 2 n. 52

²³ *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 3

²⁴ Josephus XIV.149ff

105/4 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ¹

epimeletes of Delos: []ΝΡΟΤ Φ[]ΟΤ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΣ¹

gymnasiarch on Delos: [.....] ΓΗΡΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΤ [ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ]¹

*priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΥ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ^{[6],7}

*zakoros: ΓΟΡΓΙΑΣ⁷

*archizapphos: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ⁶

priest of Sarapis: ΘΕΟΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΓΕΝΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ^{2,3,4}

zakoros: ΝΥΣΙΟΣ^{2,3,4,5}

*these magistrates could date to 104/3 B.C.

¹I.D. 1580

²I.D. 2080

³I.D. 2128

⁴I.D. 2155

⁵I.D. 2209

⁶I.D. 2224

⁷I.D. 2288

104/3 B.C.

archon: *ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ*^{2,3,7}

treasurer of the prytany (I): *Δ[]*³

secretary of the prytany (I): *ΑΠΟΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΠΕΡΓΑΣ[ΗΘΕΝ]*³

prytany magistrates: *[]HN M[]*³
*[]ΕΤΣ*³

prytany magistrate?: *ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ*³

proedros: *ΚΑΛΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΣΥΠΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ*³

orators: *[ΠΑ]ΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ ΠΑΥ[Σ]ΑΝΙΟΥ ΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ*³
*ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ*³

prytany-secretary: *ΘΡΑΣΤΒΟΥΛΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ*³

paidotribes: *ΝΕΩΝ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ*²

ephebes:^{2,7}

*priest of Aesclepius: *ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΜΗΤΡΩΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΡΜΙΟΣ*¹

epimeletes of Delos: *ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ*⁷

gymnasiarch on Delos: *ΒΥΤΤΑΚΟΣ ΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ*⁷

paidotribai on Delos: *[Σ]ΤΑΣΕΑΣ*⁷
*ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ*⁷

**priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

***archizapphos*:

***zakoros*:

priest of Sarapis: *ΑΠΟΛΩΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΩΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ*^{4,5,6}

kleidouchos: *ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΓΗΡΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ*^{5,6}

zakoros: *ΝΙΚΙΑΣ*^{4,5,6}

 *or 92/1 B.C. depending on the tribal cycle

**see 105/4 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1944

²I.G. II² 2985 (lines 1-3)

³Agora XV, n. 254

⁴I.D. 2153

⁵I.D. 2204

⁶I.D. 2415

⁷I.D. 2599

103/2 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΚΛΗΣ^{[1],2,3,6,7}

thesmothetai: ΝΙΚ[ΙΑΣ]³

ΜΕΙΔΙΑΣ³

ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ³

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ Χ[]³

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ³

general *epi ta hopla*: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ [ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟ]Υ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΙΟΣ³

general *epi to nautikon*: ΚΗΦΙΣ[]³

general *epi ten paraskeuen*: ΙΑΣ[ΩΝ]³

herald of the Areopagus: Η[]³

proedros: ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤ[ΟΣ ΔΙ]ΟΝΥΣ[Ο] ΔΩΡΟΤ ΕΥΩ[ΝΥΜΕ]ΥΣ¹

orator: [Π]ΕΙΣΙΑΝΑΞ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕ[ΥΣ]¹

[ΞΕ]ΝΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙ[ΝΟ]ΥΤΤΗΣ³

prytany-secretary: []ΘΕΝΗΣ ΚΛΕΙΝΙΟΥ ΚΟΘΩΚΙ[ΔΗΣ]¹

**epimeletes* of the Peiraeus: ΔΗΜΕΑΣ Α[ΛΑΙΕΤΣ]³

epimeletes of the Emporion: Ι[]³

treasurer, secretary and *epimeletes* of the Sabaziastai:

ΔΝΡΟΘΕΟΣ ΟΑΘΕΝ²

elected to oversee the Pythaid

of 98/7 B.C.: [ΑΜΦΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ]³

epimeletes of Delos: ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΗΣ^{3,7}

epi ta hiera: ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ³

ΘΕΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ³

**public banker on Delos:

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΕΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΚΤΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ^{3,7}

agoranomoi on Delos: [ΚΙΧΗ]ΣΙΑΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ³

ΕΡΜΟΚΛΗΣ [.....]ΟΥ[]³

herald on Delos: ΓΛΑΥΚΙΑ[Σ ΚΡΗ]ΝΕΤΣ³

paidotribes on Delos: (foreigner)⁷

ephebes:⁷

priest of Anios: ΤΙΜΩΝ ΣΚΑΜ[Β]ΩΝΙΔΗΣ³

priest of Apollo on Delos: ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ^{3,4}

priest of Artemis on Delos: ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΓΚΥΛΗ[Θ]ΕΝ³

priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ^{3,10,11,12}

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΖΗΝΩΝ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ^{3,5,6}

priest of Roma: ΠΥΘΙΛΑΟΣ [ΣΟΥ]ΝΙΕΤΣ³

priest of Sarapis on Delos: ΔΡΑΚΩΝ ΦΛΕΤΕΤΣ^{3,8,9}

zakoros: ΙΣΙΔΩΡ[ΟΥ]⁹

kanephoros: ΚΟΣΜΗΣ ΔΡΑΚ[ΩΝ]ΤΟΥ[Σ] ΦΛΕΤΩΣ⁹

*AZHNIETΣ? see Reinmuth, *BCH* 90 (1966), p. 96

**see 100/99 B.C.

¹*I.G.* II² 1034

²*I.G.* II² 1335

³*I.G.* II² 2336 (Tracy)

⁴*I.D.* 1656

⁵*I.D.* 1884

⁶*I.D.* 1885

⁷*I.D.* 1927

⁸*I.D.* 2129

⁹*I.D.* 2156

¹⁰*I.D.* 2235

¹¹*I.D.* 2236

¹²*I.D.* 2245

102/1 B.C.

archon: ΕΧΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΤΡΙΝΕΜΕΕΤΣ^{1,15,17}

king-archon?: [.....]Σ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ¹

polemarchos: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

thesmothetai: [Θ]ΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ ΚΕΦ[ΑΛΗΘ]Ε[Ν]¹

ΠΑΝΤΑΚΛΗΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ¹

[Α]ΛΚΙΒΙΑΔΗΣ ΠΟΤΑΜΙΟΣ¹

ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ¹

ΘΕΩΝ ΕΡΧΙΕΤΣ¹

ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΥΜΟΣ ΕΛΕΤΣΙΝΙΟΣ¹

general *epi ta hopla*: ΣΑΡΑΠΠΩ[Ν Μ]ΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹

general *epi to nautikon*: ΠΥΘΩΝ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹

general *epi ten paraskeuen*: ΤΙΜΟΥΧΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙ[ΟΣ]¹

epimeletes of the Peiraieus: ΒΥΤΤΑΚΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕ[ΤΣ]¹

agoranomoi: [.....]ΟΣ¹
[.....]ΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

kosmetes: ΤΙΜΩΝ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΟΥ ΒΟΥΤΑΔΗΣ¹⁷

paidotribes: ΤΙΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΛΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹⁷

hoplomachos: ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΕΙΤΕΑΙΟΣ¹⁷

akontistes: ΔΗΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΤΠΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ¹⁷

toxotes: ΖΩΠΥΡΟΣ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ¹⁷

aphetes: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΑΙΓΙΑΜΕΤΣ¹⁷

secretary of the ephebes: ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ¹⁷

hyperetes: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΕΤΣ¹⁷

ephebes:¹⁷

epimeletes of Delos: ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ^{1,3}

epimeletes of the Emporion: [.....]Σ¹

public banker on Delos: [ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ]¹

epi ta hiera: [_]ΜΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΑΧΑΡ[ΝΕΤ]Σ¹

gymnasiarch: [.....]¹

herald on Delos: ΦΙΛΩΝ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ¹

priest of Anios: [Σ]ΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΑΙΓ[ΙΑΜΕΤΣ]¹

priest of Apollo: [.....]ΙΩΝ[_]¹

priest of Artemis: ΘΕΟΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ [ΚΥΔΑ]ΘΗΝΑΙΕΤ[Σ]¹

priest of Dionysos: ΘΕΟΔΟΤ[ΟΣ]¹

priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΘΕΑ[.....] ΑΓΓΕΛΗΘΕΝ¹

priest of Zeus Kynthios: ΔΗΜΗΤ[ΡΙΟΣ]¹

*priest of Poseidon Aisios, the Great Gods, etc.:

ΗΛΙΑΝΑΞ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ^{2,[3],4-9,[10],11-12,[13-14],15-16}

priest of Roma: [.....]ΕΙΟΣ¹

priest of Sarapis: Α[.....]ΗΣ ΘΟΡΙΚ[ΙΟΣ]¹

*his tribe must be Hippothontis (tribe IX) or Kekrops (tribe VIII) depending on the tribal cycle

¹ I.G. II² 2336 (Tracy)

² I.D. 1552

³ I.D. 1562

⁴ I.D. 1563

⁵ I.D. 1569

⁶ I.D. 1570

⁷ I.D. 1571

⁸ I.D. 1572

⁹ I.D. 1573

¹⁰ I.D. 1574

¹¹ I.D. 1576

¹² I.D. 1581

¹³ I.D. 1582

¹⁴ I.D. 1585

¹⁵ I.D. 1902

¹⁶ I.D. 1903

¹⁷ *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 6

101/0 B.C.

archon: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ^{1,2,3,6}

king-archon: [Η]ΡΟΔΟΤ[Ο]Σ ΠΡΟΒΑ[ΜΙΣΙΟΣ]²

polemarchos: ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΚΥΔΑ[ΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ]²

thesmothetai: [.....]ΟΣ ΕΥΩΝΤΜΕΤΣ²

ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ²

ΦΙΛΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΚΙΚΤΝΝΕΤΣ²

ΑΠΟΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔ[Η]Σ²

ΠΟΠΛΙΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ²

general *epi ta hopla*: ΑΠΟ[ΛΛΟ]ΔΩΡΟΣ Δ[.....]²

*general *epi to nautikon*: ΑΡΧΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥ[ΑΝΑ]ΦΛΥΣΤΙΟΣ²

general *epi ten paraskeuen*: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΝΑ[Γ]ΤΡΑΣΙΟΣ²

general *epi Ramnounta*: [...] $\Delta\Omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \Xi\alpha\eta\theta\iota\omicron\tau\ \Theta\eta\mu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ³

herald of the Areopagus: $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\eta\varsigma$ ²

proedros: $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\tau\ \pi\alpha\iota\alpha\eta\iota\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ⁶

orator: $\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\eta\mu\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\tau\ \lambda\alpha\mu\pi\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ⁶

prytany-secretary: $\phi\iota\lambda\iota\omega\eta\ \phi\iota\lambda\iota\omega\eta\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\varsigma\iota\eta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ⁶

epimeletes of the Peiraeus: $\kappa\eta\phi\iota\varsigma\omicron\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega\eta\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ²

epimeletes of the Emporion: $\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\iota\omega\eta\ [E]\Xi\ \omicron\iota\omicron\tau$ ²

agoranomoi: $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\Xi\alpha\eta\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ²
 [...] $\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\eta\varsigma$ ²

epimeletes of Delos: $\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \dots\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ²

epi ta hiera: $\phi\iota\lambda\eta\mu\omega\eta$ ²
 $\delta\epsilon\iota\eta\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\eta\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ²

gymnasiarch: $\delta\iota\omicron\eta\tau\varsigma\omicron\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\iota\rho\{\alpha\delta\iota\omega\tau\eta\}\varsigma$ ²

herald on Delos: $\mu\tau\rho\omega\eta\ \lambda\epsilon\tau\kappa\omicron\eta\omicron\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ²

priest of Anios: $\nu\tau\mu\phi\omicron\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\eta\varsigma$ ²

priest of Apollo: $\alpha\eta\tau\iota\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\eta\phi\iota\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ²

priest of Artemis: $\{\phi\}\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \{\kappa\omicron\lambda\omega\eta\eta\theta\}\epsilon\eta$ ²

priest of Hagne Aphrodite: $\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\eta\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\tau\ \varsigma\phi\eta\tau\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ²

priest of Dionysos: $\alpha\varsigma\kappa\lambda\eta\pi\iota\alpha\{\delta\eta\varsigma\ \lambda\lambda\alpha\iota\}\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ²

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:
 $\delta\iota\omicron\eta\tau\varsigma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\eta\eta\iota\omicron\tau\ \pi\alpha\iota\alpha\eta\iota\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ⁴

zakoros (eleventh time): $\nu\iota\kappa\eta\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ⁴

priest of Roma: $\delta\eta\mu\langle H\rangle\tau\rho\iota\langle O\rangle\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\langle\Xi\rangle\omega\{\eta\epsilon\tau\}\varsigma$ ²

priest of Sarapis: $\theta\epsilon\omicron\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\omicron\eta\tau\varsigma\iota\omicron\tau\ \alpha\chi\alpha\rho\eta\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ ^{2,5}

 *this name could date to 97/6 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1335²I.G. II² 2336 (Tracy)³I.G. II² 2869⁴I.D. 1882⁵I.D. 2067⁶Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 6

100/99 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ^{1,2,[3]}king-archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ¹polemarchos: ΣΩΣΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΛΛΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹thesmothetai: ΣΩΣΟΣ ΦΛΕΥΤΣ¹ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹ΛΑΦΑΗΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΤΣ¹ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ¹ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ¹ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ Κ[ΗΦΙ]ΣΙΕΤΣ¹general *epi ta hopla*: ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ [ΘΕ]ΟΧΑΡΙΔΟΣ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ¹general *epi to nautikon*: ΘΕΩΝ ΠΑΙΟΝΙΔΗΣ¹*general *epi ten paraskeuen*:herald of the Areopagus: [.....]ΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ¹*epimeletes* of the Peiraieus: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ¹

**priest of Roma:

epimeletes of Delos: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ^{1,6}***public banker on Delos: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ¹

*gymnasiarch on Delos:

herald on Delos: ΦΙΛΟΜΗΛΕΙΔΑΣ ΚΥΔΑΘΗ[ΝΑ]ΙΕΤΣ¹

agonothetes of the Delia: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹

priests of Apollo on Delos: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΑΤΣΤΙΟΣ¹
ΑΘΗΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΤΙΣΑΡΧΟΣ ΑΙΜΟΤΣΙΟΣ⁶

kleidouchos: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ⁶

zakoros: ΚΕΡΔΩΝ⁶

****priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{[3],4,5}

****kanephoros*: ΝΤΜΦΩ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΥ^{3,4}

*see 97/6 B.C.

**see 99/8 and 97/6 B.C.

***see 103/2 B.C.

****these could date to 127/6 B.C. or to the archonship of ΘΕΟΔΩΤΟΣ
(95/4 B.C.)

¹I.G. II² 2336 (Tracy)

²I.D. 1760

³I.D. 2237

⁴I.D. 2238

⁵I.D. 2239

⁶I.D. 2364

99/8 B.C.

archon: ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣ^{1,[2],3,5,8}

thesmothetai: [...]|ΛΗΣ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ¹
 [...]|ΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΧΟΛΑ|ΡΓΕΥΣ¹
 [...]|ΩΝ ΦΛΥΕΥ|Σ¹
 [.....]|ΣΟ|_]¹
 ΝΑΥ|Σ|ΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΕΡΟΙΑ|ΔΗΣ¹

general *epi ta hopla*: [ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ¹

general *epi to nautikon*: [..... ΕΥ|ΩΝΤΜΕΥΣ¹

general *epi ten paraskeuen*: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ¹

herald of the Areopagus: ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΟΥΓΕΝΟΥ Α|ΙΞ|ΩΝΕΥΣ¹

**epimeletes* of the Peiraieus: [.....]|Ω|..|ΘΕΟΣ Χ|_]¹

epimeletes of the Emporion: ΑΡΧΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥ|ΑΝΑ|ΦΛΥΣΤΙΟΣ¹

agonothetes of the Panathenaia: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ¹

*priest of Roma: [Α|ΕΩΣ|ΤΡΑ|ΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΦΛΥΕΥΣ^{1,[3],4,7}

public banker on Delos: ΠΥΡΡ|ΟΣ ΠΥΡΡΟΥ ΑΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ¹

epi ta hiera: ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ^{[1],4}
 ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ^{[1],4}

**gymnasiarch on Delos:

office unknown (Delos): [ΔΙΟΣ|ΚΟΥΤΡΙΔΗΣ Δ|ΙΟΣΚΟ|ΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ⁸

**agoranomos* on Delos: [..... Ξ|ΥΠΕΤΑΙΩΝ¹

**agoranomos*?: [Δ|ΗΜ|ΗΤ|ΡΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΥ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ¹

priest of Apollo on Delos: ΠΥΡΡ|ΟΥΓΕΝΗΣ Φ|ΙΛΑΔΗΣ¹

*priest of Hagne Aphrodite on Delos:

ΘΕΟΒΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ^{1,6}

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΩΤΑΔΟΥ ΑΙΓΙΑΙΕΤΣ⁵

*these could date to 98/7 B.C., either together or separately (although the *agoranomoi* probably belong to the same year) (see 98/7 B.C.)

**see 97/6 B.C.

¹*I.G.* II² 2336 (Tracy)

²*Hesperia* 32 (1963) n. 24, pp. 23-4

³*I.D.* 1619

⁴*I.D.* 1709

⁵*I.D.* 1886

⁶*I.D.* 2265

⁷*I.D.* 2499

⁸*I.D.* 2570

98/7 B.C.

archon: ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ^{1,2,[3],8,9,13,14,15,16,19}

king-archon: ΑΡΧΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΑΥΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ^{2,14}

polemarchos: ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ^{2,14}

thesmothetai: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΚΥΘΗΡΙΟΣ^{2,14}

ΣΚΑΜΑΝΔΡΙΟΣ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΧΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ^{2,14}

ΦΙΛΕΑΣ ΕΦΟΡΟΥ ΠΤΕΛΕΑΣΙΟΣ^{2,14}

ΦΙΛΙΩΝ ΦΙΛΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΛΕΤΣΙΝΙΟΣ^{2,14}

ΒΟΥΛΩΝ ΛΕΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ^{2,14}

ΛΑΚΡΑΤΕΙΔΗΣ ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΤΣ^{2,14}

flutist: ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ¹³

salpiktes: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΔΑΜΑΝΤΟΣ¹⁴

herald of the archon: ΣΙΜΩΝ ΣΙΜΩΝΟΣ¹⁴

general *epi ta hopla* (second time):

ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ^{2,13}

general *epi to nautikon*: [ΧΑΡΙΑ]Σ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ²

general *epi ten paraskeuen*: [.....]Σ ΔΙΟ[]²

herald of the Areopagus: ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΠΥΡΡΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ^{2,14}

**epimeletes* of the Peiraeus:

epimeletes of the Emporion: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΟΒΙΟΥ ΕΠΙΤΡΙΔΗΣ⁴

epi tas prosodous: [ΤΙΜΟ]ΚΛΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΛΕΟΥ¹³

[....]ΟΥΧΟΣ¹³

[ΤΕΛ]ΕΣΙΑΣ ΤΙΜΟΜΑΧΟΥ¹³

kosmetes: ΕΠΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΠΙΜΑΧΟΥ¹⁶

paideutai: ΟΜΟΛΩΙΧΟΣ¹⁶

ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ¹⁶

ΠΑΤΡΩΝ ΤΙΜ[]¹⁶

ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ Β[]¹⁶

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ Θ[]¹⁶

ΑΜΕΙΝΙΑΔΗΣ[]¹⁶

ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΚΡΗ[]¹⁶

ephebes:¹⁶

agonothetes of the Delia: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ [ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ] ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΣ²

agonothetes of the Panathenaia: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ²

agonothetes of the Diasia: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ²

agonothetes of the Eleusinia: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ²

leader of the Pythaid: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ^{13,18}

priest of Apollo: ΑΥΣΙΑΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ¹³

exegetes appointed by the god: ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ ΑΤΤΑΛΟΥ¹³

ezegetes appointed by the people: [Κ]ΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΕΥΚΤΗΜΟΝΟΣ¹³

hippeis:^{16,17}

hieromnemon: ΚΤΗΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΤΕΛΟΥ¹³

mantis: ΧΑΡΜΥΛΟΣ ΧΑΡΜΥΛΟΥ¹³

herald of Apollo: ΘΕΑΙΟΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ¹³

architheoros: ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ¹⁴

architheoros of the *Pythaistai*: ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ¹⁸

architheoros of the Tetrapolis: ΖΗΝΩΝ ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ¹⁴

architheoros from the Erysichthonidai: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ¹⁴

theoroi:¹⁴

Pythaistai:^{14,15,18}

pythaist paides:¹⁵

kanephoroi:¹⁵

bearer of the sacred fire: ΑΜΦΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ¹⁹

epimeletes of Delos: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤΗΣ^{2,4,5,6,7,12}

**gymnasiarch on Delos:

**agoranomoi*:

***priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

priest of Dionysos, Hermes and Pan: ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΗΣ¹²

****priest of Roma:

priest of Sarapis: ΛΕΩΝ ΑΓΑΘΑΡΧΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ^{10,11}

*see 99/8 B.C.

**see 97/6 B.C.

***see 99/8 and 97/6 B.C.

****see 97/6 B.C. and 99/8 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1029

²I.G. II² 2336 (Tracy)

³I.G. II² 2990

⁴I.D. 1711

⁵I.D. 1757

⁶I.D. 1761

⁷I.D. 1816

⁸I.D. 1817

⁹I.D. 1878

¹⁰I.D. 2105

¹¹I.D. 2106

¹²I.D. 2400

¹³Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7a

¹⁴Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7b

¹⁵Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7c

¹⁶Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7d

¹⁷Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7f

¹⁸Hesperia Supplement XV, n. 7g

¹⁹F.D. III, 2 n. 32

97/6 B.C.

archon: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΗΡ[.....] ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,4,5,7,8}

king-archon: ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ Π[ΑΝΤΑΚ]ΛΕΟΥΣ ΓΑΡΓΗΤΤΙΟΣ³

polemarchos: ΑΝΤΙΚΡΑΤ[Η]Σ ΦΙΛΙΣΚΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΟΣ³

thesmothetai: ΝΙΚΟΝΟΜ[ΟΣ] ΕΚ[]ΚΗΔΩΝ³

ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ [... ΚΥΔΑΘ]ΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ³

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ Δ[..... ΠΑΛ]ΟΝ[ΔΗΣ]³

ΚΛΕΙΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ [.....] ΦΛΥΕΥΣ³

ΖΗΝΩΝ ΑΡΙΣ[ΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ]³

ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ Α[ΣΚΛΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΤ]ΗΝΕΥΣ³

general *epi ta hopla*: ΠΥΡΡΟΣ ΠΥΡΡΟΥ ΑΛΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ³

*general *epi to nautikon*: ΑΡΧ[ΙΑΣ] ΑΡΧΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ³

**general *epi ten paraskeuen*: ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΩ[Σ]ΙΚΡΑ[ΤΟΥ] ΟΙΝΑΙΟΣ³

general of the Peiraieus: ΕΤΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΖΩΙΛΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ⁴

ΖΗΝΩΝ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ⁴

ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΤΡΩΙΛΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ⁴

herald of the Areopagus: $\text{AN}\Delta\text{PEA}\Sigma\text{ AN}\Delta\text{PEO}\Upsilon[\text{ΠEIPAIET}\Sigma]^3$

***treasurer of the prytany? (V): $\Delta\text{ION}\Upsilon[\Sigma\text{O}]\Delta\text{NPO}\Sigma\text{ AIP}[\text{I}]\Lambda[\text{IE}]\text{TE}\Sigma^6$

***secretary of the prytany (V): $\text{AIE}\Sigma\text{XPIA}\Sigma\text{ ΦAITE}\Sigma^6$

***prytaneis (V):⁶

orator: $\Sigma\text{ATTPO}\Sigma\text{ MENIECKOT AIE}\Omega[\text{NET}\Sigma]^2$

***secretary of the *boule* and *demos*: [.....]
[..... $\text{EK K}[\text{O}]\Lambda\Omega\text{NOT}^6$

***prytany-secretary: [$_$ $\Lambda\text{AM}[\text{ITPET}\Sigma]^6$

***undersecretary of the *boule* and *demos*: $\Delta\text{IOSCKOTPIA}\Sigma\text{H}\Sigma$
 $\Lambda\text{IMOTCIC}^6$

***herald of the *boule* and *demos*: $\text{ETKA}\Sigma\text{ BEPENIKIA}\Sigma\text{H}\Sigma^6$

***flutist: $[\text{NE}]\text{OKA}\Sigma\text{ BEPENIKIA}\Sigma\text{H}\Sigma^6$

***antigraphus: $\text{NIK}<\text{I}>\text{A}\Sigma\text{ CTEIPIE}[\text{TE}]^6$

****epi tous* ? $\Phi\text{IAHM}[\text{ON}]\text{POPIO}\Sigma^6$
[Δ] $\text{HMOKA}\Sigma\text{ A}\theta\text{MONET}\Sigma^6$
 IASON^6
 $\Phi\text{IAON OH}[\theta\text{E}]\text{N}^6$

****epi ta psephismata*: $[\text{E}]\Sigma\text{HKIA}\Sigma\text{ [E]AET}[\Sigma\text{INIO}\Sigma]^6$

****epi to aporrheton*: $\Phi\text{IAONIA}\Sigma\text{H}\Sigma\text{ A}\Phi\text{IA}[\text{N}]\text{AIO}\Sigma^6$

****epi tous nomous*: [..... $\text{K}[\text{O}]\Lambda\text{MTET}\Sigma^6$

***priest of Attalos: $[\text{A}]\text{N}\theta\text{EMION}\text{ ΠEPI}\theta\text{OIA}\Sigma\text{H}\Sigma^6$

***prytany magistrates?: $\text{EA}[\text{PI}]\text{NO}[\Sigma\text{ B}]\text{ATH}[\theta\text{EN}]^6$
[$_$] $[\text{ET}]\text{EAIO}\Sigma^6$
[$_$] $\text{PO}\Sigma\text{ AXAPNET}\Sigma^6$

epimeletes of the Peiraieus: [.....] $\text{H}\Sigma^3$

hoplomachos: $\text{TIMO}[_]^1$

akontistes: $\text{APICTOFA}[\text{NH}\Sigma]^1$

paideutes: [$_$ $\Lambda\text{AM}[\text{ITPET}\Sigma]^1$

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ^{3,[7],8,9,11}

epi ta hiera: ΑΓΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΘΕΝ^{3,8}
ΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ^{3,8}

****gymnasiarch on Delos: ΔΑΜΩΝ [ΙΚ]ΑΡΙΕΥΣ³

paidotribai on Delos: Σ[ΤΑΣΕΑΣ ΦΙ]ΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ⁵
ΦΙΛ[ΟΚΛΗΣ] ΣΤΑΣΕΟΥ ΚΟΛΩ[ΝΗΘΕΝ]⁵

priest of Artemis on Delos: ΜΑΡΣΤΑΣ ΜΑΡΣΤΟ[Υ ΜΕ]ΛΙΤΕΥΣ³

priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:
ΘΕΟΒΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ^{3,8,9}

zakoros: ΕΡΜΙΑΣ Α[...]
ΜΙΑ ΛΑΜ[ΠΤΡΕΥΣ]?⁹

kleidouchos: [ΔΙ]ΟΝΤ[ΣΙ]ΟΥΣ [..]
Λ[.]ΥΛΟΥΣ[..]
ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥΣ⁹

demosios: [..]
Η[.]ΟΥΣ⁹

priest of Apollo on Delos: [.....]
ΝΟΥΣ ΕΞ ΟΙ[ΟΥ]Υ³

*****priest of Hagne Aphrodite: ΓΑΙΟΥΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ^{3,10}

*****kanephoros: ΝΙΚΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΥΣ¹⁰

*****priest of Roma: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΔΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³

*****priest of Sarapis: ΕΥΚ[Υ]ΜΕ[ΝΟΥΣ ΕΥΔΗ]ΜΟΥ ΕΙΤΕΑΙΟΥΣ³

*see 101/0 B.C.

**see 100/99 B.C.

***Agora XV, n. 259 has also been dated to 193/2 B.C. but 97/6 B.C. is possible

****see 100/99, 99/8 and 98/7 B.C. are all vacant and possible years for his gymnasiarchy

*****see 98/7 B.C.

*****Eitea is a "split" deme; his tribe must be Attalis (tribe XI) according to the tribal cycle

- ¹*I.G.* II² 1029
²*I.G.* II² 1337
³*I.G.* II² 2336 (Tracy) -
⁴*I.G.* II² 2873
⁵*I.G.* II² 2990
⁶*Agora* XV, n. 259
⁷*I.D.* 1817
⁸*I.D.* 1878
⁹*I.D.* 1892
¹⁰*I.D.* 2240
¹¹*I.D.* 2310
-
-

96/5 B.C.

archon: [] *KPATOT*²

prytany-secretary: [.....] *ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΤΗΣ*¹

akontistes: *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑ[ΝΗΣ]*¹

paideutes: [] *ΛΑΜΠ[ΤΡΕΤΣ]*¹

hoplomachos: *TIMO[]*¹

epimeletes of Delos: [] *ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΝΑ[ΦΑΡΕΤΙΟΥΣ]*²

gymnasiarch: [] *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΟΣ Μ[]*²

paidotribes on Delos: (foreigner)²

¹*I.G.* II² 1029 (with *Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 11)

²*I.D.* 2600

95/4 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ^{1,[2,3]}

treasurer of the prytany (VIII): ΑΡΙΑΡΑΘΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΣΤΠΑΛΗΤΤΙΟΣ²

secretary of the prytany (VIII): ΑΓΕΛΛΟΣ ΑΓΕΛΛΟΥ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ²

priest of the Eponymous Hero (VIII): ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ²

prytaneis:²

proedroi: ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ²
[.....]ΙΕΥΣ²

secretary of the *boule* and *demos*: [_]Υ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ²

undersecretary: ΕΥΜΑΧΟΣ [.....]²

prytany-secretary: [_]ΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ²

herald of the *boule* and *demos*: ΚΛΕΩΝ ΚΙΚΥΝΝΕΥΣ²

flutist: ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ²

epi ta psephismata: [.....] ΕΙΤΕΑΙΟΣ²

epi to apporreton: ΣΙΔΩΝ ΛΑΚΙΑ[ΔΗΣ]²

anagrapheus: ΑΓΑΘΑΡΧΟΣ [Κ]ΗΦΙΣ[Ι]ΕΥΣ²

magistracy unknown: [_ ΕΚ Κ]ΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ²

didaskalos of the *mellepheboi*: ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝ ΘΗΜΑΚΕΥΣ¹

ephebes:¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{4,5}

epi ta hiera: ΘΕΩΝ ΠΑΙΟΝΙΔΗΣ^{4,5}
ΑΡΓΗΙΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ^{4,5}

*priest of Hagne Aphrodite:

**kanephoros*:

priest of Sarapis: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ^{4,5}

*see 100/99 B.C.

¹*I.G.* II² 2986

²*Agora* XV, n. 261

³*Hesperia* 28 (1959) n. 13, pp. 200-1

⁴*S.E.G.* XVI.452

⁵*S.E.G.* XVI.453

94/3 B.C.

archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ^{1,[2],10,14?,[15]}

proedros: [.....] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ²

orator: [.....] ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ²

ephebes:⁷

treasurer of the *synepheboi*: ΦΙΛΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ¹

didaskalos of the *synepheboi*: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΥΣ¹

mellepheboi:¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΛΑΥΚΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ^{3,4,6}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΣΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΣΩΣΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΕΤΩΝΥΜΕΥΣ^{5,6,7}

paidotribes on Delos: (foreigner)⁷

priest of Sarapis: ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{8,9,10,11,12,13}

kleidouchos: ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΣΠΕΥΘΟΥ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ^{10,11,12}

kanephoros: ΔΩΣΙΘΕΑ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΥ^{10,11}

zakoros: ΑΠΟΜΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{10,12}

*kleidouchos:¹⁴

*depending on the restoration of the archon's name, this magistrate could date to 131/0 B.C.

¹ I.G. II² 2991

² *Hesperia* 28 (1959) n. 13, pp. 200-1

³ I.D. 1658

⁴ I.D. 1763

⁵ I.D. 1930

⁶ I.D. 1931

⁷ I.D. 1932

⁸ I.D. 2039

⁹ I.D. 2040

¹⁰ I.D. 2081

¹¹ I.D. 2094

¹² I.D. 2104

¹³ I.D. 2158

¹⁴ I.D. 2601

¹⁵ I.D. 2621

93/2 B.C.

archon: ΚΡΙΤΩΝ⁴

*priest of Asclepius:

epimeletes of Delos: ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ¹

priest of Hagia Aphrodite: ΣΤΡΑΤΙΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΟΥ ΦΛΙΕΥΣ³

zakoros: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ^{3,4}

priest of Sarapis?: [_ ΠΑΛΛΑΝΙΕΥΣ²

zakoros: []*POΣ*²

*see 83/2 B.C.

¹*I.D.* 1764

²*I.D.* 2039

³*I.D.* 2243

⁴*I.D.* 2244

92/1 B.C.

archon: *MENEΔΗΜΟΣ*⁴

*priest of Asclepius:

epimeletes of Delos: *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ*^{1,2,3}

epi ta hiera: *A[] ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΛΛΑΙΕΤΣ*^{2,5}
*ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ [] ΚΛΕΟΥΣ*²

gymnasiarch: *ΤΕΛΕΣΙΑΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ*⁴

paidotribes: *ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ*⁴

*see 104/3 B.C.

¹*I.D.* 1657

²*I.D.* 1714

³*I.D.* 1762

⁴*I.D.* 1934

⁵*I.D.* 2039

91/0 B.C.

archon: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ^{1,2}

amphithaleis:²

¹*I.G. II*² 1713

²*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 19

90/89 B.C.

archon: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ¹

*epimeletes of Delos: ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ^{2,3,4}

*priest of Sarapis: ΕΛΛΗΝ ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΥ⁵

*zakoros (eighteenth time): ΕΥΘΥΔΟΥΣ^{4,5}

kleidouchos: ΑΡΣΙΝΟΥ⁵

*this is a possible year for these magistrates. The *zakoros* is serving for the eighteenth time and is first attested in 107/6 B.C.

¹*I.G. II*² 1713

²*I.D.* 1893

³*I.D.* 2161

⁴*I.D.* 2205

⁵*I.D.* 2212

89/8 B.C.

archon: ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ¹

¹I.G. II² 1713

88/7 B.C.

no archon (*anarchia*)

general *epi ta hopla*: ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΙΩΝΟΣ¹

¹Ath. V. 213e

87/6 B.C.

archon: ΦΙΛΑΝΘΗΣ^{1,3}

proedros: ΝΕΩΝ ΔΩΡΟΘΕΟΥ²

orator: ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΔΗΜΕ[ΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ]²

prytany-secretary: [ΔΗΜΗΤΡ]ΙΟΥ ΑΝΑ[ΚΑΙΕΥΣ]²

¹*I.G.* II² 1713

²*Hesperia* 40, 1971, n. 3, pp. 101-7

³*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

86/5 B.C.

archon: *ΙΕΡΟΦΑΝΤΗΣ*^{1,3}

king-archon: *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛ[Ο]Σ ΑΜΦΙΟΥ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ*²

polemarchos: *ΦΙΛΩΤΑΣ ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ*²

thesmothetai: *ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ*²
*ΑΤΤΙΝΑΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕ[Ι]ΔΟΥ ΦΛΙΤΕΥΣ*²
*ΠΑΤΡΩΝ ΠΟΛΕ[ΜΩ]ΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ*²
*ΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ Α[ΘΗ]ΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΥΣ*²
*ΠΟΣΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤ[Ω]ΝΟΣ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ*²
*ΠΑΣΙΩΝ ΕΡΜΑΙΣΚΟΥ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΤΙΟΣ*²

herald of the Areopagus: *ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΥ [Σ]ΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ*²

 (Delos independent)

¹*I.G. II*² 1713

²*I.G. II*² 1714

³*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

85/4 B.C.

archon: *ΠΥΘΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΘΡΑΣΩΝΝΟΣ*^{[1],2,3}

king-archon: *[_]ΦΙΑΣ ΜΕΝΕΜΑΧΟΥ ΦΙΛΑ[Ι]ΔΗΣ*²

polemarchos: *ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ [Α]ΕΥ[Κ]Ο[Ν]Ο[Ε]ΥΣ*²

thesmothetes: *[ΣΩΣ]ΩΣ ΧΑΡΜΙΔΟΥ Α[Γ]ΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ*²

 (Delos independent)

¹*I.G.* II² 1713

²*I.G.* II² 1715

³*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

84/3 B.C.

archon: *NIKHTEHΣ*^{[1],2}

¹*I.G.* II² 1713

²*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

83/2 B.C.

archon: *ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ*^{1,2}

orator: *ΞΕΝΟΦΩΝ ΘΡΙΑΣΙΟΣ*²

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): *ΠΑΣΙΝΙΚΟ[Σ]*¹

*priest of Asclepius: *ΕΜΒΙΟΣ ΕΜΒΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΠΑΛΤΙΟΣ*³

 *see 93/2 B.C.

¹*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

²Pouilloux, *Rhamnounte*, n. 24

³*I.G.* II² 1944

82/1 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΗ[ΤΡΙΟΣ]¹

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): ΔΙΟΚΛΗ[Σ]¹

¹*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

81/0 B.C.

archon: ΑΡ[]¹

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): ΦΙΛΙΠ[]¹

¹*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

80/79-78/7 B.C.

archon: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ^{1,4}

general *epi ta hopla*: ΜΝΑΣΕΑΣ ΜΝΑΣΕΟΥ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ¹

kosmetes: ΗΔΥΛΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΕΤΣ¹

ephebes:¹

epimeletes of Delos: ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ^{2,[3],4}

gymnasiarch on Delos: ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ⁴

¹*I.G.* II² 1039 (with *S.E.G.* XXII.110)

²*I.D.* 1659

³*I.D.* 1660

⁴*I.D.* 1935

79/8-77/6 B.C.

*archon: ΑΙΣΧΡΑΙΟΣ^{1,2}

orator: ΜΝΑΣΕΑΣ ΜΝΑΣΕΟΤ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚ[ΙΔΗΣ]¹

epimeletes (third time): ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ²

**I.G.* II² 1039 [.....]ΟΤ. See Appendix C.

¹*I.G.* II² 1039

²*I.G.* II² 1338

78/7-76/5 B.C. or 74/3-65/4 B.C.

archon: ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ^{1,2}

epimeletes (fourth time): ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ¹

¹*I.G.* II² 1338

²*I.G.* II² 3489

77/6-76-5, 74/3 or following to 64/3 B.C.

archon: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ¹

¹*I.G.* II² 3489

75/4 B.C.

archon: ΑΙΣΧΙΝΗΣ¹

priest of Aesclepius: ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹

kleidouchos and *pyrphoros* of Aesclepius:

ΚΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹

*priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia:

ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΠΛΑΤΟΥΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ²

**zakoros*: ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΣ²

**kleidouchos*: ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΥ ΣΚΑΜΒΩΝΙΔΗΣ²

*the *zakoros* is first attested in 109/8 B.C. and could have started continuous service as *zakoros* in 112/1 B.C. He served for the eleventh time in 101/0 B.C. If he served continuously, his thirty-seventh term in office would be this year.

¹*I.G.* II² 1944

²*I.D.* 1894

74/3-73/2 B.C.

72/1 B.C.

priest of Aesclepius: ΑΜΕΨΙΑΣ ΑΡΧΕΣΤ[ΡΑ]ΤΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜΙΟΣ¹

kleidouchos and *pyrphoros* of Aesclepius:

ΑΡΧΕΣΤ[ΤΡ]ΑΤΟΣ ΑΜΕΨΙΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜ[ΙΟΣ]¹

¹*I.G.* II² 1944

71/0 B.C.

*archon: [ΟΙ]ΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ¹

*pytany-secretary: ΤΑΡΑΝ[Τ]ΕΙΝΟΣ ΝΕΙΚΙΟΥ ΑΙΓ[ΙΛΙΕΤΣ]¹

*treasurer of the pytany (II): [..... ΠΑ]ΝΘΕ[ΥΣ]¹

*depending on the secretary cycle, 64/3 B.C. is also possible

¹Agora XV, n. 266

70/69-67/6 B.C.

66/5 B.C.

priest of Aesclepius: [Α]ΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΟΥ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

¹I.G. II² 1944

65/4 B.C.

*64/3 B.C.

magistracy unknown: []E¹

*see 71/0 B.C.

¹*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

63/2 B.C.

archon: [.....]IOY²

magistracy unknown: [APICT]AIOΣ²

priest of Aesclepius: ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹

¹*I.G.* II² 1944

²*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

62/1 B.C.

archon: ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,4}

magistracy unknown: ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΟΣ⁴

archer~~an~~istes: ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ Μ[.....]ΝΟΣ [.....]
Σ[.....]ΕΤΣ³

priest of Aesclepius: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ¹

kleidouchos and pyrphoros of Aesclepius:

ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΛΥΝΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

¹*I.G.* II² 1944

²*I.G.* II² 3219

³*Hesperia* 14 (1945) n. 19, pp. 147-8

⁴*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

61/0 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ¹

magistracy unknown: ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΥ¹

¹*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

60/59 B.C.

archon: *HPΩΔΗΣ*^{1,2}

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): [*_ O*]*Τ*²

magistracy unknown: *ΔΕΚΜΟΣ ΑΥΦΙΔΙΟΣ*²

paidotribes: *ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΙΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΣ*¹

¹*I.G.* II² 2992

²*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

59/8 B.C.

archon: *ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ*^{1,3,4}

magistracy unknown: *ΠΟΠΑΙΟΣ ΟΥΦΡΙΟΣ*⁴

paidotribes: *MENISΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ*^{2,3}

hypopaidotribes: [*..*]*ΘΑ*[*...*] *ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ*³

¹*I.G.* II² 5172

²*Hesperia* 3 (1934) n. 27, p. 39

³*Hesperia* 30 (1961) n. 100, p. 270

⁴*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

58/7 B.C.

archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΦΩΝ ΚΑΛΛΙΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΠΑΝΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ^{2,[3],4}

office not filled?:⁴

hieromnemon: [Α]ΙΝΕΙΑΣ ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΟΥ [ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ]²

magistracy unknown (Pythaid): [] ΑΡΓ[] ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ¹

¹F.D. III, 2 n. 56a

²F.D. III, 2 n. 56b

³F.D. III, 2 n. 56c

⁴Hesperia Supplement VIII, p. 117 (line 132 blank)

57/6 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ^{1,[2],3}

treasurer of the prytany (VII): ΝΕΙΚΑΝΩΡ ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ²

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): [.....]ΟΣ ΖΗ(ΝΩΝΟΣ?)³

magistracy unknown: ΕΥΔΟΞΟΣ ΕΥ[]³

treasurer of the Heroistai: ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΥ []ΤΣ¹

archeranistes: [ΖΗΝΙΩΝ ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ]¹

Heroistai: ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ¹

ΖΗΝΩΝ¹

¹I.G. II² 1339

²*Agora* XV, n. 268

³*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

58/5 B.C.

archon: ΚΟΙΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΙΝΤΟΥ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ^{1,2}

king-archon: ΙΑΣΩΝ ΘΗΡΩΝΟΣ ΑΝΑΦΛΕΤΗ[ΟΣ]¹

polemarchos: ΑΠΟΛΛΩ[Ν]ΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤ[Σ]¹

thesmothetai: ΘΡΑΣΩΝ Ε[Τ]ΘΥΚ[Α]Ρ[ΤΟΥ] ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤ¹

ΒΑΚΧΙΟΣ ΣΩΠΟΛΙΔΟΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ¹

ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ¹

ΕΠΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤ¹

ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΔΕΚΜΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΤ¹

ΜΕΝΕΣΤΑΣ ΜΕΝΕΣΤΟΥ ΚΡΙΩΕΤ¹

flutist: ΚΑΛΕΤΟΦΩΝ ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ¹

herald of the archon: ΕΥΔΗΜΟΣ ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤ¹

demosios: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ¹

herald of the Areopagus: ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤ¹

magistracy unknown: ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΕΠ[Ι]Λ(ΝΙΚΟΥ)²

office not filled?:²

¹*I.G.* II² 1717

²*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117 (line 64 vacant)

55/4 B.C.

archon: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΣ^{[1],2,[3],4}

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): [ΑΓΑΣΙΑ]Σ ΑΓΑΣΙΟΥ⁴

*office not filled?:⁴

gymnasiarch: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΜΝΗΣΤΟΥ [Α]Θ[ΜΟΝ]ΕΥΣ²

paidotribes: ΦΙΛΙΟ[Σ] ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΥΣ²

hypopaidotribes: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ []ΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ²

**Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117, line 138 vacant

¹*I.G.* II² 1713

²*I.G.* II² 2993

³*Hesperia* 52 (1983) n. 3, pp. 161-3

⁴*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

54/3 B.C.

archon: ΖΗΝΩΝ^{[1],2,3}

treasurer (of the stratiotic fund?): [ΑΓΑΣΙΑΣ Α]ΓΑΣΙΟΥ³

magistracy unknown: ΕΠΙΓΕ[ΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΥ]³

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ ΦΛΙΤΕΥΣ²

¹*I.G. II*² 1713

²*I.D.* 1662

³*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

53/2 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ^{1,2,4}

treasurer of the prytany (VI): ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΡ[.....]^{2,3}

treasurer (of the stratotic fund?): [_]ΙΙ[_]⁴

¹*I.G. II*² 1713

²*Agora* XV, n. 269

³*Agora* XV, n. 270

⁴*Hesperia* Supplement VIII, p. 117

52/1 B.C.

archon: ΑΓΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΔΟΣ^{1,2,3}

proedros: ΘΕΑΝΓΕΛΟΣ ΘΕΑΝΓΕΛΟΥ ΑΙΘΑΛΙΔΗΣ¹

orator: ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ¹

prytany-secretary: ΓΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ¹

¹*I.G. II*² 1046

²*I.G. II*² 1713

³*Hesperia* 14 (1945) n. 19, pp. 147-8

51/0 B.C.

archon: ΑΓΣΙΑΔΗΣ²

priest of Asclepius and Hygeia: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ¹

¹I.G. II² 1046

²I.G. II² 1713

50/49 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ^{1,2,3,4}

general: []ΔΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ³

magistracy unknown: ΜΕΝΕ[ΣΘΕ]ΥΣ ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΩΣ ΕΡΧΙΕΥΣ⁴

¹I.G. II² 1047

²I.G. II² 1713

³I.G. II² 2993a

⁴I.D. 2632

 49/8 B.C.

archon: ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ^{[1],2,4}

proedros: ΦΙΛΙΣΤΙΔΗΣ ΦΑΝΙ_[]¹

orator: ΞΕΝ_[]¹

pytany-secretary: _[] ΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΥΣ¹

magistracy unknown: ΣΙΜΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΘΟΡΙΚΙΟΥ⁴

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΓΑΘΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ³

¹I.G. II² 1047

²I.G. II² 1713

³I.D. 1587

⁴I.D. 2632

48/7 B.C.

archon: ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ^{1,[2]}

magistracy unfilled:²

¹I.G. II² 1713

²I.D. 2632

47/6 B.C.

archon: *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ^{1,2}

*prytaneis:¹

magistracy unknown: ΣΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ [ΣΩΣΙ]ΘΕΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ²

*Agora XV, n. 278 could date to 47/6 B.C. or 43/2 B.C.

¹Agora XV, n. 278

²I.D. 2632

46/5-43/2 B.C. (46/5?)

archon: ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ¹

treasurer (of the stratotic fund?): ΘΕ[]¹

*paidotribes: [.]Ε[]¹

hoplomachos: ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

paideutes: [] ΚΟ[ΛΩΝΗ]ΘΕΝ¹

*see Appendix A.2 for restoration of the name

¹I.G. II² 1041

46/5-43/2 B.C. (45/4?)

archon: ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ^{[1,2,3],4}

treasurer of the prytany (I): ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ³

prytaneis (I):³

prytany-secretary: [] ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ²

kosmetes: [ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ] ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ⁴

paidotribes?: [] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΤΕΙΟΣ⁴

ephebic instructor: ΣΙΜΩΝ [] ΝΙΑΝΟΥ ΤΕΙΡΩΤΕΙΟΥ⁴

ephebic instructor: [.....] ΕΥΠΡΟΔΗ[Σ]⁴

foreign ephebic instructor:⁴

¹I.G. II² 1063

²I.G. II² 2876

³Agora XV, n. 281

⁴Hesperia 34 (1965) p. 255

46/5-43/2 B.C. (44/3?)

archon: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ^{[1?],3}

king-archon: [] ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΟΥ^[ΤΣ]¹

polemarchos: [] Σ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ^[Τ]¹

thesmothetai: [] ΕΥΠΥΜΑΧΟΥ ΠΑΜΒ[ΩΤΑΔΗΣ]¹

[] ΗΣ ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΟΥ ΒΕΡΕ[ΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ]¹

[] ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΑΖΗ[ΝΙΕΥΣ]¹

[ΖΗΝΩΝ ΖΗ[ΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡ[ΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ]¹

prytany-secretary: ΑΝΑ[]²

magistracy unknown: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ³
(Delos?)

¹*I.G.* II² 1719

²*Hesperia* 34 (1965) p. 255

³*I.D.* 2632

46/5-43/2 B.C. (43/2?)

archon: *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ¹

*prytaneis:

magistracy unknown: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΥΣΙΟΣ¹
(Delos?)

*see 47/6 B.C.

¹I.D. 2632

42/1 B.C.

archon: ΕΥΘΥΔΟΜΟΣ^{1,2}

treasurer of the Soteriastai: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ¹

priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ^{2,3?}

hieromnemon: ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ^{2,3}

architheoros: ΚΡΙΤΟΛΛΟΣ ΦΛΕΥΣ^{2,3}

theoroi:^{2,3}

¹I.G. II² 1343

²F.D. III, 2 n. 57

³F.D. III, 2 n. 58

41/0 B.C.

archon: ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ^{1,2,3}

treasurer of the Soteriastai: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ²

kosmetes: []ΟΣ []ΕΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ¹

secretary of the ephebes: [Α]ΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΛΛΙΕΥΣ¹

magistracy unknown: [ΑΙΣΧΥ]ΛΟΣ ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ Ε]ΡΜΕΙΟΣ³
 (Delos?)

¹I.G. II² 1042²I.G. II² 1343³I.D. 2632

40/39 B.C.

archon: ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ²orator: [... Ω]Ν ΑΝΘΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΥ[Σ]¹magistracy unknown: [_]Α[]²
(Delos?)

¹I.G. II² 1042²I.D. 2632

39/8 B.C.

archon: ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ¹treasurer of the Soteriastai: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΥΣ¹magistracy unknown: [_]ΟΔ[]⁵
(Delos?)*paidotribes: Α[]²*secretary of the ephebes: ΔΗΜ[Η]ΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙ[ΕΥΣ]²*hoplomachos: ΜΙ[] ΝΙΚ[] Μ[]
(ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ)²

*ephebic officers: Σ[Ι]ΜΩΝ ΕΥ[ΠΤΡΙ]ΔΗ[Σ] (gymnasiarch)³
 ΑΕΤΚΙΟΣ ΣΟΤΝΙΕΤΣ (gymnasiarch)⁴
 ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ (treasurer)³

*paidotribes (or ephebe?): ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ⁴

*ephebes:^{2,3,4}

*these could date to 36/5-35/4 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1343

²I.G. II² 1961

³I.G. II² 1965

⁴I.G. II² 3730

⁵I.D. 2632

38/7 B.C.

archon: ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ^{1,2,3,4}

gymnasiarch: ΤΑΑ[.....]ΟΣ [.....]ΟΣ¹

lampadarchos: [] ΑΧΑΡΝΕΤΣ³

priest of Soteria: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ²

kosmetes: ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΥ ΑΓΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ¹

paidotribes: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΣ¹

hoplomachos: ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ¹

secretary of the ephebes: ΑΤΤΑΛΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ¹

ephebes:¹

magistracy unknown: [Ε]ΥΡΥΤΜ[]⁴
 (Delos?)

¹I.G. II² 1043

²I.G. II² 1343

³I.G. II² 2994

⁴I.D. 2632

37/6 B.C.

archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ^{1,2,3,4}

proedros: ΔΙΩ[N.....Ε]ΤΕ¹

orators: ΚΡΑΤΙΠΠΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛ[ΕΟΥΣ]¹
 ΑΤΣ[ΙΣ Α]ΣΚΛΗΠ[ΑΔΟΥ ΑΙΜΟΥΣΙΟΥ]¹

treasurer of the Soteriastai: ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ²

paidotribes: [ΑΝΤΙ]Ο[Χ]ΟΣ? ΚΟΛΩΝΗ[Θ]ΕΝ³

hypopaidotribes: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΥΣ³
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΗΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ³

magistracy unknown: [Ε]ΥΘΥ[ΔΙΚ]ΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ⁴
 (Delos?)

¹I.G. II² 1043

²I.G. II² 1343

³I.G. II² 2995

⁴I.D. 2632

36/5 B.C.

*archon: ΘΕΟΠΙΘΗΣ^{1,2,3}

orator: ΑΕΤΚΙΟΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ¹

archon of the Gephyraioi: ΦΙΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ³

archeraniastes of the Soteriastai:

ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ¹

priest of Zeus in the Palladium: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³

eis eperotesin of the god: ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ³

ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ³

**ephebic instructors

**ephebes

magistracy unknown: [Α]ΠΕ[]⁴
(Delos?)

*ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ could date to 35/4 B.C. (or even after 34/3 B.C.)

**see 39/8 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1343

²Hesperia 36 (1967) n. 23, pp. 94-5

³Hesperia 49 (1980) pp. 40-1

⁴I.D. 2632

35/4 B.C.

*archon: []NETΣ KYΔA[]¹

***paideutai*:

***ephebes*:

magistracy unknown: []Σ ΚΛΕΙΤΟΔΟΤΟΥ [ΕΓ ΜΤΡΡΙΝ]ΟΥΤΤΗ[Σ]²
(Delos?)

*ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ could date to this year (see 36/5 B.C. and Appendix C)

**see 39/8 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1051 (with *Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 12, pp. 66-8)

²I.D. 2632

34/3 B.C.

archon: [A]ΠΟΛΛΟΓΕΝΗ[Σ]^{1,2}

*general *epi ta hopla* (second time?):

[ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΦΛΕΥΣ]¹

*herald of the Areopagus: ΠΑ[.....]¹

**proedros*: [..... Δ]ΠΡΟΘΕΟΥ[.....]¹

*orator: []ΟΣ[.....]ΣΤΟΥ ΠΕ[.....]¹

*prytany-secretary: a name of 22 letters¹

*herald of the *boule* and *demos*:

[ΟΙ]ΝΟΦ[Ι]ΛΟΣ ΣΤΝΔΡΟΜΟΤ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΣ¹

ambassadors:¹

*these names are assigned to this year on the basis of a restoration of the archon's name in *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8. See Appendix A.2.

¹*Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8 (with *I.G.* II² 1051)

²*I.D.* 2632

33/2 B.C.?

archon: ΚΛΕΙΔΑΜΟΣ¹

magistracy unknown: ΝΙΚΟΚΛΗΣ ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ¹
(Delos?)

¹*I.D.* 2632

32/1 B.C.

*general *epi ta hopla*: ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΦΛΕΤΕΣ^{1,2}
(third time)

*treasurer of the prytany (VIII): ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΤΔΗΜ[ΟΤ ΜΕ]ΛΙ[ΤΕΤΣ]¹

*priest of the Eponymous Hero (VIII): ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΣΩΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ¹

**prytaneis* (VIII):^{1,2}

*pytany-secretary?: [_] ΣΟΤΝΙ[Ε]ΥΣ¹

*herald of the *boule* and *demos*:

[ΟΙ]ΝΟΦ[Ι]ΛΟΣ ΣΤΝΔΡΟΜΟΤ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ¹

*undersecretary: ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ¹

*treasurer of the stratiotic fund:

[ΑΛΕ]ΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ¹

*this college is dated to this year by means of the secretary cycle from 20/19 B.C. (see Appendix A.2)

¹Agora XV, n. 290 (with *Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 22, pp. 297-99)

²AJP 100 (1979) pp. 285-87

31/0 B.C.

30/29 B.C.

*archon: ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ^{[1],2,3,4}

**pytaneis* (VIII):¹

*priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ^{2,3}

**exegetes* appointed by the god: ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ²

**exegetes* appointed by the people: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ^{2,3}

**manteis*: ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΘΡΑΣΤΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ²

ΛΤΣΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΥ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ^{2,3}

*hieromnemon: ΘΡΑΣΥΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΧΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ^{2,4}

herald of Apollo: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ^{2,3}

*priest of Hermes: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ²

*this college could fall in 26/5 B.C.

¹Agora XV, n. 288

²F.D. III, 2 n. 59

³F.D. III, 2 n. 60

⁴F.D. III, 2 n. 67

29/8-27/6 B.C.

26/5 B.C.

Either ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ (see 30/29 B.C.) or ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ (see 23/2 B.C.) could date to this year. If ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ belongs here, the cycle of the priests of Aesclepius would have been unbroken from 51/0 B.C. (for further discussion see Appendix A.2)

25/4-24/3 B.C.

23/2 B.C.

*archon: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ^{1,2,3}

*paidotribes: ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ [ΝΕΩΤΕΡΟΣ] ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΣ¹

*hypopaidotribes: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΣ¹

*priest of Aesclepius: ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΕΣ[ΤΗ]ΑΙΟΘΕΝ²

*priest: ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ³

*this college could date to 26/5 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 2996

²I.G. II² 4465

³I.D. 1840

22/1 B.C.

archon: [.....]¹

epistates: [_]ΙΟΣ¹

orator: [ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ] ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΦΙΛ[ΥΕΥΣ]¹

secretary: [_]¹

¹*Hesperia* 26 (1957) n. 98, pp. 260-5

21/0 B.C.

20/19 B.C.

archon: ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ^{[1,2],3,4,5}

general *epi ta hopla* (fourth time):

ΑΝΤΙ[ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΦΙΛΕΥΣ]³

epimeletes of ?: ΔΗΜΕΑΣ [ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ]¹

proedros: ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΣΑΤΤΡΟΥ ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΙΔΗΣ⁵

treasurer of the prytany (VIII): [.....]³

prytaneis (VIII):³

secretary: ΜΗΤΡΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΤΣ⁵

treasurer of the *sitonika*: [] ΦΙΛΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΑΛΛΗΝΕΤΣ¹

treasurer of the *boule*: [] ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ¹

priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ⁴

exegetes appointed by the god: [ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ⁴

exegetes appointed by the *demos*:

[ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ] ΑΛΛΙΕΤΣ⁴

herald of Apollo: [ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ]⁴

priest of Hermes: [ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΤΣ]⁴

hieromnemon: ΔΙΟΝΤΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ⁴

manteis: ΑΡΧΙΚΛΗΣ ΘΡΑΣΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΛΑΚΙΑΔΗΣ]⁴

*(ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ) [Α]ΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ⁴

treasurer (of the Dodekade): ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΕ[ΥΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ]⁴

flutist (of the Dodekade): []ΕΥΤΣ⁴

*F.D. III, 2 n. 61 reads [] ΑΑΜΠΤΡΕΤΣ. The name may be restored on the basis of F.D. II, 2 nn. 62-4.

¹I.G. II² 3505

²Agora XV, n. 291

³Agora XV, n. 292 (with *Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 22, pp. 297-9)

⁴F.D. III, 2 n. 61

⁵Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 50

19/8 or 18/7? B.C. (after ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ II)

archon: ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ¹

general *epi ta hopla* (fifth time):

ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΦΛΗΕΤΣ¹

orator: ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ¹

treasurer of the prytany (III) (second time):

ΦΙΛΩΝ ΗΓΕΛΟΧΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ¹

prytaneis:¹

herald of the *boule*: ΜΠ[]ΤΙΔΟΤ[]¹

treasurer of the *boule* and *demos*: []ΗΣ []ΟΥΤΣ¹

treasurer of the stratiotic fund: ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΓΕΝΟΥ (ΓΟΝΩΙ ΔΕ
ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ) ΕΠΙΤΡΙΔ[ΗΣ]¹

¹Agora XV, n. 293

18/7 B.C.

*general *epi ta hopla* (sixth time):

(ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΦΛΗΕΤΣ)

*see 17/6 B.C.

17/6 B.C.

archon: ΑΓ[]¹

*general *epi ta hopla*:

*see 18/7 B.C.

¹I.G. II² 1713

16/5 B.C.

archon: ΠΡΘΑΓΓΟΡΑΣ¹

¹I.G. II² 1713

15/4 B.C.

archon: ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ¹

¹I.G. II² 1713

14/3 B.C.

archon: ΠΟΛΤΑΙΝΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΣΟΥΝΙΕΥΣ^{1,3}

king-archon: ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΧΟΛΛΕΙΔΗΣ³

polemarchos: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΣ ΦΛΙΤΕΥΣ³

thesmothetai: ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΣ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ³

ΝΙΚΗΤΗΣ ΖΩΙΑΟΣ ΕΓ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΤΤΗΣ³

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ³

ΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΗΦΑΙΣΤΙΩΝΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ³

ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΜΥΡΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ³

ΑΓΝΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΧΑΡΟΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ³

herald of the Areopagus: ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΛΕΥΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ^{2,3}

herald of the archon: ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΑΙΔΗΣ³

flutist: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ³

¹ I.G. II² 1713

² I.G. II² 1720

³ I.G. II² 1721

13/2 B.C.

archon: ZHNQN^{[1],2}

kosmetes: MENEKAEIDHS ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΤ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΤΣ^{2,3}

ephebes:²

¹I.G. II² 1713

²I.G. II² 1963

³I.G. II² 3512

12/1 B.C.

archon: ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ^{1,[2]}

priest of Aesclepius: [_ ΟΥ]Σ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ ²

¹I.G. II² 1713

²I.G. II² 3174

11/0 B.C.

archon: ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ^{1,2}

priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ²

hieromnemon: ΗΡΩΔΟΤΟΣ ΜΟΥΣΑΙΟΥ²

manteis: ΛΥΣΙΛΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΥ²
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ²

exegetes appointed by the god: Π(Ο)ΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ²

exegetes appointed by the demos: ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ²

herald of Apollo: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ [ΕΥ]ΔΗΜΟΥ²

priest of Hermes: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ²

flutist: ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΗ[ΝΟΔ]ΩΡΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑΔΗΣ²

¹I.G. II² 1713

²F.D. III, 2 n. 62

Delphic Priesthood XXIV: between ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ (11/0 B.C.)
and ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ

archon: ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ^{1,2}

king-archon: ΔΩΣΙΘΕΟΣ ΚΛΕΟΜΕΝΟΥ¹

polemarchos: ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ¹

thesmothetai: ΘΕΩΡΙΚΟΣ ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΥ¹
ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ [...]ΟΥ¹
ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΑΓΩΝΟΣ¹

priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ [ΗΡΩΔΟΥ]²

hieromnemon: ΕΠΑΙΝΟΣ ΕΥΦΡΟΝΙΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ²

ezegetai: ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ²
ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ²

manteis: ΑΓΣΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟΥ²
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ Α[ΜΜΩΝΙΟΥ]²

flutist: ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ²

herald of Apollo: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ²

priest of Hermes: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ²

¹I.G. II² 1727

²F.D. III, 2 n. 64

Delphic Priesthood XXV: after ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ

archon: ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ^{1,2}

paidotribeis: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΥ¹
ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ ΝΕ(ΩΤΕΡΟΣ) ΦΡΕΑΡΡΙΟΥ¹

hypopaidotribes: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥΣ ΛΕΥΚΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕ[ΥΣ]¹

priest of Apollo: ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ²

hieromnemon: Θ[Ε]ΟΓΕΝΗΣ Θ[Ε]ΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ²

ezegetai: ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΥ ΑΤ[Η]ΝΙΕΥΣ² (read A<Z>[H]ΝΙΕΥΣ
ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ Δ[ΙΟ]ΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΥΣ²

mantis: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ Α<Μ>ΜΩΝΙΟΥ²

flutist: ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΩΤΑ[ΔΗΣ]²

herald of Apollo: ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΜΕ[ΛΙΤΕΥΣ]²

¹*I.G.* II² 2997

²*F.D.* III, 2 n. 63

10/9 B.C. - A.D. 1

A.D. 1

epimeletes of Delos: [_] *NOΣ MAPKOT ΦIA[AIΔHΣ]*¹

priest of Apollo: *ΠAMMENHΣ [ZHNO]NOΣ MAPA[Θ]ΩNIO[Σ]*¹

¹*I.D.* 1605

A.D. 1 - A.D. 5

A.D. 6

epimeletes of Delos: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ^{1,2}

priest of Apollo: ΠΑΜ[Μ]ΕΝΗΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ²

¹*I.D.* 1586

²*I.D.* 1626

A.D. 6 - A.D. 14/15

A.2. Some Chronological Notes

Tribal Cycles on Delos to 89/8 B.C.

The office of prytany-secretary, the priesthood of Asclepius and possibly other magistracies at Athens were held in sequence by members of the twelve Athenian tribes according to a principle of tribal rotation. These annual offices were rotated through the twelve tribes (ranging from Tribe I, Erechtheis, to Tribe XII, Attalis) in loose cycles which were frequently disrupted or even "broken" in some way.¹ Tribal cycles were also followed on Delos for the priesthoods of the cults of Sarapis, the Great Gods and the Cynthian Deities (Table A.1).² According to the cycle of the priests of Sarapis,³ the Athenian administration on Delos commenced sometime during the year 167/6 B.C. (and not 166/5 B.C. as previously thought), and this means that a tribal cycle had been started in a partial or incomplete administrative year. The situation is parallel to that in 87/6 B.C. It is generally agreed that a new cycle of the priests of Asclepius at Athens

¹These "breaks" in the tribal cycles often make it difficult to date magistrates by means of the cycle alone. Nonetheless, the discovery of the tribal cycles at Athens remains as one of the most important breakthroughs in Athenian chronology of the Hellenistic period (See W.S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

²In Table A.1 years in which the tribal affiliation of attested priests are recorded are indicated by a Roman numeral. Arabic numerals indicate the probable tribal affiliation of the priest of a cult based on the reconstruction of the cycle. Years for which no tribal cycle can be postulated are left blank. Between 149/8 B.C. and 138/7 B.C. two different tribal cycles may be postulated for the priests of Sarapis, and these are indicated by two columns of tribal numbers.

³Roussel, *DCA*, p. 349 concluded that there was no tribal cycle for the cult in the first years of the administration. W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, pp. 238-9, on the other hand, argued that a cycle for the cult of Sarapis began in 166/5 B.C. and coincided with the tribal cycle of the priests of Asclepius at Athens, but with the archon ΠΕΛΟΨ now dated to 165/4 B.C. (see Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, New York, 1940, p. xxix) the cycle for the priests of Asclepius began in 165/4 B.C. with a priest from Erechtheis (tribe I) and the two cycles were unrelated.

Table A-1: Tribal Cycles of Priesthoods on Delos (167/6-89/8 B.C.)

Year Sarapis	Great Gods	Cynthian Deities	
167/6	I	5	3
166/5	II	6	4
165/4	3	7	5
164/3	4	8	6
163/2	5	IX	7
162/1	6	X	8
161/0	7	XI	9
160/59	8	XII	10
159/8	IX	I	XI
158/7	10	?	12
157/6	11	?	
156/5	12	?	
155/4	I?	?	
154/3	2	?	
153/2	3	?	
152/1	4	III?	
151/0	5	4	
150/49	VI?	V?	?
149/8	7 IX		
148/7	8 10		
147/6	IX 11		
146/5	10 12		
145/4	11 1		
144/3	12 2		
143/2	1 3		
142/1	2 4		
141/0	3 5		
140/39	4 6		
139/8	5 7		
138/7	6 8		
137/6	IX		
136/5	X		
135/4	XI		
134/3	XII		
133/2	I (V or XII)		
132/1	II		
131/0	III		
130/29	IV		
129/8	V	6	
128/7	VI	VII	
127/6	VII	8	
126/5	VIII	IX	
125/4	9	10	
124/3	X	11	
123/2	XI	12	

122/1	XII	1	
121/0	I	2	
120/19	II	III?	
119/8	III	4	XII
118/7	IV	5	1
117/6	V	6	2
116/5	VI	7	3
115/4	VII	8	4
114/3	VIII	IX	5
113/2	IX	10	VI
112/1	X	11	7
111/0	XI	12	8
110/09	XII	?	9
109/8	I	?	X
108/7	?	?	?
107/6	I	?	?
106/5	II	?	?
105/4	III	?	?
104/3	IV	1	?
103/2	V	2	I
102/1	VI	III	2
101/0	VII		III
100/99	8		4
99/8	9		V
98/7	X		6
97/6	XI (or VI)		VII
96/5	12		
95/4	I		
94/3	II		
93/2	III?		
92/1	4		
91/0	5		
90/89	VI		
89/8	7		

began in 87/6 B.C. with a priest from Erechtheis (tribe I).⁴ The siege of Athens by Sulla's Roman army extended through the winter of 87/6 B.C. until the city fell in March of 86 B.C.⁵ There is no reason to believe that a new cycle was begun before the city fell, and the new cycle for the priests of Asclepius was probably started after the fall of the city to mark its new era.⁶ The archon for 87/6 B.C., moreover, could only have been elected after the fall of the city.⁷ The Athenian administration of Delos, therefore, could have started sometime during 167/6 B.C., perhaps in January 166 B.C.,⁸ and this might explain why, in the first decades of the Athenian administration, the terms of the annual temple administrators straddled the terms of the eponymous archons at Athens.

The priest of Sarapis in 158/7 B.C. should come from Aiantis (tribe X). The name of the priest in this year is known (*EIPHNAIOS*) but his deme and tribal affiliation is not recorded. Although an *EIPHNAIOS NEIPAIEΤΣ* (tribe IX) was active at this time, the name *EIPHNAIOS* is also found in a family from Marathon (tribe X) which flourished during the second century B.C. The first cycle of

⁴This is the basis for dating the archon *AIEXINHΣ* to 75/4 B.C. The priest in his year, *MENANΔΡΟΣ ΚΑΜΙΠΠΙΟΤ*, was from Erechtheis (tribe I). Cf. Notopoulos, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p. 25 and Dow, *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 120.

⁵Athens fell on the Kalends of March in 86 B.C. If the Roman calendar at this time corresponded to the solar year (cf. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Calendars and Chronology*, p. 163-4 and E.J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London, 1968, p. 46), the siege of Athens extended through the winter.

⁶It is possible that the break in the cycle occurred before or after 87/6 B.C. although the start of a new cycle at this time is an attractive hypothesis.

⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Athenion und Aristion," *Sb. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1923, p. 40: "Die Bezeichnung der Jahre ist natürlich von der Regierung gegeben, welche Sulla einsetzte; diese betrachtete die Beamten der "Tyrannenzeit" als ungesetzlich, gab also das Jahr 87/6 dem Philanthes, obgleich der erst im März 86 eingesetzt sein kann" Although Wilamowitz here is speaking only of the archon, if a partial year could be attributed to an eponymous archon chosen late in the year, a new cycle of priests could also have been instituted at the same time. Magistrates and priests who served for "87/6" B.C., therefore, only served for the last few months of the Athenian year.

⁸The Delian administrative year began in January and so corresponded to the Roman year.

priests would have ended in 156/5 B.C. with a priest from Attalis (tribe XII). The priest named on *I.D.* 2098, 2118 and 2203 (*ZHNON ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΔΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΤΡΕΣ*, tribe I) cannot be dated independently of the tribal cycle. He made a dedication to Sarapis in 159/8 B.C. and is not named as a former priest. Roussel consequently dated his priesthood to soon after 158/7 B.C. On the basis of the tribal cycle, however, his priesthood could date to 155/4 B.C. or, less probably, to 145/4 B.C. or 143/2 B.C.⁹ According to the same cycle a priest from Kekropis (tribe VIII) would be expected to have served in 160/59 or 148/7 B.C. A priest (cult unknown) named *ΑΕΩΝ* served sometime before 159/8 B.C. A second *ΑΕΩΝ*, priest of Sarapis between 156/5-147/6 B.C. is also known. One of these must be *ΑΕΩΝ ΑΙΩΝΕΤΕΣ* (tribe VIII), a prominent member of the Delian cleruchy from the first generation who served as an overseer for the erection of a public monument on Delos in 160/59 B.C.

I.D. 2605, which dates to 159/8 B.C.,¹⁰ lists apparently in official order the names of the ten annual priests for the public cults on Delos. The priest of Sarapis, *ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΕΣ*, is from Hippothontis (tribe IX). *I.D.* 1499 names nine priests who served on Delos in the archonship of *ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ*.¹¹ Because the priest of Artemis in this year, *ΠΤΑΛΑΔΗΣ ΑΙΕΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΘΟΙΔΗΣ*, is named last, whereas on *I.D.* 2605 the priest of Artemis falls in fifth place, the priests do not seem to be named in the official order found on *I.D.* 2605. For this reason it is impossible to determine the priests of the other cults listed on *I.D.* 1499 from the mere order of their names. Roussel had originally dated *ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ* to 153/2 B.C. but the archon may now be dated to 150/49 B.C.¹² If a tribal cycle was followed for the priests of Sarapis from 167/6 B.C., in

⁹In the *Fasti* he is entered in 155/4 B.C. with cross-references to 145/4 and 143/2 B.C.

¹⁰Roussel, *DCA*, pp. 348-9, dates the text to 158/7 B.C. The following discussion supersedes *ZPE* 58 (1985) pp. 117-8.

¹¹*I.D.* 2605 lists ten priests. Only nine priests are named on *I.D.* 1499. Which cult is not represented on *I.D.* 1499 remains unknown.

¹²Meritt, *Historia* 26 (1977) p. 284, dates him to 149/8 B.C.

150/49 B.C. the priest should come from Akamantis (VI). Only one priest named on *I.D.* 1499 is from Akamantis, a *ΑΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΕΙΟΣ*, and he is listed in third place. *I.D.* 2083, a fragment of a dedication to the Egyptian deities, has been edited to give the following text:¹³

———— *ΜΑΙ* ————
 ———— *μελ]* *ανηφόρο[ι* ————
 'Ανουβιδι,
[ἐπὶ ———— *]ηναιου*

In dedications such as this, after the dedication to the four Egyptian deities Sarapis, Isis, Anoubis and Harpocrates,¹⁴ we expect to find in an eponymous formula the name of the priest for the cult in the year the dedication was made (for example, *I.D.* 2065, 2067, 2076 and 2085-8).¹⁵ Line 4 of *I.D.* 2083 should be restored to read *[ἐπὶ ἱερέως Α]ηναίου [Ερμείου]*¹⁶ and the dedication dated to 150/49 B.C.

The cycle of priests of Sarapis followed a regular sequence from 137/6 B.C. to 110/09 B.C. The cycle between 150/49 and 138/7 B.C. was interrupted in some way. The second priesthood of *ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΜΑΞΑΝΤΕΤΣ*, who, as we saw above, first served as priest of Sarapis in 159/8 B.C., cannot be dated precisely. His second term could date to 147/6 B.C., counting forward from 159/8 B.C., or to 149/8 B.C., counting backwards from 137/6 B.C. Since there is no priest from the tribe Kekrops (tribe VIII) in 150/49 B.C., the break in the cycle occurred after 150/49 B.C. After some irregularity during the 140s B.C., the cycle continued without interruption down to 110/09

¹³I examined *I.D.* 2083 on Delos. The text is badly corroded and I could not confirm these readings.

¹⁴On the characteristics of the cult and the associated deities, see Bruneau, *Les cultes de Délos*, pp. 457-66.

¹⁵In *I.D.* 2055 and 2056 the *epimeletes* of Delos is named in this position instead of the priest.

¹⁶There is no other known priest whose name could be restored in place of *ΑΗΝΑΙΟΣ*. The homonymous Athenian archon (118/7 B.C.) is not a likely solution.

B.C.¹⁷ ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΤΣ, was an underpriest of Sarapis in 109/8 B.C. (the office is otherwise unattested) and made a dedication to the deity as a former priest in 95/4 B.C.¹⁸ The cycle was resumed in 107/6 B.C. after two years of irregularity. Dinsmoor had postulated a break in all the priestly cycles in 97/6 B.C. coinciding with a presumed second archonship of the archon ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ in that year. But the second archonship of ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ has now been disproven and ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ moved up into 97/6 B.C. The cycle for the priests of Sarapis which began in 107/6 B.C. can now be shown to operate down to 94/3 B.C.,¹⁹ and, assuming an unbroken continuation of this cycle, the priest ΕΛΛΗΣ ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΥ ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ (tribe VI) may be dated to 90/89 B.C. ΕΥΔΟΣ, who was first attested in 107/6 B.C., served as *zакoros* under the priest ΕΛΛΗΣ. In an otherwise unrelated series of texts, dating to a year when ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ was *epimeletes* of Delos, ΕΥΔΟΣ is said to have served as *zакoros* for the eighteenth time. The year ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ was *epimeletes* is unknown but the earliest possible would be 90/89 B.C. (assuming that ΕΥΔΟΣ served as *zакoros* in consecutive years from 107/6 B.C.); ΚΑΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ and ΕΛΛΗΣ are both assigned to 90/89 B.C. in the *Fasti*. Finally, the priest in 94/3 B.C., ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΔΗΣ, made a dedication to the deity after leaving office (*I.D.* 2039). His successor in the priesthood (the title of the office is restored) bears the demotic ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ (Tribe III) and an ΑΡΟΠΟΣ

¹⁷The tribe of the priest in 125/4 B.C. is not recorded but the regularity of the cycle at this time makes it almost certainly Hippothontis (tribe IX).

¹⁸I differ from M. Guarducci in dating the magistrates named in *I.D.* 2065 ("Una nuova iscrizione di Delo," *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 14-16, 1952-4, pp. 175-84). On my dating ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ' dedication was made 14 years after he had been underpriest. This would be the longest recorded interval between an individual's tenure in a priesthood and his dedication to the deity, but *I.D.* 1947 is a dedication made by a priest nine years after he had held the office. Also, since the father and uncle of ΔΙΟΝΤΕΙΟΣ were in their prime in c. 100 B.C., he could have been quite young as underpriest and this could also account for the late dedication.

¹⁹The priest in 97/6 B.C. is from the split deme of Eitea (tribe XI or VI); but the cycle makes it likely that he was from Aiantis (tribe XI). A possible grandfather is attested as a *prytanis* for Aiantis in 140/39 B.C.

was *epimeletes* of Delos in the same year. Two men by this name were *epimeletes* around this time. *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΛΑΥΚΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ* was *epimeletes* in 94 B.C. when C. Coelius and L. Domitius were consuls at Rome, while *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ* was *epimeletes* sometime in the 90s B.C. Which *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ* was *epimeletes* in 94/3 B.C.? Since the priest named on *I.D.* 2039 is from Pandionis (Tribe III), the tribal cycle for priests of Sarapis should date him to 93/2 B.C. But 93/2 B.C. is already occupied by a known *epimeletes* of Delos, dated by a synchronism to the Roman consuls of 93 B.C. (*I.D.* 1764). This means that the *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ* named in the dedication by *ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ* must date from 92/1 or 91/0 B.C.²⁰ If the term of the priests of Sarapis did not coincide with the Athenian civic year, the priest from Pandionis could still date to 93/2 B.C., without breaking the tribal cycle. Otherwise the priest would have dated to 92/1 or 91/0 B.C. and the cycle would have been broken. The priest and *epimeletes* tentatively dated above to 90/89 B.C. on the basis of the cycle, would then date to either 90/89 or 89/8 B.C. With 95/4 B.C. now occupied by a different *epimeletes*, *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΓΛΑΥΚΟΥ* could only have served in 94/3 B.C. and the *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ* named in *I.D.* 2039 may safely be identified as *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ ΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΕΥΣ*.

The tribal cycle of the priests of Sarapis presents one final difficulty which must remain unresolved. In 133/2 B.C. two priests are associated with the cult of Sarapis on Delos. One, named as priest of Sarapis on *I.D.* 2610, an annual list of the priests for the cult, must be regarded as the regular priest for that year. But in addition to this priest, an individual who made a dedication to Isis, is also

²⁰Dinsmoor assigns our unknown *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ* to the archonship of *ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ*. But it is clear from *I.D.* 2039 that the *epimeletes* served in the year *ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ* made his dedication and not in the year of his priesthood (Cf. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List*, p. 204). The year 93/2 B.C. is now occupied by *ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ ΚΡΩΠΙΔΗΣ* as *epimeletes* (I tentatively identify *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ* [] *ΚΛΕΟΥΣ*, a temple administrator in this year, with *ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ*, a brother of *ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣ*). The year 90/89 B.C. is occupied by another *epimeletes*. This leaves only 92/1 and 91/0 B.C. vacant for *ΑΡΟΠΟΣ*.

identified as a priest in 133/2 B.C.²¹ Unlike the priest of Sarapis who belongs to Erechtheis (tribe I) as required by the tribal cycle, this individual is from Oion (a split deme belonging to either tribe V or XII). *I.D.* 2107 also mentions two priests, whose years of tenure remain uncertain, who are also associated with the deity Isis. The first, *APISTEAS APISTEOR MAPAΘNNIOΣ*, is from Aiantis (tribe X). Roussel dated *APISTEAS* to the period before 88/7 B.C. According to the tribal cycle, however, no years are vacant for a priest of Sarapis from Aiantis (tribe X) after 146/5 B.C. The tribe of the second priest named on *I.D.* 2107, *ΔΙΟΝΤΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, is unrecorded. The text records that in his year part of the sanctuary was restored, and Roussel supposes that this might have followed the destruction it suffered during the Mithridatic War. The cult of Isis is usually included with that of Sarapis, but Isis did have her own sanctuary on Delos.²² Is it possible that on occasion a separate priest of Isis was named, without regard to a tribal cycle, in addition to the priest of Sarapis? On four irregular occasions *I.D.* 2610 provides the names of two priests for the cult of Sarapis in the same year who are always from the same tribe. The second priest on these occasions could have been a priest of Isis, the subordinate deity in the cult, and this might account for the otherwise unattested appearance of an "underpriest" of Sarapis in 109/8 B.C.

The tribal cycles on Delos were occasionally synchronized in a manner which suggests some kind of attempt to stagger or regulate the sequence of tribes. In the first years of the cleruchy, for example, the three cycles for the priests of Sarapis, the Great Gods and the Cynthian deities were all separated by two years. Interestingly, the cycle of the priests of Asclepius at Athens began a new cycle in 165/4 B.C. with a priest from Erechtheis (tribe I) and this cycle was also separated from the cycles on Delos by a two year interval. Although the other

²¹The text is datable to 133/2 B.C. by the name of the archon *ΞΕΝΩΝ*. Note, however, that during the Augustan period two individuals by the name of *ΞΕΝΩΝ* and *ΞΕΝΙΩΝ* are known to have been eponymous archon.

²²Roussel, *DCA*, p. 251.

cults do not seem to have followed a tribal cycle, similar patterns can also be detected. In 161/0 and 159/8 B.C., the priest of Asclepius on Delos came from Aiantis (tribe X) and Attalis (tribe XII).²³ The priest of the Great Gods in 162/1 B.C., the priest of Asclepius in 161/0 B.C. and the priest of the Cynthian deities in 160/59 B.C., therefore, all came from tribe X. Breaks in the cycles and the fragmentary evidence thwart the detection of any further consistent pattern, but beginning in 152/1 B.C. the cycle for the priests of the Great Gods followed that for the priests of Sarapis by one year. Beginning in 128/7 B.C. the situation is reversed and this continues until 110/9 B.C. After this the two cycles seem to have been unrelated. But in 102/1 B.C. and 101/0 B.C. the apparent cycles for the priests of the Great Gods and the Cynthian deities are offset by one year. The priests of Anios and the priests of Artemis between 103/2-101/0 B.C. are in tribal sequence (IV, V, VI and II, III, and IV/V/or II respectively) although the priests of these two cults are too poorly attested for a regular tribal rotation to be postulated.

The Date of I.G. II² 1714

I.G. II² 1714 is an archon list which lacks the name of an eponymous archon at the top of the list where one should be found. It has been dated by Dow

²³It remains unproven that this is a result of a tribal cycle for the priests of Asclepius on Delos. If a cycle was followed, in 150/49 B.C. the priest would have come from Hippothontis (tribe IX) and I tentatively identify *AEONTIXOΣ ΔΕΚΕΑΕΤΣ* as the priest in that year. Rotating the cycle of the priests of the Great Gods backwards from 128/7 B.C., the priest of that cult in 150/49 B.C. would also have come from tribe IX. However, with the archon *MIKION* dated to 152/1 B.C., the priest of the Great Gods in that year was from Pandionis (tribe III). Counting forward from 152/1 B.C. the priest in 150/49 B.C. would have come from Ptolemais (tribe V), and a priest from this tribe is also attested in 150/49 B.C. He may be tentatively identified as the priest of the Great Gods in that year. Note that the cycle for this cult was broken sometime in the 150s B.C. If the first cycle had continued uninterrupted the priest in 150/49 B.C. should have come from Aiantis (tribe X) and a priest from this tribe does not appear on *I.D.* 1499. So too, the first cycle for the priests of the Cynthian Deities would require a priest from Kekrops (tribe VIII) in 150/49 B.C. A priest from this tribe does not appear on *I.D.* 1499 and so the first cycle must have been interrupted before this year.

to the year of *anarchia* at Athens in 88/7 B.C. on the basis of epigraphical format and the literal meaning of *anarchia*, "a year without an archon". Dow determined from the measurements of the *stele* on which the archon list was inscribed that there is not enough space at the top of the list for the name of an eponymous archon and so concluded that when the list was composed the name of the eponymous archon was deliberately omitted. That the eponymous archon's name was inscribed on a pedimental margin above the inscription cannot be ruled out entirely although "inscriptions on pediments were largely abandoned in the early third century, and moreover mouldings of ca. 100 B.C. have fascias too narrow for letters of 0.014 m."²⁴ Dow's assertion that this is the very archon list from the year of *anarchia* in 88/7 B.C. is an attractive hypothesis but when closely examined leaves too many unanswered questions.²⁵

E. Badian and Ch. Habicht have accepted Dow's date for *I.G.* II² 1714, and it is necessary here to consider the chronological implications of dating *I.G.* II² 1714 to 88/7 B.C. and the impact this will have for historical analysis of the revolution and its outcome. Although Dow, Badian and Habicht all date this archon list to 88/7 B.C., they disagree about how to interpret the absence of an eponymous archon. Dow, in a more straight-forward approach, concluded that the lack of an eponymous archon was due to the absence of a rich and willing Athenian candidate in the elections for 88/7 B.C.²⁶ But, as Habicht has pointed out, the flaw in Dow's explanation is that if there was no candidate available to assume the burden of the office of eponymous archon, a king or wealthy foreigner would likely have assumed the cost and the honour of the office, as occurred

²⁴Dow, *Hesperia* 3 (1934) p. 145.

²⁵Badian's statement that Dow has proven *I.G.* II² 1714 dates to 88/7 B.C., moreover, may go too far (*AJAH* 1, 1976, p. 111). The only evidence which would constitute proof would be the appearance on the *stele* of *anarchia* in the place where the name of the eponymous archon should be found. Also, it remains very doubtful whether a full board of archons, except the eponymous archon, would be elected and such a year designated as "*anarchia*", especially when the year in question is 88/7 B.C.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 146.

frequently in other Greek cities during the Hellenistic period.²⁷ Also, if the year was really one of only technical and not political *anarchia*, Dow cannot explain why the word *anarchia* does not appear at the top of the archon list. Nonetheless, according to Dow's explanation for the missing eponymous archon, the list could have been inscribed early in 88/7 B.C. after the elections had been held for the other archons.

Although Badian and Habicht accept Dow's date for *I.G. II*² 1714, they differ from him most fundamentally in their assessment of the palaeographical date for the *stele*. For if this archon list were inscribed after Sulla sacked the city in March, 86 B.C., the absence of an eponymous archon can be interpreted in a more sinister light.²⁸ Badian insists that the name was suppressed because the eponymous archon, unlike the junior archons named on the *stele*, was so hateful to the new regime and its Roman patrons that he could not be immortalized as an eponymous archon of Athens. Habicht, following Badian, concludes that the eponymous archon must have been no other than Mithridates VI, who would have assumed the office on the invitation of the Athenian faction at Athens which wanted to revolt from Rome. It is important to observe, however, that Badian's and Habicht's accounts are virtually independent of the date for *I.G. II*² 1714. But if *I.G. II*² 1714 does date to 88/7 B.C., how do Badian and Habicht account for the missing name of the eponymous archon, whether he be one of Athenion's henchmen or Mithridates himself? Badian, pointing out that the other archons on the list are attested after 88/7 B.C., dates the list epigraphically to the last half of 87/6 B.C., following the sack of the city, and explains the missing name as a result of *damnatio memoriae*. We do not know when in a particular year archon

²⁷Chr. Habicht, "Zur Geschichte Athens in der Zeit Mithridates VI," *Chiron* 6, 1976, pp. 127-35. Unlike Dow, Habicht believes that an eponymous archon must have been chosen for 88/7 B.C. The absence of the name on *I.G. II*² 1714, then, becomes a clue to his identity.

²⁸This is assumed by Habicht: "... bei der schon bald nach Sullas Eroberung der Stadt aufgezeichneten Liste..." (ibid., p. 129). Why a partial archon list for 88/7 B.C. would have been inscribed sometime after March, 86 B.C., remains unexplained.

lists such as this were normally inscribed,²⁹ but if the new regime was anxious to obliterate the memory of the eponymous archon (and presumably succeeded), why would only a partial list have been inscribed almost a full year after the board of archons had left office? That would only have served to remind the Athenians and their Roman friends of the revolution. Badian would have better evidence, perhaps, if *I.G. II² 1714* bore traces of letters *in rasura*.³⁰ A final argument against Badian's reconstruction is that even if the elections for 88/7 B.C. were legitimate and, what is more, recognized by the new regime following the sack of the city, it is doubtful that the junior archons Badian labels moderates would have stayed in the city to serve in their offices or, if they did stay, it is doubtful that they would have survived the reign of terror and the bloody sack of the city by Sulla's troops.³¹

Habicht's bold hypothesis that Mithridates VI was archon, like Badian's, does not depend on *I.G. II² 1714*. In fact, the hypothesis would be strengthened if *I.G. II² 1714* were not dated to 88/7 B.C., for the hypothesis then evokes the same objections which have been made against Badian's account with the added difficulty that the junior archons named on the *stele*, whose families survived the revolution of 88/7 B.C. and the restoration of Roman hegemony over the city, would have been colleagues of a Hellenistic king who sanctioned the massacre of Roman citizens on Delos and who remained a significant threat to Roman interests for another generation. But the greatest difficulty with dating *I.G. II² 1714* to 88/7 B.C. and assuming that Mithridates VI was the eponymous archon in this year is the complete silence of the literary sources. This would have been the first time in Athenian history that a foreigner had served as eponymous

²⁹But cf. Habicht: "... nur der Name des eponymen Archonten unterdrückt wurde, während die Namen aller seiner Kollegen in der üblichen Weise registriert wurden...." (ibid., p. 124).

³⁰In this case the list would date epigraphically to 88/7 B.C. The erasure presumably, would date to 86 B.C.

³¹A difficulty hinted at by Habicht: "... wenigstens einige von ihnen nach der Ersturmung Athens durch Sulla mit dem Leben gebüsst haben müssen" (ibid. p. 134).

archon.³² Habicht can only speculate that a decision was taken after the fall of the city to keep Mithridates' tenure a secret.³³

The epigraphical evidence for dating *I.G.* II² 1714 to 88/7 B.C., then, is inconclusive and involves two problems, the "real" or textual date of the archon list and the "palaeographical" date of the *stele*. The year 88/7 B.C. was definitely designated a year of "*anarchia*" in the middle of the first century A.D. when *I.G.* II² 1713 was inscribed.³⁴ That this designation derives from a conspiracy to suppress the name of an actual eponymous archon in 88/7 B.C. is unlikely. Without an eponymous archon at its head, which would have provided a name or label for the specific year to which it is supposed to refer,³⁵ *I.G.* II² 1714 remains difficult to date. I think it is unlikely that *I.G.* II² 1714 was meant to be unlabelled or undated in this way and that the name of the eponymous archon could indeed have been inscribed on a pediment which has been lost. Such a format for an archon list would have been unusual during this period and would have physically separated the name of the eponymous archon from the names of his colleagues. But a possible solution to the dilemma posed by *I.G.* II² 1714 as it now exists may be found in *I.G.* II² 1713 which names an Eleusinian *hierophantes*, known only by his title and not his personal name, as archon in

³²In the first decades of the first century A.D. two members of a royal family from Thrace were archons at Athens.

³³Habicht, *ibid.*, p. 129.

³⁴On *I.G.* II² 1713, see below. The list runs out about the middle of the first century A.D. I have examined this inscription at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. Although Graindor (*Chronologie des Archontes athéniens sous l'Empire*, Brussels, 1922, p. 45) seems to indicate otherwise, the script and the style of the text is uniform. This suggests that the list was inscribed at the same time (in contrast, other diachronic lists, such as *I.D.* 2589 and *I.G.* II² 1944 were continued by different stone cutters). This means that the entry designating 88/7 B.C. a year of *anarchia* was inscribed at least a century or more after the fact.

³⁵Cf. Graindor, *ibid.*, p. 172, for the difficulties presented by the absence of an eponymous archon in a particular year.

86/5 B.C.³⁶ Hieronymy in this instance involved the suppression of the priest's human qualities, his name and patronymic, for example, as well as his civic identity, his demotic. It would have been unusual for a *hierophantes* to have served as eponymous archon,³⁷ and his service in 86/5 B.C. must be due to the circumstances at Athens following the sack of the city. *I.G.* II² 1714, therefore, may plausibly date to 86/5 B.C. Either the name of the *hierophantes* was deliberately omitted from the *stèle* or, perhaps more likely and in keeping with his special status, his name was inscribed on a special pediment appropriate to his dignity and his "separateness".³⁸

Tribal Cycles at Athens and Delos After 88/7 B.C.

The priest-elect of Asclepius for 51/0 B.C. was from Erechtheis (tribe I). Exactly twelve years separate his priesthood from that of *ΕΝΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΚΗΦΙΣΙΕΥΣ* (tribe I) who served in 63/2 B.C. This suggests that a regular tribal cycle was in operation during the first century B.C. and allows *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΥ* (tribe I) to be dated to 75/4 B.C. with the archon *ΑΙΞΙΝΗΣ*.³⁹ In the archonship of *ΙΑΣΩΝ* (109/8 B.C.) the priest of Asclepius was from Erechtheis (tribe I). The next two attested priests of Asclepius, *ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ* and *ΕΜΒΙΟΣ*, are from Akamantis (tribe VI) and Ptolemais (tribe V). The cycle was interrupted at some point since otherwise the priest in 75/4 B.C. should have come from Antiochis (tribe VI); just less than three complete cycles of

³⁶See Chapter 5. On the practice of "hieronymy", see Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 9.

³⁷Chapter 2.

³⁸The *stèle* on which *I.G.* II² 1714 was inscribed has unusual dimensions and Dow does not include it in his calculations of average measurements.

³⁹Ferguson was the first to notice that the date for *I.G.* II² 1046 proves that a tribal cycle can be inferred for the first century B.C. (see Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, pp. 286-7). Samuel, however, remains unconvinced and places *ΑΙΞΙΝΗΣ* in his right-hand column of archons of uncertain date (*Greek and Roman Calendars and Chronology*, p. 224; cf. p. 211 n. 2).

the tribes must have occurred between 109/8 B.C. and 75/4 B.C. The two intervening priests belong to two separate cycles. If $\Phi\Lambda\text{H}\text{M}\text{O}\text{N}$ served in 104/3 B.C., $\text{E}\text{M}\text{B}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$ would have served in either 93/2 B.C. (during the first cycle after 109/8 B.C.) or in 81/0 B.C. (during the third cycle). If $\Phi\Lambda\text{H}\text{M}\text{O}\text{N}$ dated to 92/1 B.C., $\text{E}\text{M}\text{B}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$ ' priesthood would fall in 83/2 B.C. Rotating the cycle backwards from 75/4 B.C., a priest from Erechtheis would have served in 87/6 B.C. and $\text{E}\text{M}\text{B}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$ could have served in 83/2 B.C. on the basis of this cycle also.⁴⁰ The fact that a priest from Erechtheis (tribe I) would have served in 87/6 B.C. on the basis of the cycle during the first century B.C. strongly suggests that a new cycle was begun following the sack of the city by Sulla in March, 86 B.C.

A certain $\text{N}\text{I}\text{K}\text{H}\Phi\text{O}\rho\text{O}\Sigma$ served as *zакorос* of the Cynthian deities on Delos for the thirty-seventh time in the priesthood of $\text{A}\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{T}\text{O}\text{N}\ \text{P}\text{A}\text{A}\text{T}\text{O}\rho\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{K}\text{H}\Phi\text{I}\Sigma\text{I}\text{E}\text{T}\Sigma$. He is first attested in 109/8 B.C. His eleventh year as *zакorос* may be dated to 101/0 B.C. In 113/2 B.C. the *zакorос* was a son of the priest and $\text{N}\text{I}\text{K}\text{H}\Phi\text{O}\rho\text{O}\Sigma$ could have served for the first time in 112/1 B.C. If he served consecutively, his thirty-seventh year as *zакorос* would fall in 75/4 B.C. The priest of Asclepius in 75/4 B.C. was from $\text{K}\text{H}\Phi\text{I}\Sigma\text{I}\text{E}\text{T}\Sigma$ and $\text{A}\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{T}\text{O}\text{N}\ \text{P}\text{A}\text{A}\text{T}\text{O}\rho\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{K}\text{H}\Phi\text{I}\Sigma\text{I}\text{E}\text{T}\Sigma$ may be dated to the same year. This date would indicate that the cycle of the priests of the Cynthian deities was interrupted at some point after 97/6 B.C. when the priest was from Oineis (tribe VII). The date proposed here for the priesthood of $\text{A}\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{T}\text{O}\text{N}$ suggests that a new cycle for the priests of the Cynthian deities was begun on Delos in 87/6 B.C. in conjunction with the cycle of the priests of Asclepius at Athens. This is the first evidence for a tribal cycle on Delos after 88/7 B.C.

⁴⁰The problem, of course, is to locate the break in the cycle. If the break is not placed in 88/7 B.C. with a new cycle beginning in 87/6 B.C., it would be impossible to calculate even these dates. Dinsmoor chooses 104/3 B.C. and 83/2 B.C. for $\Phi\Lambda\text{H}\text{M}\text{O}\text{N}$ and $\text{E}\text{M}\text{B}\text{I}\text{O}\Sigma$ respectively on the basis of lettering (*The Archons of Athens*, pp. 249-50) and is followed by Pritchett and Meritt (*The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. 79). On page 84, however, they accord this date for $\Phi\Lambda\text{H}\text{M}\text{O}\text{N}$ more certainty than it can support. The alternative years for these priests must be kept open.

The Tribal Rotation of Prytany-secretaries in the First Century B.C.

The existence of a regular tribal cycle of the prytany-secretaries during the first century B.C. remains unproven. The sequence of tribes between 52/1 B.C. (secretary from tribe VIII or II), 49/8 B.C. (secretary from tribe XII) and 45/4 B.C. (tribe XI) makes the existence of a regular rotation of secretaries at this time impossible. Notopoulos, however, assumed the continuation of an uninterrupted secretary cycle from the second century B.C. into the second century A.D. which was only suspended during the "dictatorship" of ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ between 91/0-89/8 B.C.⁴¹ Notopoulos dated the archon ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ (Π), in which year the secretary was from Attalis (tribe XII), to 21/0 B.C. by means of this secretary cycle. ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ (Π) has recently been redated, following Dinsmoor, to 20/19 B.C., making Notopoulos' secretary cycle less plausible. In addition, Notopoulos' secretary cycle cannot provide a secretary in 87/6 B.C., a year in which an archon is known to have been elected. A new cycle for the priest of Asclepius at Athens and the priest of the Cynthian deities on Delos began in 87/6 B.C. with priests from Erechtheis (tribe I).⁴² In 109/8 B.C. the two cycles for the priests of Asclepius and the prytany-secretaries were brought into synchronization and a new cycle begun from tribe I. This suggests that a new cycle for the prytany secretaries could also have started with tribe I in 87/6 B.C. (see Table A.2).⁴³

⁴¹He accounts for the years between 52/1 B.C. to 45/4 B.C. by suggesting that an allotted cycle was employed rather than a fixed rotation of the tribes in numerical order (*Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 6ff).

⁴²See above. All previous breaks in the secretary cycle were followed by a new cycle beginning with Erechtheis (tribe I). But Notopoulos reaches all the way back to the third century B.C. for evidence of the temporary "suspension" of a cycle.

⁴³In Table A.2 years in which the tribal affiliation of attested secretaries or priests are recorded are indicated by a Roman numeral. Arabic numerals indicate the probable tribal affiliation of the secretary or priest based on the reconstruction of the cycle. Years for which no tribal cycle can be postulated are left blank. Between 93/2 B.C. and 71/0 B.C. two different tribal cycles may be postulated for the prytany-secretaries, and these are indicated by two columns of tribal numbers.

Table A-2: Tribal Cycles at Athens (After 88/7 B.C.)

Year	Priest of Asclepius	Prytany-Secretary
109/8	I	I
108/7	2	II
107/6	3	III
106/5	4	IV
105/4	5	5
104/3	VI (or 92/1)	VI
103/2	7	VII
102/1	8	8
101/0	9	IX
100/99	10	10
99/8	11	11
98/7	12	12
97/6	1	I
96/5	2	II
95/4	3	III
94/3	4	4
93/2	V (or 83/2)	5 Notopoulos
92/1	VI (or 104/3)	6 6
91/0	7	7 vac.
90/89	8	8 vac.
89/8	9	9 vac.
88/7	?	? vac.
87/6	I	I? vac.
86/5	2	2 7
85/4	3	3 8
84/3	4	4 9
83/2	V (or 93/2)	5 10
82/1	6	6 11
81/0	7	7 12
80/79	8	8 1
79/8	9	9 2
78/7	10	10 3
77/6	11	11 4
76/5	12	12 V (or 64/3)
75/4	I	1 6
74/3	2	2 7
73/2	3	3 8
72/1	4	4 9
71/0	5	V 10
70/69	6	11
69/8	7	12
68/7	8	1
67/6	9	2
66/5	X	3
65/4	11	4
64/3	12	V (or 76/5)
63/2	I	
62/1	II	

A secretary named in *Hesperia* 40 (1972) n. 3, pp. 101-7, is from a deme recorded only as ANA[_]. Geagan has pointed out that only three restorations are possible: ANAKAIETE (tribe IX), ANAΦAΓETIOΣ (tribe XI) or ANAΓTPAΣIOΣ (tribe I). He preferred ANAKAIETE because this restoration gives the decree, a tantalizing law-code restoring the democracy after the revolution of 88/7 B.C.,⁴⁴ a possible date, on the basis of Notopoulos' secretary cycle, of 84/3 B.C. This would be the earliest possible date according to that cycle, and Geagan argues that the decree must date to soon after 87/6 B.C. But if a new secretary cycle is postulated to begin in 87/6 B.C., the decree could date to the first few months after Sulla sacked the city (restoring the deme as ANAΓTPAΣIOΣ). Badian has recently dated the decree to 88/7 B.C. without regard for the secretary cycle.⁴⁵

In the archonship of OINOΦIAOΣ, the prytany-secretary was from Ptolemais (tribe V). On the basis of a new cycle starting in 87/6 B.C., OINOΦIAOΣ's archonship could fall in 83/2 B.C., which is impossible since an archon is already known for this year, or in 71/0 B.C., a year for which an archon is not known. I tentatively date OINOΦIAOΣ, therefore, to 71/0 B.C. According to Notopoulos' cycle OINOΦIAOΣ would fall in either 76/5 B.C. or 64/3 B.C., for both of which years the archon list remains vacant.⁴⁶

Athenian Archons and Ephebic Instructors Between 46/5-43/2 B.C.

With the four archons ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ, ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ (I), ΕΥΚΛΗΣ and ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ now assigned to the years 46/5-43/2 B.C., it is worthwhile to try to

⁴⁴See Chapter 5. Also Oliver, *JHS* 49 (1980) p. 199.

⁴⁵Badian, *AJAH* 1 (1976) p. 115-7.

⁴⁶Notopoulos dates ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ to 76/5 B.C. although this remains uncertain since he is not named in a fixed sequence with a predecessor named ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ.

date them with greater precision.⁴⁷ Two methods have been used to date these archons, the prytany-secretaries and the sequence of ephebic trainers. In a dedication dating to the archonship of ΑΕΥΚΙΟΣ (59/8 B.C.) a ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ is named as *paidotribes*. He is also named in a dedication (*Hesperia* 3, 1934, n. 27) which can only be approximately dated to c. 50 B.C. A ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ turns up once more in an ephebic dedication (*I.G.* II² 3730) which is dated to after 39/8 B.C. When ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ was archon, a man whose name is recorded in *I.G.* II² 1041 as [.]Ε[] was *paidotribes*. In the same year ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ was *hoplomachos*. In the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I) a man with the demotic ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ was *paidotribes* and a foreigner served as *hoplomachos*. O. Reinmuth accordingly dated ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ to before ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I) and assumed that ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ had been "promoted" from *hoplomachos* to *paidotribes*.⁴⁸ The *paidotribes* who served under ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ has been identified by A. Raubitshek as ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ, the *paidotribes* first attested in 59/8 B.C.⁴⁹

In a subsequent publication, Reinmuth reversed his sequence making ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ succeed ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I). This was a necessary consequence of his adoption of Notopoulos' secretary-cycle.⁵⁰ In the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I) the

⁴⁷The chronological difficulties presented by *I.D.* 2632, *I.G.* II² 1343 and *I.G.* II² 1043 have been discussed in detail by Roussel (*DCA*, p. 376-81) and Dinsmoor (*The Archons of Athens*, pp. 284-6). I follow Dinsmoor for the dates of the other archons between 47/6-36/5 B.C.

⁴⁸Reinmuth dated ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ to c. 45/4 B.C. and ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I) to the "open" year 43/2 B.C. ("An Ephebic Text of ca. 43/2 B.C.," *Hesperia* 34, 1965, pp. 255-62). But 46/5-43/2 B.C. are all open in the sense that no archons can be dated securely to any one of these years. Reinmuth discusses ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ on page 259 (Kirchner had originally identified the *hoplomachos* [] [] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ with ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ). He claims that the apparent advancement of ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ to position of *paidotribes* "adds confirmation to the dating of *I.G.* II² 1040 later than 1041." Ephebic instructors rarely changed their offices, however, and I doubt if "promotions" such as this were common (cf. Appendix B).

⁴⁹Stamires discusses the restoration of [.]Ε[] in *Hesperia* 26, 1957, p. 251.

⁵⁰Reinmuth, *BCH* 90 (1966) pp. 93-100. Cf. p. 95 for the date of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I). In his earlier article Reinmuth was aware that Notopoulos had dated ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (II) to 21/0 B.C. but did not associate the secretary named on *I.G.* II² 2876 with ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (I).

prytany-secretary was from Attalis (tribe XII). Notopoulos dated *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (II) to 21/0 B.C. (his secretary was also from Attalis) and, rotating a hypothetical cycle backwards from this year, a secretary from Attalis would have to fall in 46/4 B.C.⁵¹ Dating *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (I) to 46/5 B.C., however, left no room for *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ* in 47/6 B.C., and he was accordingly bumped to 45/4 B.C. But this sequence interrupts the career of *ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ* with a *paidotribes* from Myrrhinous. The *paidotribes* [.]E[] could now, with equal plausibility, have been identified as *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, the *paidotribes* who served in the archonship of *ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ* (38/7 B.C.).⁵² Also, as a result of this sequence, the *paidotribes* from Myrrhinous could no longer be identified with the *hoplomachos* *ΜΗΤΡΩΔΩΡΟΣ* *ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ*.⁵³ Reinmuth's reversal of the sequence *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ-ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (I), however, is only based on Notopoulos' secretary cycle. Dinsmoor had originally dated *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (II) to 20/19 B.C. and this date has recently been adopted by K. Clinton and J. Traill.⁵⁴ In this case, an unbroken secretary cycle would allow *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (I) to be dated to 45/4 B.C. and *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ* could once again be his predecessor. I tentatively assign *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*, *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (I), *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ* and *ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ* to the years 46/5-43/2 B.C. although their exact sequence remains uncertain.

⁵¹Notopoulos arrived at the year 21/0 B.C. by working backwards from a secretary known from 117/8 A.D. This assumes an unbroken cycle and I know of no other period in Athenian chronology where a tribal cycle remained unbroken for such a length of time.

⁵²I examined *I.G. II² 1041* at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens. The initial letter is more likely *mu* than *pi*.

⁵³Reinmuth did not follow out these necessary consequences of his new sequence for *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* and *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ*.

⁵⁴Dinsmoor. *The Archons of Athens*, p. 293. Dinsmoor's date is not founded on precise evidence (cf. *Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 40, p. 194). For this period Athenian and Delphic chronographers look to one another for fixed dates which simply do not exist. Dinsmoor mentions that Daux (*Chronologie delphique*, p. 75) has adopted his date for *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ*. Daux several times refers to the "certain" dates for Athenian archons. There is danger of circular argument here and the fact is that the chronology of both Delphi and Athens in the first century B.C. is very fragile. For the date of *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (II) cf. also Clinton, *Sacred Officials*, p. 50 n. 30 and Traill, *Hesperia* 47 (1978) p. 299.

The sequence of ephebic instructors during this period may now be considered in greater detail. In a series of ephebic texts (*I.G.* Π^2 1961, 1965 and 3730) which G. Stamires assigns to the same year,⁵⁵ two *paidotribes* are named. In the ephebic decree for this year, *I.G.* Π^2 1961, a single *paidotribes* is recorded only as A[]. In *I.G.* Π^2 3730, one of the two dedications erected by the ephebes themselves for this year, a *MENIEKOΣ KOΛONHΘEN* is named instead of A[] as *paidotribes*. The stone on which *I.G.* Π^2 1961 had been inscribed has now been lost and the text recorded by the first editor has been called into question. Stamires proposed emending and restoring A[] to <M>[ENIEKOΣ], and Reinmuth has suggested that the name of the *hoplomachos* which was read by the first editor as MI[] NIK[] M[] (the intial letters of his name appear on separate lines) should be restored to give *MHTPOΔΩPOΣ MYPPINOTΣIOΣ*, the *hoplomachos* who served under ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ.⁵⁶ Neither solution, however, is satisfactory. A better restoration for M[]I NIK[] M[] is *ANTIΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΣ*, who was *hoplomachos* under *MENANΔPOΣ* (38/7 B.C.). At the same time the name of the *paidotribes* could be restored as *ANTIOXOΣ KOΛONHΘEN*, who served as *paidotribes* in 37/6 B.C. The readings offered by the first editor for the lost inscription *I.G.* Π^2 1961, therefore, might have been more accurate than recent scholars have been willing to allow. The series of three ephebic texts, as Reinmuth has already shown, must date after 39/8 B.C. which brings the mysterious *hoplomachos* into closer proximity to *ANTIΦΑΝΗΣ* than to *MHTPOΔΩPOΣ*, and the restoration proposed here accounts for the original reading of the patronymic as NIK[]. To return to *MENIEKOΣ*, the fact that between 59/8 B.C, when he is first attested, and the year of *I.G.* Π^2 3730, when he is last attested after an interval of about twenty years, two or perhaps three ephebic decrees (depending on whether *I.G.* Π^2 3730 dates to 39/8 B.C. or after 38/7 B.C.) intervene, makes his sudden reappearance in an ephebic dedication

⁵⁵Raubitschek joined *I.G.* Π^2 1965 and 3730 and Stamires discovered their association with *I.G.* Π^2 1961 (*Hesperia* 26, 1957, n. 69, pp. 251-2).

⁵⁶Reinmuth, *Hesperia* 34 (1965) p. 270.

suspicious. Stamires has already determined that the other apparent ephebic instructors named on *I.G.* II² 1965 and 3730 are in fact ephebes themselves, their rank being somewhat analogous to officer cadets. *MENISKOS*, therefore, is probably not the *paidotribes* of 59/8 B.C. but his son or a relative.⁵⁷ The sequence which is eventually adopted for the archons *ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ-ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ* will determine the sequence and restoration of the names for several ephebic instructors during this period (Table A.3).

⁵⁷ A second solution would be to assume that there were two *paidotribai* in this year. Reinmuth sees a difficulty in assigning A[] and *MENISKOS* to the same year (ibid., p. 271) although *I.G.* II² 2997 records two *paidotribai* and one *hypopaidotribes* in the same year. He suggests as an alternative, admitting that there is no parallel, that one *paidotribes* replaced the second in the course of the year. Perhaps the easiest solution is the one offered above and the heading in the dedication, *synepheboi*, supports this interpretation.

Table A-3: Archons and Ephebic Instructors (59/8-38/7 B.C.)

Year Archon	Ephebic Instructors	Office
59/8 ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ	ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ	<i>paidotribes</i>
?	ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ	<i>paidotribes</i>

46/5 ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ	[.]Ε (ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ?) ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ	<i>paidotribes</i> <i>hoplomachos</i>
45/4 ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ	[_] [_] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ	<i>paidotribes</i>

46/5 ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ	[_] [_] ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ	<i>paidotribes</i>
45/4 ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ	[.]Ε (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ?) ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ	<i>paidotribes</i> <i>hoplomachos</i>

38/7 ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ	ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ	<i>paidotribes</i> <i>hoplomachos</i>
39/8- 36/5	Α[_] ΜΙ[_] ΝΙΚ[_] Μ[_]	<i>paidotribes</i> <i>hoplomachos</i>
37/6 ΚΑΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ	ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ	<i>paidotribes</i>

The Hoplite Generalships of Antipatros of Phlya

ANTIPATPOΣ ANTIPATPOΣ ΦΑΤΕΤΕΣ was hoplite general at Athens seven times.⁵⁸ His first, third, fifth and seventh generalships are attested. One other text, in addition, dating to the archonship of *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (II), mentions a hoplite generalship of *ANTIPATPOΣ* although the number of that generalship is not preserved in the inscription.⁵⁹ In *Hesperia* 47 (1978) n. 19, pp. 290-2, *ANTIPATPOΣ* is named as hoplite general without a qualifying numerical designation and presumably this is his first tenure. In this year, *ΚΑΜΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΟΥΣΙΟΣ* was herald of the *boule* and *demos* and *ΦΙΑΗΜΩΝ* was *leitourgos en tei skiadi*. By the time of *ANTIPATPOΣ*' third generalship, a new herald, *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΟΥ ΣΤΕΙΡΙΕΤΕΣ*, was in office (the name of the *leitourgos* is not recorded). As a consequence three prytany decrees which name *ΚΑΜΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* as herald (*Agora* XV, nn. 282 and 286-7) must have as their *terminus ante quem* the third hoplite generalship of *ANTIPATPOΣ*. When *ANTIPATPOΣ* was hoplite general for the third time, the prytany-secretary was from Attalis (tribe XII).⁶⁰ If the secretary cycle was operating at this time and *ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ* (II) dates to 20/19 B.C. when his secretary was also from Attalis, *ANTIPATPOΣ*' third generalship would fall in 32/1 B.C.

In another inscription dating to the period when *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ* was herald (*Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 12, pp. 66-8, with *I.G.* II² 1051), the names of the archon

⁵⁸For a different solution to the chronology of his generalships, see Geagan, *AJP* 100 (1979) pp. 59-68.

⁵⁹*Agora* XV, n. 292.

⁶⁰I identify the secretary as the prytany-secretary because he is not from the tribe in prytany and therefore cannot be the secretary of the prytany. In another prytany list from about the same time (*Hesperia* 47, 1978, n. 19, pp. 290-2), the prytany-secretary is named by title. Since the secretary from Sounion (tribe XII) in *ANTIPATPOΣ*' third generalship is designated only as a *grammateus*, he could be identified as one of the other secretaries.

and the hoplite general are missing. This inscription must at least postdate the first hoplite generalship of *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ* since at that time *ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* was herald. In this otherwise undated inscription, the archon's name comprised eleven letters and that of the hoplite general seventeen letters. The decree must post-date 39/8 B.C., and although the archon list in the 30s and 20s B.C. is fragmentary, the only attested archon whose name will fit a lacuna of eleven letters is *ΑΠΟΛΛΟΓΕΝΗΣ* (34/3 B.C.).⁶¹ Although the names of other attested hoplite generals at this time (*ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*, *ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΡΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ* and *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ*)⁶² would fit a lacuna of seventeen letters, only *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ* among these is known to have repeatedly served as hoplite general at a time when *ΟΙΝΟΦΙΛΟΣ* was herald of the *boule* and *demos*. The names of *ΑΠΟΛΛΟΓΕΝΗΣ* and *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ*, therefore, make a plausible restoration in a text which must in any case date to between 39/8 B.C. and the archonship of *ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ* (19/8-18/7 B.C.) when a different herald was in office. If this restoration is correct, the two generals named in the decree (it is unclear if they are hoplite generals or generals of some colony such as Lemnos) will have served before 34/3 B.C.⁶³ and *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ*' second hoplite generalship

⁶¹*ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ* is much too long and *ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ* (10 letters in the genitive) may be too early in 36/5 B.C. *ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ* is also possible (11 letters) but Graindor expresses doubt about the attribution of this archon to this period (Cf. *Chronologie*, pp. 38-9). *I.G. II*² 1051 was partly re-edited by Meritt in *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8.

⁶²Only *ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ* (18 letters) is an exact contemporary. But the name of the general in *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8, is in the nominative, and *ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ*) *ΦΑΥΕΤΣ* comprises exactly seventeen letters. If *ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ* had been named in this text he could not have been named with his patronymic.

⁶³One of these is *ΕΥΚΛΗΣ*. See Chapter 6.

will have come in 34/3 B.C. (his third being in 32/1 B.C.).⁶⁴

In the archonship of ΔΗΜΕΑΣ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ, ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ was hoplite general for the fifth time. The number of his generalship in the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ is unknown, but because ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ was apparently general a total of seven times, his fourth or his sixth generalship could have come in the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (II) depending on the sequence of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ and ΔΗΜΕΑΣ. Dow has determined from prosopographical evidence that *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, n. 116 (now *Agora* XV, n. 293) and the archonship of ΔΗΜΕΑΣ could date anywhere between c. 20 B.C. and the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (III) (between 8/7 - 2/1 B.C.). This makes it likely that ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ was hoplite general for the fourth time in the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ (II) although the sequence ΔΗΜΕΑΣ-ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ cannot be ruled out entirely. I date ΔΗΜΕΑΣ to 19/8-18/7 B.C. in the *Fasti*.

I.G. II² 1713 Col. IV (17/6 B.C. - 11/0 B.C.)

The fourth column of this list of eponymous archons which, in a total of five columns, lists archons from the late second century B.C. to the middle of the first century A.D. provides the names of seven archons.⁶⁵ On the assumption that each column of the inscription contained thirty-eight lines with one line

⁶⁴The archon list I.G. II² 1721, dated to the archonship of ΠΟΛΥΤΑΙΝΟΣ, mentions ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΤΣ as herald of the Areopagus. The same herald appears on the undated archon list I.G. II² 1720 with the flutist ΚΑΕΙΤΟΦΩΝ and the *demosios* ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ. A different flutist and *demosios* are attested in 56/5 B.C. which provides a terminus post quem of sorts for ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ. In 14/3 B.C. a new flutist is in office and the *demosios* has been replaced by a *leitourgos*. It is unlikely that an individual would have held a senior office such as the heraldship of the Areopagus for many years and I.G. II² 1720 should be dated close to I.G. II² 1721. In any case it cannot date earlier than *Hesperia* 36 (1967) n. 12, pp. 66-8, when the heraldship was held by a man whose name is only recorded as PL[]. I.G. II² 1720, therefore, will date to between 33/2 B.C. and 15/4 B.C.

⁶⁵I had the opportunity to examine this inscription at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens.

corresponding to each archonship (*ΝΙΚΙΑΣ* and *ΙΕΙΓΕΝΗΣ*, archons in 124/3 B.C., being the only exceptions), the seven sequential names which are extant in Column IV will date to between 17/6-11/0 B.C.⁶⁶ But this calculation involves two difficulties, neither of which can be resolved. In the archonship of *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* the Dodecade was celebrated by the Athenians at Delphi. The Dodecade was a festival which replaced the more elaborate Delphic Pythaiads sometime after 42/1 B.C. The Pythaiads had all been celebrated in a Pythian year (the third year of an Olympiad when the Pythian Games were celebrated at Delphi) except in 128/7 B.C. when a Pythaid was celebrated in the first year of an Olympiad, possibly in connection with the Delphic Soteria.⁶⁷ As a successor to the Pythaid, the Dodecade could be expected to have occurred in a Pythian year, but this may not have always been the case. The first Dodecade, which was celebrated in the archonship of *ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ*, did in fact coincide with the Pythian Games, and this is the basis for dating *ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ* to either 30/29 or 26/5 B.C. But after this archonship, on the basis of the current state of Athenian chronology during this period, the Dodecade seems to fall in any year of an Olympiad. The Dodecade in the archonship of *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* (II) (who tentatively dates to 20/19 B.C.), for example, occurred in an Olympic year while the Dodecade which was celebrated in the archonship of *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* (11/0 B.C.) would fall in the second year of the 192nd Olympiad.⁶⁸ Dinsmoor suggested that Column IV could be moved up one year to place *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* in the Olympic year 12/1 B.C.⁶⁹ This suggestion has not

⁶⁶Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, pp. 292-4.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, p. 129.

⁶⁸The dates for *ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ* and *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* (III) are too uncertain to allow any conclusions to be drawn about the Dodecades celebrated during their archonships.

⁶⁹*The Archons of Athens*, p. 293. It is unclear what Dinsmoor means when he calls 12/1 B.C. "an even, though not a Pythian, year." Although Dinsmoor's table of archons ends in 27 B.C., I believe that it is on the basis of his proposed year for *ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ* that he dates *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* (II) to 20/19 B.C. On his "higher" chronology 18/7 B.C. (Ol. 3) will fall to the archon *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ* which places *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* (II) in 20/19 B.C. and *ΔΗΜΕΑΣ* in 19/8 B.C. Notopoulos, in dating *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ* (II) to 21/0 B.C. on the basis of the secretary cycle, does not seem to have accounted for the discrepancy between this date and the celebration of the Dodecade which occurred in *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΟΣ*' archonship.

been followed and it must be allowed that tampering with Column IV in this way will immediately alter the dates for the archons named in Column V.⁷⁰

A second difficulty concerns the priest of Asclepius in the archonship of *ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ* which falls, according to *I.G. II*² 1713, in 12/1 B.C. In this year a man from Erechtheis (tribe I) was a priest (only his demotic is completely extant). In 51/0 B.C., we have already seen above, the priest was also from Erechtheis. If a unbroken cycle had been followed from 51/0 B.C., a priest from Erechtheis should have come in 15/4 B.C. and not 12/1 B.C. A second priest of Asclepius, *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΑΘΕΝ* (tribe II), served in the archonship of *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΑΑΙΕΤΣ*. He has been dated to 26/5 B.C. on the assumption that an unbroken cycle had been followed from 51/0 B.C.⁷¹

With *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΑΑΙΕΤΣ* we may return to consider the date of the series of related ephebic inscriptions *I.G. II*² 1961, 1965-3730. P. Graindor identified

⁷⁰Changing the dates for Col. IV would have immediate repercussions for the date of the archons listed in Col. V. But even if it were possible, a radical adjustment for the dates of the archons in Col. IV is probably unnecessary. Dinsmoor suggested moving *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* up to 12/1 B.C., but the same result would be obtained by moving him down to the year of the Pythian Games in 10/9 B.C. (Ol. 3). If we date *ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ* to 15/4 B.C. (see below), *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* would automatically fall in a Pythian year. This is the only solution that satisfies a unbroken cycle of the priests of Asclepius from 51/0 B.C. and the requirement that *ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ* date to a Pythian or Olympic year. It is interesting to note that in this case *ΑΙ*[_] would fall in 20/19 B.C., the year Dinsmoor assigns to *ΑΠΟΛΛΕΙΣ* (II). Graindor apparently read the letters *ΑΙ*[_] and ascertained that the vertical stroke was too far from *alpha* to have been any other letter than *tau* or *iota*. He ruled out the possibility that it could have been the left-hand vertical of *mu* or *pi*. But it could have been the right hand vertical of *pi* (obviously if Graindor read dotted *tau* he was unable to discern an upper horizontal stroke). I have examined this part of the inscription. Although the stone is badly worn I believe that dotted *pi* is a possible reading.

⁷¹Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, p. 287 and Graindor, *Chronologie*, p. 31. Dinsmoor is so confident of the date that he moves *ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ* to 30/29 B.C. (p. 293) thereby lengthening the career of the 21st priesthood at Delphi. This requires the assumption that the break in the cycle came between 25/4-13/2 B.C. But rotating the cycle backwards from 12/1 B.C., we find that *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΑΑΙΕΤΣ* could with equal plausibility date to 23/2 B.C. (or even 24/3 B.C. if the archons named in Column IV of *I.G. II*² 1713 were moved up a year following Dinsmoor). Dinsmoor had dated *ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ* to 30/29 and not 26/5 B.C., the only other year to which *ΑΡΧΙΤΙΜΟΣ* could be assigned, on the assumption that *ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ ΑΑΑΙΕΤΣ* was firmly dated to 26/5 B.C. Now 26/5 B.C. must be kept open for either archon and in the *Fasti* they are cross-referenced to 26/5 B.C. from 30/29 B.C. and 23/2 B.C. respectively.

$\Delta IOTIMOS$ with an ephebe named in *I.G.* Π^2 1961 which has, as a *terminus post quem*, 39/8 B.C.⁷² If $\Delta IOTIMOS$ was archon in 23/2 B.C. at thirty years of age, his *ephebeia* would have been in 35/4 B.C. If he was archon in 26/5 B.C., on the other hand, his *ephebeia* would have been in 38/7 B.C. But an ephebic list is already known for 38/7 B.C. (*I.G.* Π^2 1043). *I.G.* Π^2 1961 could list the ephebes from 39/8 B.C. and date to 38/7 B.C., in which case $\Delta IOTIMOS$ would have been archon at the earliest when he was thirty-one years of age. If *I.G.* Π^2 1961 postdates *I.G.* Π^2 1043, on the other hand, $\Delta IOTIMOS$ could not have been archon in 26/5 B.C. and, since *ANTIΦΑΝΗΣ* would have replaced *ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ* as *hoplomachos* in the intervening years, this sequence would confirm the restoration proposed above for *MI*[_] *NIK*[_] *M*[_] in *I.G.* Π^2 1961.

⁷²Commentary on *I.G.* Π^2 1961, line 3. Cf. Reinmuth, *BCH* 90 (1966) p. 96.

A.3. Index of Dated Texts

This index lists all inscriptions which have been cited in Appendix A. Each text is followed by the year or years to which magistrates named on it are dated. Other texts which may be dated to within fixed *termini* as explained in Appendix A.1 are also entered in this appendix. All dates are B.C. unless otherwise indicated.

Agora XV:

210	before 164/3
223	160/59
222	161/0
215	167/6
216	166/5
217	167/6
219-21	164/3
225	155/4
226	between 160/59-146/5
228	153/2
236	between 160/59-146/5
238	145/4
239	145/4
240	140/39
243	136/5-135/4
244	135/4
249-50	125/4
251	124/3
252	122/1
253	118/7
254	104/3
259	97/6
261	95/4
266	71/0
268	57/6
269-70	53/2
278	47/6 or 43/2
280	before 278
281	46/5-43/2 (45/4?)
282	before 34/3
286-7	before 34/3
288	30/29
290	32/1
291-2	20/19
293	19/8 or 18/7

<i>AJP</i> 100 (1979) pp. 285-87	32/1
Athenaeus V.213e	88/7
<i>AM</i> 76 (1961) pp. 141-3	157/6
<i>AM</i> 97 (1982) pp. 172-3	154/3
<i>BCH</i> 59 (1935) n. 3	109/8
Clinton, <i>Sacred Officials</i> , p. 50	20/19
<i>F.D.</i> III, 2:	
3	128/7
4-5	106/5
7	138/7
8	128/7
9	106/5
11	138/7
12	128/7
13-5	106/5
23	138/7
24	128/7
25	106/5
27	128/7
28	106/5
29	138/7
30	106/5
32	98/7
33-6	128/7
39	128/7
46-7	128/7
50	128/7
52	106/5
56a	58/7
56b-c	58/7
57-8	42/1
59-60	30/29
61	20/19
62	11/0
63	DP XXV
64	DP XXIV
67	30/29
68	130/29
69	117/6
70	112/1

Hesperia:

2 (1923) 16, pp. 503-5	162/1, 161/0
3 (1934) 20, pp. 27-31	166/5, 163/2
3 (1934) 27, p. 39	59/8
9 (1940) p. 129	136/5-135/3
10 (1941) 25, pp. 60-1	155/4
10 (1941) 26, pp. 61-2	122/1
10 (1941) 27, p. 62	112/1
11 (1942) 58, pp. 293-8	149/48
14 (1945) 19, pp. 147-8	62/1, 52/1
16 (1947) 64, pp. 164-8	167/6, 162/1-161/60
16 (1947) 67, pp. 170-2	117/6-116/5
17 (1948) 10, pp. 22-3	136/5, 135/4
17 (1948) 29, p. 41	after 17/6-16/5
23 (1954) 10, p. 240	166/5
24 (1955) pp. 228-32	128/7-127/6
26 (1957) 98, pp. 260-5	22/1
28 (1959) 1, pp. 273-4	164/3
28 (1959) 7, pp. 185-6	165/4
28 (1959) 10, pp. 188-94	138/7-137/6
28 (1959) 13, pp. 200-1	95/4-94/3
29 (1960) 154, pp. 76-7	139/8
29 (1960) 155, pp. 78-80	157/6
30 (1961) 20, p. 223	133/2
30 (1961) 28, p. 229	113/2-112/1
30 (1961) 29, pp. 230	111/0
30 (1961) 51, p. 252	154/3
30 (1961) 100, p. 270	59/8
32 (1963) 24, pp. 23-4	99/8
33 (1964) 42, p. 193	126/5
34 (1965) 2, pp. 89-90	149/48
34 (1965) 4, pp. 92-5	127/6
34 (1965) p. 255	45/4-44/3
36 (1967) 12, pp. 66-8	35/4-34/3
36 (1967) 19, pp. 88-91	164/3
36 (1967) 23, pp. 94-5	36/5
37 (1968) 12, p. 273	147/6-146/5
40 (1971) 3, pp. 101-7	87/6
41 (1972) pp. 185-91	123/2-122/1
45 (1976) 3, pp. 287-8	117/6
47 (1978) 14, p. 286	131/0
47 (1978) 15, pp. 286-7	119/8
47 (1978) 19, pp. 290-2	before 34/3
47 (1978) 20, pp. 292-5	before 34/3
47 (1978) 22, pp. 297-9	32/1, 20/19
52 (1983) 3, pp. 161-3	55/4

Hesperia Supplement VIII, p. 117:

87/6-81/0, 64/3-53/2

Hesperia Supplement XV:

1	132/1-131/0
2	116/5
3	106/5
6	102/1-101/0
7a-d, f-g	98/7
18	c. 100 (after <i>I.G.</i> II ² 1943)
19	c. 100, 91/0, after 91/0? (Hand Z)

I.D.:

1403	167/6-166/5
1408	165/4-161/0
1413	162/1
1415	159/8-158/7
1416	167/6, 166/5, 159/8-156/5
1417	167/6, 159/8, 156/5
1418	156/5
1421	158/7-154/3
1422	158/7, 155/4
1426	156/5, 153/2
1428	165/4
1429	155/4
1430	165/4
1432	165/4, 151/0-149/8
1439	161/0
1441	163/2, 161/0
1442	156/5, 148/7, 146/5-144/3, 141/0
1443	165/4, 146/5, 142/1, 141/0
1444	146/5, 142/1-139/8
1445	139/8, 136/5
1447	141/0
1450	165/4, 163/2, 161/0-160/59, 141/0-140/39
1464	155/4
1497b	160/59
1497	165/4
1498	162/1-159/8
1499	150/49-149/8
1500	151/0
1501-3	148/7
1504	148/7-147/6
1505	149/8-147/6
1506	145/4
1507	145/4-144/3
1513	116/5
1519-20	150/49
1531	111/0
1551	110/09

1552	102/1
1558	129/8
1560	116/5, after 111/0
1562-3	102/1
1569-4	102/1
1576	102/1
1579	127/6
1580	105/4
1581-2	102/1
1585	102/1
1586	A.D. 6
1587	49/8
1605	A.D. 1
1609	117/6
1618	151/0
1619	99/8
1626	A.D. 6
1645-6	126/5
1647-9	124/3
1652	118/7
1653	112/1
1654	110/09
1656	103/2
1657	92/1
1658	94/3
1659-60	80/79-78/7
1662	54/3
1709	99/8
1711	98/7
1714	92/1
1750	142/1
1757	98/7
1760	100/99
1761	98/7
1762	92/1
1764	93/2
1763	94/3
1777	122/1
1800	113/2
1806	126/5
1807	125/4
1808-9	121/0-120/19
1810-15	110/09
1816	98/7
1817	98/7-97/6
1833	151/0
1837	156/5
1839	115/4
1840	23/2
1871	106/5
1877	129/8

1878	118/7, 98/7-97/6
1879-81	113/2
1882	101/0
1884-5	103/2
1886	99/8
1887-8	109/8
1892	97/6
1893	90/89
1894	75/4
1897	119/8
1898	160/59, 158/7
1899	152/1
1900	128/7
1901	114/3
1902-3	102/1
1907	127/6
1911	110/09
1922	136/5
1923-1923bb	126/5
1924	123/2
1925-6	118/7
1927	103/2
1930-2	94/3
1934	92/1
1935	80/79-78/7
1941	122/1
1942	114/3
1945-6	between c. 136-123
1947	127/6, 118/7
1948	137/6
1949	133/2
1950	167/6
1951	154/3
1952	148/7
1953	138/7
1954	between c. 138/7-118/7
1959	before 111/0, 111/0
1979	148/7
1981	163/2
1987	138/7
2037	synchronism with 2107b
2038	110/09
2039	94/3-92/1
2040	94/3
2042	135/4
2043	130/29
2044	128/7
2047-8	126/5
2049	124/3
2050-2	119/8
2053-4	118/7

2055-6	117/6
2057-8	116/5
2059	114/3
2060	112/1
2061	113/2, 110/09
2062-4	110/09
2067	106/5, 101/0
2068-9	149/8
2070	before 111/0, 111/0
2072-3	115/4
2075	124/3
2076	130/29, 123/2
2077	119/8
2078	116/5
2079	115/4
2080	105/4
2081	94/3
2083	150/49
2085	112/1
2087-8	107/6
2089	129/8
2090	116/5
2091	115/4, 112/1
2092	112/1
2094	94/3
2098	155/4
2099	136/5
2101	130/29
2102	122/1
2103	114/3
2104	94/3
2105-6	98/7
2107a	synchronism with 2210, 2508
2107b	synchronism with 2037
2118	155/4
2120	129/8
2121	120/19
2122-3	118/7
2125	111/0
2126	110/09
2127	106/5
2128	105/4
2129	103/2
2137-9	159/8
2141	131/0
2142	129/8
2143-5	128/7
2146	127/6
2147	126/5
2148	124/3
2149	122/1

2150	119/8
2151	114/3
2152	112/1
2153	104/3
2154	106/5
2155	105/4
2156	103/2
2158	94/3
2160	107/6
2161	90/89
2163	131/0
2164?	118/7
2165	114/3
2166	112/1
2203	155/4
2204	104/3
2205	90/89
2206	134/3
2207	126/5
2208	114/3
2209	105/4
2210	synchronism with 2107a, 2508
2211	107/6
2212	90/89
2220-2	110/09
2224	105/4
2226	128/7
2227	118/7
2228	113/2, 110/09
2229	112/1
2230-1	110/09
2232-3	107/6
2234	106/5
2235-6	103/2
2237-9	100/99
2240	97/6
2243-4	93/2
2245	103/2
2248	112/1
2249	107/6
2250	108/7-107/6
2251-2	108/7, 106/5
2253	106/5
2254	107/6-106/5
2261	113/2
2262	108/7
2265	99/8
2274	108/7
2285	113/2
2286	107/6
2288	105/4

2310	97/6
2342	110/09
2364	100/99
2374	150/49
2400	98/7
2414	between 112/1-75/4
2415	104/3
2419-20	between 112/1-75/4
2423	125/4, 109/8
2499	99/8
2508	synchronism with 2107a, 2210
2515-9	between c. 20-A.D. 10
2529	between 112/1-75/4
2565	159/8
2566	136/5-135/4
2570	99/8
2589	167/6-112/1
2590-2	155/4
2593	144/3
2594	133/2
2595	between 128/7-123/2
2596	127/6
2597	126/5
2598	119/8
2599	104/3
2600	96/5
2601	131/0 or 94/3
2603	124/3
2605	159/8
2610	140/39-110/09
2615	108/7
2617-9	107/6
2621	94/3
2626	113/2
2627	110/09
2628	108/7
2632	50/49-33/2

I.G. II²:

783	163/2
887	135/4
946-8	166/5
949	165/4
951	167/6
953	160/59
954	166/5
956	161/0-160/59
957	161/0, 157/6-156/5
958	150/49-149/8

968	148/7, 144/3, 142/1-141/0
969-71	140/39
979	155/4
1005	122/1
1006	123/2-122/2
1008	119/8-118/7
1009	117/6-116/5
1010	117/6
1011	107/6-106/5
1012	112/1
1014	110/09-109/8
1016	126/5
1017	118/7
1018	120/19
1019	138/7
1027	159/8
1029	98/7-96/5
1034	103/2
1036	108/7
1039	80/79-78/7, 79/8-77/6
1041	46/5-43/2 (46/5?)
1042	41/0-40/39
1043	38/7-37/6
1046	52/1-51/0
1047	50/49-49/8
1051	35/4-34/3
1063	46/5-43/2 (45/4?)
1132	130/29
1134	117/6
1135	111/0
1332	125/4, after 125/4
1335	103/2, 101/0
1337	97/6
1338	78/7-76/5 or 74/3-65/4, 79/8-77/6
1339	57/6
1343	42/1-36/5
1713	129/8-123/2, 91/0-84/3. 55/4- 48/7, 17/6-11/0
1714	86/5
1715	85/4
1717	56/5
1719	44/3
1720	between 31/0-15/4, 14/3
1721	14/3
1727	DP XXIV
1937	156/5
1938	149/48
1941	106/5
1943	c. 100 (before <i>H.S.</i> XV, 18)
1944	110/09-109/8, 104/3, 83/2, 75/4, 72/1, 66/5, 63/2-62/1

1961	39/8
1963	13/2
1965	39/8
1966	after 23/2
2323	163/2-161/0, 157/6-155/4, 143/2
2336	103/2-97/6
2444	154/3
2452	between 128/7-87/6?
2864	162/1
2869	101/0
2870	110/09
2873	97/6
2876	46/5-43/2 (45/4?)
2981	160/59, 108/7
2982	127/6
2983	111/0
2984	106/5
2985	104/3
2986	95/4
2990	98/7-97/6
2991	94/3
2992	60/59
2993	55/4
2993a	50/49
2994	38/7
2995	37/6
2996	23/2
2997	DP XXV
3174	12/1
3219	62/1
3473	c. 100
3489	78/7-76/5, 74/3-65/4
3497	c. 100
3505	20/19
3508	c. 100
3512	13/2
3539	after 17/6-16/5
3730	39/8
4465	23/2
5172	59/8
<i>I.G.</i> VII 2850	122/1
Josephus XIV.149ff	106/5
Philostratos <i>Acad. Ind.</i> :	
33	134/3

80 O.21

143/2

Pouilloux, 24

83/2

S.E.G.:

XII, 110

80/79-78/7

XVI, 98

159/8

XVI, 452-3

109/8, 95/4

XXI, 469

129/8

XXIV, 225

133/2

S.I.A. 4

139/8-138/7

Appendix B

Ephebic Instructors

B.1. Athens

In Chapter 1 the ephebic instructors were included in the ranks of a cultural-educational elite at Athens. In this appendix the prosopographical and epigraphical evidence for these instructors may be examined in greater detail. A total of eighty-four ephebic instructors are named in the period from 167/6 B.C. to A.D. 14. Only eleven instructors are named on more than one inscription. Iteration in the offices of these instructors is rare, and the average length of office for those instructors who did iterate is generally rather short:

ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ	<i>akontistes</i>	128/7-117/6	12
ΙΕΡΩΝ	<i>hyperetes/ akontistes</i>	128/7-119/8	10
ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ	<i>aphetes</i>	123/2-119/8	5
ΚΑΜΜΙΑΣ	<i>aphetes</i>	117/6-98/7	20
ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ	<i>hoplomachos</i>	117/6-98/7	20
ΝΕΩΝ	<i>paidotribes</i>	111/0-104/3	8
ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ	<i>paidotribes</i>	60/59-55/4 B.C.	6
ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ	<i>paidotribes</i>	59/8-46/5	16
ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ	<i>paideutes/ paidotribes</i>	45/4-37/6	9
ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ	<i>paidotribes</i>	23/2-DP XXV	13+
ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ	<i>hypopaid./ paidotribes</i>	23/2-DP XXV	13+

Because of the fragmentary state of our evidence it is impossible to determine the actual limits of a man's career as an ephebic instructor. But we can at least regard the dates presented above as the minimum *termini* for the careers of those instructors who are known to have iterated in office. Many of the other instructors seem to have served for only a few years. This can be determined

with some precision since several ephebic decrees are extant from the last decades of the second century B.C. and few instructors are named on two or more lists. The instructors who served over a number of years seem, in the second century, to have been the professional trainers such as the *aphetes* or *akontistes*. In the first century, on the other hand, it is the *paidotribai* who seem to serve for the longest term.

Every college in the period before 98/7 B.C., except in one year, has at least one iterating instructor. *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25, a catalogue of ephebes and their instructors from 106/5 B.C., lists eight (rather than the expected seven) *paideutai*; none of the individuals named in the list are found elsewhere. What makes this peculiar is the fact that instructors such *HPOΔOTOΣ* and *KΑΑΜΙΑΣ* served before and after 106/5 B.C. but not in 106/5 B.C. In the fourth century the instructors were appointed by the vote of the *ecclesia* (Aristotle, *AP* 42.3). It is possible that such appointments were influenced by political factions. A second peculiarity in this year is the fact that *NEΩN* is named as *paidotribes* on *I.G.* II² 2984, dating to the same year, but not in the list of eight *paideutai* inscribed at Delphi (*F.D.* III, 2 n. 25).

A second feature of the college of ephebic instructors is the fact that few instructors seem to have changed their rank or specialty. *IEPΩN* served as *hyperetes* in 128/7 and 123/2 B.C. and then as *akontistes* in 119/8 B.C., replacing *NIKΑΝΔΡΟΣ*. But *NIKΑΝΔΡΟΣ* returned in 117/6 B.C. *ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ* served in 45/4 B.C. as the fourth *paideutes* and, if he received the citizenship, as *paidotribes* in 38/7 B.C. The evidence for the career of *ΑΠΟΜΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΟΤΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ* shows an interesting progression. He was an ephebe himself in 38/7 B.C. He is first attested as a *hypopaidotribes* in 23/2 B.C. He would have been about 33 years of age. He is next attested as a full *paidotribes* in the twenty-fifth priesthood at Delphi XXV (sometime after 10 B.C.) when he

would have been in his late 40s.¹ The professional nature of these offices is further highlighted by the career of *ΖΩΠΥΡΟΣ ΑΙΞΩΝΕΤΣ*. He served as *systratiotes*, a military position, in 106/5 B.C. and appears in 102/1 B.C. as *toxotes*. Other than these examples, "promotions" or changes in rank do not occur. A relatively fixed order of instructors, similar to that of the prytany magistrates, does occur in the ephebic lists.² But there is no evidence for a rigorous order of precedence for the ephebic instructors, and a number of variations occur in the extant lists.³

¹Note that another instructor, *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΤΑΣΕΟΥ ΚΟΛΩΝΗΘΕΝ*, is first attested as an instructor assisting his father on Delos, when he was about 30 years of age (see Chapter 1). *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΕΤΚΙΟΥ ΑΛΑΙΕΤΣ* served as *hypopaidotribes* sometime after 8/7 B.C. His father was born in 57/6 B.C. *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ* would have been in his 20s as instructor if his father was 30 years of age when *ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ* was born.

²Tracy, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, p. 105. Tracy refers to a strict order of precedence, but a number of exceptions to the order he has determined for the instructors are evident. Before c. 166 B.C. there was no regular ranking or sequence in ephebic texts (cf. Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, pp. 179-80). The two Delphic texts, *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25 and *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7d, list the instructors as *paideutai* without specifying their functions. If a fixed order was followed in these texts, it would be an easy matter to determine the function of each instructor. But the lists do not seem to follow the regular ranking. First, *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25 lists eight rather than the usual seven instructors. Secondly, in *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 7d *ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΣ Β[]* and *ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ ΚΡΗ[]* seem to be the *hoplomachos* and the *aphetes* named in earlier texts. If these are the same individuals, the *paideutai* are not listed in any official order or rank. But it is a reasonable assumption that one of the instructors named on *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25 served as the rarely attested *hypohoplomachos*. This position only appears on one other ephebic text, *F.D.* III, 2 n. 24, which also lists eight rather than the usual seven instructors. (Cf. Reinmuth, *Hesperia* 34, 1965, p. 262 and n. 8).

³In 117/6 B.C., for example, the *grammateus* and the *hyperetes* are reversed, the *grammateus* occurring in last place rather than in second-last place. In 119/8 B.C. the *toxotes* is listed before the *akontistes* rather than after. In 123/2 three *hyperetai* are listed and no *grammateus*. All of these are variations which occur between different lists. There is also an instance where the ranking varies within a single list. In *Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 6, the *grammateus* is listed in the usual second-last position but is named in the first of the crowns honouring the instructors. In the 90s B.C., finally, the sequence for listing the instructors seems to have broken down, for in *I.G.* II² 1029 the *hoplomachos* is listed in second-last position. Pelekidis indicates that only four instructors were named in this text (*l'Éphébie attique*, p. 269) but the text in *I.G.* II² seems to give room for the full complement of seven instructors. It is difficult to determine whether these variations in the ranking of the instructors reflect administrative or policy decisions rather than scribal error or omission (although cf. Tracy, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, p. 105: "The elevation (i.e. of the *grammateus*) cannot be accidental....").

The board of instructors each year comprised a *paidotribes* and a varying number of specialized instructors. O. Reinmuth has observed that the college of ephebic instructors was first reduced to four instructors after 86 B.C., and then, after 38/7 B.C., to three instructors. The average age of the *paidotribai* was between 45-50 years of age. The other instructors tended to be a bit younger.⁴ The *hoplomachos* is the only remaining "military" specialist after 88/7 B.C. The other instructors in the use of weaponry (*katapallaphetes*, *akontistes* and *toxotes*) are last attested in 102/1 B.C. (although they are probably present in 98/7 B.C.). These instructors were probably dropped after the revolution of 88/7 B.C. After 38/7 B.C., as well, the secretary occurs in first rank ahead of the *paidotribes*. The office of *hypopaidotribes*, which first appears after 86 B.C., is found only on unofficial ephebic texts, such as dedications made by some of the ephebes for their instructors. Individuals attested as *hypopaidotribai* seem to have been in their 20s and 30s,⁵ marking them as apprentice instructors, as their title suggests.⁶ On official lists after 86 B.C., only the *paidotribes*, *grammateus* and *hoplomachos* are found along with a fourth instructor whose title is not preserved in any of our lists. It was pointed out above that in the first century the *paidotribai* often seem to iterate in office. The difference, I think, is due to the survival of official and unofficial texts. No *paidotribes* iterates in any official ephebic lists. *NEΩN*, the first to iterate, is named on unofficial lists only. In fact, he is named on a text dating from 106/5 B.C., the same year as *F.D.* III, 2 n. 25, but does not appear in the official list of *paideutai* for the year. Similarly, in the first century we find several unofficial ephebic texts naming the *paidotribes* alone or with one or two

⁴The instructors of the *mellepheboi*, who may have been only private instructors, were about the same age; *ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΝΘΟΥΣ ΛΑΜΙΤΤΡΕΥΣ* was 43 in the year he is attested as instructor; *ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝ ΘΗΜΑΚΕΥΣ* was 52 or more years of age.

⁵See above, note.

⁶Reinmuth, *Hesperia* 34 (1965) p. 268, first noticed the reductions in the number of instructors. But he counts the *hypopaidotribes* as one of the official instructors. The *hypopaidotribes*, however, never seems to appear in official ephebic texts (although most of our texts at this time are fragmentary).

hypopaidotribes.⁷ In addition, ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ is named as *paidotribes* on two dedications dating to 60/59 and 55/4 B.C. ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ is named in a dedication dating from 59/8 B.C. Two contemporaneous *paidotribai* are not otherwise attested until the Augustan period (*I.G.* II² 2996-7). It seems that unofficial *gymnasia* might have developed at Athens and that the title *paidotribes* was a generic title for an instructor, whether he was employed in the official *ephebeia* or ran his own school.⁸ In fact, two private *palaistrai* are known from the beginning of our period from lists of victors at the Theseia. Teams of children are attested as competing from the *palaistra* of a ΤΙΜΕΑΣ and a ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΣ. Although ΤΙΜΕΑΣ and ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΣ are not called *paidotribai*, and although such private *palaistra* are not attested after the 150s B.C., it is possible that ΝΕΩΝ also ran a private *palaistra*. In the first century B.C., therefore, the training of youths at Athens seems to have undergone considerable changes and a number of the individuals attested in the first century as *paidotribai* seem to have been unofficial or "private" instructors.⁹

Foreign instructors seem to have been rare at Athens. Three of the official trainers in 128/7 B.C. and one in 45/4 B.C. were non-Athenians. It is possible that the Athenians deliberately stopped hiring foreigners, but this would contradict the evidence that more and more foreigners were acquiring the

⁷In the archonship of ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ, ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ was *paidotribes* and ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ was *hypopaidotribes*. Under ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ III, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ has been "promoted" to *paidotribes* (note that ΦΙΛΙΟΣ continues to be named first, perhaps out of seniority) and a ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ has become *hypopaidotribes*. On the undated fragment *I.G.* II² 1966 ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ is named alone. His office is not specified although there is no room for the addition of the name of a *hypopaidotribes*. The position of the verb before his name suggests that this fragment dates to the time when ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΗΣ was still serving as *hypopaidotribes*.

⁸For this use of the term *paidotribes* cf. Theophrastus, *Char.* VII.

⁹On private *palaistrai* at Athens, cf. Pelekidis, *l'Éphébie attique*, p. 235. Roussel makes a distinction between texts discovered at Athens and texts discovered at the Piraeus (*DCA*, p. c. 190). He also noticed that only *paidotribai* named in the latter category seem to have iterated in office.

Athenian citizenship at this time, partly perhaps, through the *ephebeia* itself.¹⁰ If foreign instructors were avoided, this could be due to a desire to have new or potential Athenian citizens trained in civics by Athenians and not by foreigners. But *ANTIOXOΣ HPAKAEΩTHΣ*, a *paideutes* in 45/4 B.C. might be identified as *ANTIOXOΣ KOΛΩNHΘEN*, named as *paidotribes* in 37/6 B.C. It would seem that *ANTIOXOΣ* received the Athenian citizenship. Some of the apparently Athenian instructors who served in the late second or during the first century B.C., therefore, might be new citizens and not native Athenians.¹¹ This is consistent with the finding in Chapter 1 that the *ephebeia* was an important avenue for the acquisition of the Athenian citizenship.

The instructors were generally professionals, but the prosopographical evidence justifies assigning them to the governing class. Families of ephebic instructors, for example, are frequently attested in the *ephebeia*. This shows that these families belonged to the military or ephebic elite. Only one instructor, however, can be shown to belong to a family of the governing elite: *TIMΩN TIMAPXOY BOYTAΔHΣ*, *paidotribes* in 123/2 B.C. and *TIMΩN TIMAPXIDOT BOYTAΔHΣ*, *kosmetes* in 102/1 B.C. is probably the same individual.¹² He is the son of *TIMAPXIDHΣ*, archon in 136/5 B.C. His career offers the only known instance where a senior ephebic instructor went on to hold the prestigious and

¹⁰See Chapter 1.

¹¹The nomenclature for several instructors might suggest they were naturalized citizens. *ΟΜΟΛΗΧΟΣ*, instructor in 98/7 B.C., for example, is certainly not an Athenian in origin. Unfortunately the text does not record his demotic, and so we do not know if he had acquired Athenian citizenship. *ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝΟΣ ΤΡΙΚΟΡΤΕΙΟΣ* and *ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΤ*, instructors between 123/2-119/8 B.C. and in 106/5 B.C., respectively, might be related. The name *ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ* does not appear in Athenian prosopography before 123/2 B.C. *ΝΕΩΝ ΑΦΙΔΝΑΙΟΣ*, instructor between 111/0-104/3 B.C., might also be a new citizen; the name *ΝΕΩΝ* is rare at Athens until after 167/6 B.C. Similarly, *ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΣ*, instructor between 23/2 B.C. and DP XXV, also bears a name which is not common at Athens.

¹²The discrepancy in the patronymics must be due to a scribal error.

expensive liturgical position of *kosmetes*.¹³ The prosopography of the ephebic instructors, therefore, provides further evidence for stratification by class affiliation and status of office within the governing class at Athens. Belonging to the ranks of the military and cultural-educational elite, they only occasionally managed to share in the offices belonging to the liturgical and governing elites. The *kosmetai*, in contrast, belong to a more exclusive segment of the governing class. The office is liturgical in nature and the incumbents cannot be considered part of the actual board of ephebic instructors.¹⁴ Several *kosmetai*, in contrast to the ephebic instructors, belong to the governing elite.¹⁵ The average age of the *kosmetai* is between 55-60 years of age, making them the most senior in age and rank.

Relatives among the ephebic instructors, in particular, fathers and sons, are common. The *aphetes* in 128/7 B.C. is the son of the *aphetes* who served in c. 158 B.C. Similarly, the *aphetes* ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΚΑΛΧΗΔΟΝΟΣ (119/8 B.C.) could be related to the *paideutes* ΚΑΛΧΗΔΩΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ (106/5 B.C.). The *paidotribes* ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΟΜΝΗΘΕΝ (59/8 B.C.) might be related to the *paideutes* ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΕΙΚΑΔΙΟΥ (106/5 B.C.). The *hoplomachoi* ΝΙΚΑΔΑΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ (119/8 B.C.) and ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΝΙΚΑΔΑ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ (38/7 B.C.) also seem to be related. Finally, ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΟΥ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΥ (23/2 B.C.) is the son of ΦΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΦΡΕΑΠΠΙΟΥ (55/4 B.C.). Another family might have been active as athletic instructors as well. In the first century B.C., many of the

¹³ ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΦΥΛΑΣΙΟΣ was *paidotribes* in c. 150 B.C. His son, ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ served as *kosmetes* in 123/2 B.C.

¹⁴ In the fourth century B.C. the ten tribes each supplied a *sophronistes* who had to be over forty years of age. By 167/6 B.C. these *sophronistai* had been replaced by a single *kosmetes*. Although there is no explicit evidence for his office, the prosopographical evidence suggests that the *kosmetes* also had to be over forty years of age at this time.

¹⁵ ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΥ ΕΚ ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΝ, for example, was *kosmete* in 119/8 B.C. He became herald of the Areopagus in 101/0 B.C. and temple administrator in 99/8 B.C. ΜΕΝΕΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΗΜΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ served as *hierophantes* and *kosmetes*. His father was archon in 61/0 B.C. and herald of the Areopagus. ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΥ ΠΑΜΒΟΤΑΔΗΣ was thesmothete in 14/3 B.C. and *kosmetes* in c. 1 B.C.

preserved names are fragmentary, but some of the instructors bear the demotic *KOΛΩNHΘEN*. Unfortunately, most of the names are too fragmentary to determine identities or family connections.¹⁶ Several of these unknown individuals from Kolonos are named in private dedications and not official texts. This supports the suggestion that private *gymnasia* seem to have emerged late in the second century B.C. In the first century, one of these might have been run by a family from the deme Kolonos, perhaps that of *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΤΑΣΕΩΤ ΚΟΛΩNHΘEN*, who seems to have moved from Delos to Athens after 88/7 B.C. He is the son of a well-attested ephebic instructor on Delos in the second century B.C. If *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ* did move to Athens after the disruptions of 88/7 B.C., he might have opened his own *palaistra* at Athens and continued his profession. His son, *MENIEKOS*, continued to be associated with the Athenian ephebeia. This is the only attested connection between the ephebic instructors at Athens and on Delos.

B.2. Delos

On Delos no *paidotribes* is attested before 138/7 B.C., but the first extant list of ephebes dates from 144/3 B.C. (*I.D.* 2593).¹⁷ All of the known instructors are named in dedications by members of the ephebic body at Delos. There are no official lists of ephebes on Delos as there are at Athens. The chronological listing of the instructors on Delos shows that there is no apparent order or sequence to the careers of individual instructors. A total of nine instructors are known and three of these are attested for just one year (*ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ*, *ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ* and *ΝΙΚΗΠΑΤΟΣ*). The careers of the remaining instructors all overlap, with the result that all six instructors seem to have had their *floruit* in the last decades of the

¹⁶In a few cases, such as with *ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ ΣΤΑΣΕΩΤ ΚΟΛΩNHΘEN* in *I.G.* II² 2989, the name of a family relative might belong in the lacuna.

¹⁷A decree dating from 148/7 B.C. honours *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ* as a *didaskalos* and for his service over several years (*I.D.* 1503). This suggests that he served in this capacity from early in the Athenian administration. A single ephebe is also known from 148/7 B.C. (*I.D.* 1952) for his victory at the Theseia.

second century. From the available evidence it is also clear that their careers were considerably longer than those of instructors at Athens:

ΝΙΚΙΑΣ	138/7-118/7	20
ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΣ	136/5-123/2	13
ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ	133/2-?	?
ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ	133/2-95/4	38
ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΣ	123/2-92/1	31
ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ	104/3-95/4 (Athens c. 80 B.C.)	9 (24)

The careers of ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ and ΝΙΚΗΠΑΤΟΣ are less well-attested, but it would be wrong to assume that they were necessarily shorter than the careers of the other instructors. These two instructors are first named c. 100 B.C., and it is reasonable to suppose that the events of 88/7 B.C. and the paucity of epigraphical evidence for the first century B.C. accounts for the lack of testimony regarding their careers. Also, ΦΙΛΟΚΛΗΣ, as was pointed out above, seems to have moved to Athens. He is attested as a *paidotribes* at Athens c. 80 B.C. This would give him an active career of at least twenty-four years of service on both Delos and Athens. The other careers differ significantly from those at Athens. At Delos several *paidotribai* had overlapping careers. At Athens no *paidotribes* is known to have iterated in office on the evidence of the *official* ephebic lists. In the second century B.C., only one *paidotribes* at Athens is attested over several years and he is only named in private dedications.¹⁸ In the first century B.C., a few other *paidotribai* are attested more than once at Athens, but they, too, are named on only private dedications. Like their counterparts on Delos, however, these Athenian *paidotribai* seem to be private instructors.

Several *paidotribai* on Delos are named together as a fixed pair. Other instructors, who are always named alone, are sometimes said to be masters of their own *palaistra* and are named in texts celebrating a victory in ephebic games. Roussel had already noticed that there was no pattern to the order of the instructors on Delos and concluded that on Delos the title *paidotribes* was a

¹⁸ ΝΕΩΝ (see above).

generic term for any *paideutes*, including a private owner of a school. If this was the case, Roussel observed, it would be reasonable to expect that in any particular year several *paidotribai* would be functioning on Delos. *I.D.* 1949, which was discovered after Roussel's analysis, confirms his expectation for, dating to 133/2 B.C., it brings to three the number of *paidotribai* attested for that year.

It seems certain, therefore, that several private *palaistrai* functioned on Delos. Whether there was an official *ephebic* corps with appointed or official instructors remains unclear.¹⁹ We have already observed that over the period from c. 140 to c. 90 B.C. several pairs of *paidotribai* are regularly named together. In addition, three other instructors, *NIKIAΣ*, *ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ* and *ΝΙΚΗΠΑΤΟΣ* are sometimes called simply *paidotribai* and sometimes *paidotribai* who ran their own *palaistra*. In 133/2 B.C., finally, three *paidotribai* are named, *ΣΩΤΑΔΗΣ* and *ΣΤΑΣΕΑΣ* together in a single text, and *ΝΙΚΙΑΣ* in a different inscription. In this year *ΝΙΚΙΑΣ* is also associated with a younger category of student, the *symphetai*. It is possible, then, that on Delos there was an official *ephebeia* for which two *paidotribai* were appointed. In addition to these, several private athletic schools for students of all ages were run by men who were also called *paidotribai*.²⁰ These latter instructors are sometimes named on texts commemorating victories by the ephebes. Perhaps the *palaistrai* competed with one another at the games as at Athens.

The Delian instructors, to conclude, show several distinct differences from the official instructors at Athens. At Athens we find a high turnover of staff, relatively infrequent iteration and shorter careers. On Delos, on the other hand,

¹⁹Ferguson refers to an official Delian corps (*HA*, p. 409). On p. 384 he seems to indicate that he believes the board of *paidotribai* on Delos consisted of two instructors.

²⁰Before 167/6 B.C. the Delian inscriptions record several *palaistrophulakes* (*I.D.* 372 A98, c. 200 B.C.). These are not mentioned during the Athenian period. It remains unclear whether the "unofficial" *paidotribai* owned their own *palaistra* or were appointed to oversee a public one. Perhaps in 167/6 B.C. the athletic facilities on Delos became the property of the Athenian cleruchy.

several instructors are attested as serving concurrently in the short period from c. 140 to c. 90 B.C. But one similarity does emerge from this comparison. The evidence for the career of *NEON* and *MENIEKOS* at Athens show the most similarity to the pattern we determined for Delos. The title *paidotribes* at Athens seems to have acquired in the first century B.C. the generic sense which it already had on Delos after 167/6 B.C. Only *paidotribai* or instructors named on official texts at Athens can readily be assumed to be official or state-appointed instructors. The decline of the Athenian *ephebeia* after 86/5 B.C. is reflected in the composition of the board of instructors and in the apparent proliferation of private schools of athletic instruction. This process had been anticipated on Delos after c. 140 B.C. and coincided with the decline of the Athenian cleruchy on Delos.

Appendix C

Undated Archons

Appendix A lists only those magistrates who could be dated to a particular year on the basis of evidence such as fixed synchronisms or the tribal cycles of priests of the prytany-secretaries. Over one-half of all the attested magistrates for this period, however, cannot be dated in such a precise manner. In this appendix the names of the remaining undated archons are listed in alphabetical order. The most recent editions of the texts are provided and the years proposed by previous scholars are indicated. In a few cases prosopographical evidence, such as the careers of individuals named on a text with one of these archons, allows a narrowing of the range of years available for a particular archon.¹ Archons named with other magistrates can only date to a year with list vacancies for all the associated magistrates.² Unfortunately there are few vacant years to which most of the archons listed below could not be assigned on the basis of the list vacancies. The following years have no known archon:

146/5 or 142/1
 141/0
 120/19
 88/7 (*anarchia*? See Appendix A.2)
 74/3-72/1
 71/0 or 64/3
 70/69-65/4

¹See ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΕΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, for example, and [.....]S (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 96, pp. 268-9) below.

²ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ (*I.D.* 1580), for example, must date to between 112/1 and 92/1 B.C. Only 105/4 B.C. is available and I have entered him in that year in the *Fasti*.

32/1-31/0
 30/29 or 26/5
 29/8-27/6
 26/5 or 23/2
 25/4-24/3
 21/0
 19/8 or 18/7
 10/9-14/5 A.D.

There are twelve vacant archonships before 32/1 B.C. and thirty-five between 32/1 and 14 A.D. To fill these years the names of about thirty-five archons remain undated (some of the archon names listed below are fragmentary and might actually belong to known archons already dated to a particular year).

-
1. ΑΝΑΞΑΓΟΡΑΣ [] ΓΟΝΝΙ ΔΕ ΑΝΑΞΑΓΟΡΟΥ (I.G. Π² 1724): Graindor (*Chronologie*, n. 20) dates him to 9/8 B.C. or after that year.
 2. ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΔΗΣ (I.G. Π² 2988): Kirchner dates this archon to s. Π/I a. Raubitschek, "Sylleia," p. 54, dates to the first century B.C. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List*, p. 204, is uncommittal although most recently Meritt, *Historia* 26 (1971) p. 187, dates him to 105/4 B.C.
 3. ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ (I.G. Π² 1039): Dated to 80/79 by Notopoulos (*Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 24). In the archonship of ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ, ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡ was *epimeletes* of Delos and his son gymnasiarch. ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ was archon when the Sylleia were celebrated which provides a window between 83/2-78/7 B.C. Only 80/79-79/8 B.C. are vacant. I.G. Π² 1338 provides a relative sequence for the archons ΑΙΣΧΡΑΙΟΣ and ΣΕΛΕΤΚΟΣ. In addition I.G. Π² 3489 implies that ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ succeeded ΣΕΛΕΤΚΟΣ. Notopoulos fits these three archons into a gap of three years between 78/7-76/5 B.C. (ibid., p. 25). Note that if ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ is dated to 79/8 B.C., his immediate successor, [.....]ΟΥ, could be collated with ΑΙΣΧΡΑΙΟΣ. This would create a vacant archonship and all of the archons ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ, ΑΙΣΧΡΑΙΟΣ, ΣΕΛΕΤΚΟΣ and ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ must "float" within a gap of five years. Note that H. Mattingly has recently redated I.G. Π² 1039 to 65/4 B.C. (*Chiron* 9, 1979, pp. 166-7).
 4. ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ (I.G. Π² 2997, F.D. III, 2 n. 63): This archon dates to Delphic priesthood XXV, after ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ

and within the lifetime of ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 17).

5. ΑΡΕΙΟΣ ΔΩΡΙΩΝΟΣ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 2338, 3173): Graindor (*Chronologie*, n. 4) dates this archon to between 27/6-18/7 B.C. See [...]ΟΥ (Agora XV, n. 289) below.
6. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔ[ΗΜΟΣ (Agora XV, n. 302): dated to c 1 B.C. but note ΑΡΙΣΤΟΞΕΝΟΣ (55/4 B.C.) and ΑΡΙΣΤ[] (38/7 A.D.).
7. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ (I.D. 2609): This archon must fall between 165/4 B.C. and 147/6 B.C. Dinsmoor had dated him to 149/8 (*The Archons of Athens*, 268) and then to 153/2 (*The Athenian Archon List*, 192). Most recently Meritt has dated him to 154/3 (*Historia* 26, 1977, pp. 161-91).
8. ΑΡΙΣΤ[]Ν ΝΕ[]ΤΕΡΟΣ (I.G. Π² 1733): dated by Graindor to *init. s. I. p.* (*Chronologie*, n. 24), he seems to date to the year after [] [] ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ.
9. Δ[.....] (Agora XV, n. 265): Notopoulos, *ibid.*, 25, dates to 74/3-63/2 B.C.
10. ΔΕ[] (I.D. 1741): One of the Roman Hermaistai named in this list reappears c. 100 B.C. as a *magister*. Presumably this archon must date sometime before that time. Because there are no known archons whose names begin in ΔΕ, the restoration is suspect.
11. ΔΗ[] (Hesperia 13, 1944, n. 15, pp. 262-3): Meritt dates to the archonship of ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ (49/8), but note also ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ (50/49). Other restorations are also possible and the text remains unattributable.
12. ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ (I.G. Π² 1723): 9/8 B.C. or later, depending on date for Julius Nikanor (see Dow, *Hesperia* 3, 1934, pp. 162-7, and Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 28).
13. ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ (I.G. Π² 3176): Dated by Graindor to after 9/8 B.C. (*Chronologie*, n. 21), ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ and ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 3120) fall within the life-long priesthood of ΖΗΝΩΝ ΑΕΤΚΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ. [] []ΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 4308) falls within the life-time of ΖΗΝΩΝ although not necessarily within his priesthood.

14. ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ (*Hesperia* 10, 1941, n. 27, p. 62): Meritt dates to *fin. s.* Π/init. s. I., but if the general date is correct, 112/1 B.C. seems to be the only likely year. This text would then be the first to mention *mellepheboi*.
15. ΕΠΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ: This archon is not named on any extant inscriptions. The earliest year to which he could date is 152/1 B.C. (see Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 261).
16. ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΑΕΤΚΟΝΟΕΥΣ (*I.G.* Π² 4714): 27/6 B.C. or shortly after (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 1).
17. ΖΗΝΙΩΝ (*I.G.* Π² 1334): Kirchner dates this archon to *fin. s. II?*, Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, p. 261 to c. 78 B.C. and Notopoulos, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p. 25, to 74/3-63/2 B.C.
18. Η[] (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 12, p. 209): Dated to *aet. Aug.* by Traill, there is no known archon whose name begins with this letter. Traill notes that Π[] and ΙΙ[] are also possible readings.
19. ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ (*I.G.* Π² 1343, *Hesperia* 36, 1967, n. 23, pp. 94-5, *Hesperia* 49, 1980, pp. 40-1): The earliest year for this archon is 36/5 B.C. although he could also date to 35/4 or to after 34/3 B.C. Note that []ΝΕΥΣ ΚΥΔΑ[] might also date to 36/5 or to 35/4 B.C. if *I.G.* Π² 1051 dates to 34/3 B.C. (see Appendix A.2). I tentatively date ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ to 36/5 B.C.
20. ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ (*I.G.* Π² 1340): Notopoulos dates to 74/3-63/2 (*Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 25). See ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ below.
21. ΛΑΚΩΝ (*I.G.* Π² 1069): between 9/8 B.C. and 13/4 A.D. (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 26).
22. ΜΕΝΝΕΑΣ ΖΩΠΥΡΟΥ (*I.G.* Π² 1718): 36/7-18/7 B.C. and probably earlier than later (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 2).
23. ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ (*I.G.* Π² 1095): Koehler dates to *med. s. I a. Chr. n.* and makes him the son of ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ (Π) (PA 10098). He should then be equated with the following archon.
24. ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΟΥ (*I.G.* Π² 1340): Notopoulos dates to 75/4-63/2 (*ibid.*, p. 25). This archon must date to after ΘΕΟΞΕΝΟΣ (see above).
25. ΜΙΚΙΩΝ (*I.D.* 1899): In Appendix A.2 he is dated to 152/1 B.C. on

the basis of the cycle of the priests of the Great Gods on Delos. The year 96/5 B.C., which would also be possible, is filled by []ΚΡΑΤΗΣ.

26. ΝΙΚΙΑΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΩΝΟΣ ΑΘΜΟΝΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 3175): Graindor dates to 10/9-2 A.D. (*Chronologie*, n. 2).

27. ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΝΙΚΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΡ (I.G. Π² 1727, F.D. III, 2 n. 64): This archon dates to the lifetime of ΕΥΚΛΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΤ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ, after 11/0 B.C. and before ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΕΞ ΟΙΟΥ. He falls within Delphic Priesthood XXIV. ΘΕΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΣΙΟΣ was *paredros* of the *polemarchos* in c. 30 B.C. He would have been about 50 years of age in 11/0 B.C.

28. ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ (GDI 2089): Daux (*Delphes*, p. 626) says that this man, named as a general in a text from Delphi, could be an Athenian archon dating to c. 145 B.C. Sarikakis lists him as a hoplite general instead. It is clear that of the vacant archon years for this period (152/1, 151/0 and 146/5), only 146/5 could be reserved for ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ. Sarikakis redates *Hesperia* 15 (1956) n. 48, p. 221, to the middle of the second century B.C. and restores the name of the hoplite general to ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΟΥΡΥΝΕΥΣ (*The Hoplite General at Athens*, p. 87). Perhaps the ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ from Delphi should be equated with this ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ. The most important aspect of the Delphic text is that if ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ is in fact a hoplite general, this would be the first occasion when the name of the hoplite general is employed in a quasi-eponymous fashion. Sarikakis attributes the mention of the hoplite general at Delphi in place of the archon as would be expected to the prominence of the hoplite general at this time. ΞΕΝΟΚΛΗΣ, therefore, is either an unattested Athenian archon mistakenly called a general (Daux) or an Athenian hoplite general named in place of the archon (Sarikakis, *ibid.*, p. 86-7).

29. ΞΕΝΩΝ ΜΕΝΝΕΟΥ ΦΑΥΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 1722): 9/8 B.C. or soon after (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 16). ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΚΙΝΕΟΥ ΚΥΔΑΘΗΝΑΙΕΥΣ was a *prytanis* in 19/8 or 18/7 B.C. and a *thesmothetes* in the archonship of ΞΕΝΩΝ. Similarly, ΑΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΑΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ, archon in 12/1 B.C., was herald of the Areopagus under ΞΕΝΩΝ.

30. ΠΑΜ[] ΓΟΝΩΙ ΔΕ [] ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 1725): This archon must date after 9/8 B.C. Graindor equates him with ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ (*Chronologie*, n. 32, A.D. 26/7). Note that a ΠΑΜΜΕΝΗΣ is also active at the time of Augustus.

31. ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΕΥΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ (I.G. Π² 1730): Between 9/8

- and 22/3 B.C. (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 28). Because ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΣ ΗΡΟΔΙΚΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΗΦΙΣΙΟΣ served in c. 40 B.C. as a treasurer of the *boule* (Agora XV, n. 287) and as *thesmothetes* under ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ, I.G. Π² 1730 should probably date earlier than later in this period.
32. ΠΟΛΥΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΚΡΙΤΟΥ ΑΖΗΝΙΕΥΣ (I.G. Π² 3120): Between 10/9 B.C.-A.D. 13/4 (Graindor, *Chronologie*, n. 25). See ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ.
33. ΠΟΛΤΑΙΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ (I.G. Π² 3177): It is uncertain that this man is eponymous archon but Graindor restores the text to read [ἐπὶ] ΠΟΛΤΑΙΝΟΥ ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΥ [ἄρχοντος] (*Athènes sous Auguste*, p. 146).
34. ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ (I.G. Π² 2991a = *Hesperia* 3, 1934, n. 64, p. 69): Notopoulos dates to 74/3-63/2 (*Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 25). A ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ ΚΗΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΙΤΕΑΙΟΣ was ephebe between 80/77 B.C. If he is the archon, I.G. Π² 2991a would date to after 68/7 B.C.
35. ΦΩΚΙΩΝ (I.G. Π² 1015): The prytany-secretary for this year is ΕΥΑΝΔΡΟΣ (tribe unknown). Koehler dated the archon to *fin. s. II*. Meritt dates him to 121/0, making the secretary come from Tribe I (Erechtheus). In Appendix A, ΕΥΜΑΧΟΣ is entered in 121/0 B.C. Note that a ΦΩΚΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΤΕΥΣ was a gymnasiarch on Delos in 155/4 B.C.
36. []ΔΗΣ (I.G. Π² 1336): Could be either ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΔΗΣ (136/5), ΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΔΗΣ (127/6) or ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ (104/3)
37. [...]ΕΙΟΥΣ (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 17): Tracy notes that of the known archons this must be either ΑΡΓΕΙΟΣ or ΜΗΔΕΙΟΣ.
38. [...]ΙΟΥΣ (*Hesperia* Supplement XV, n. 17): Tracy notes that the dotted *iota* could be *eta* or *pi* as well. The archon must date after the preceding name ([...]Ε [ΙΟΥΣ, above).
39. []ΚΟΜΗΔΗΣ (*Hesperia* 44, 1975, pp. 207-23): Dated to 10/9-3/2 B.C. by Graindor (*Athènes sous Auguste*, pp. 142-4).
40. []ΜΟΣ (I.G. Π² 1016): The prytany-secretary is ΣΥ[]. Koehler restored the archon's name to ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ (126/5 B.C.). But in Koehler's day ΕΥΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ (185/4) and his secretary ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΟΣ were unknown. The name of the secretary for ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ (179/8) is not known but ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΧΜΟΣ (159/8) may be ruled out (his secretary was ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ). Other possible archons are ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣ (92/1?), ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ (61/0) and several others later

than this. The attribution of this fragment to ΔΙΟΤΙΜΟΣ is not justified since we do not know that the secretary in his year had a name beginning in Σ. The fragment could be reexamined. From Lolling's drawing reproduced by Koehler, the *upsilon* seems certain (and no other letter is suggested). But then, why should the *upsilon* have been dotted? See Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens*, p. 273 and *The Athenian Archon List*, p. 198 and Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. xxxii, for earlier discussion.

41. []OR (I.G. II² 1039): See above on ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ.
42. [...]OR (Agora XV, n. 289): dated to c. 30/20, could be ΑΡΕΙ]ΟΡ? Note also that ΑΙΞΙΝΗΣ ΑΙΞΙΝΟΥ ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ, *prytanis* in c. 60 and c. 50 B.C., could be [.....] ΑΙΞ[] (tribe X), the treasurer named in Agora XV, n. 289. So too, ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ Ο[] ΦΑΛΗΡΕΥΣ, was *prytanis* in c. 60 B.C. and on this list. This prosopographical evidence suggests that the 40/30 B.C. might be a more likely date.
43. [.....]Σ (*Hesperia* 30, 1961, n. 96, pp. 268-9): Only three known archons can fill this lacuna: ΜΙΚΙΩΝ (152/1 B.C.), ΞΕΝΩΝ (133/2 B.C.) and ΙΑΣΩΝ (125/4 B.C.). One of the ephebes is named ΣΙΜΩΝ. Α ΣΙΜΩΝ ΣΙΜΩΝΟΣ was a pythaist *pais* in 106/5 B.C. His father must be the herald of the Areopagus in 98/7 B.C. If he was an ephebe in 133/2 B.C. he would have been 53 years of age when he was herald, if in 125/4 B.C. he would have been 45 years of age. The earliest year, 152/1 B.C., is less likely. Unfortunately none of the other ephebes on this dedication (there are four names without patronymics or demotics) can be identified. The identification of the ephebe named ΣΙΜΩΝ with the herald of the Areopagus, therefore, is only tentative.
44. [] [] ΣΟΤΝΙΕΥΣ (I.G. II² 1732): dated by Graindor to *init. s. I. p.?* (*Chronologie*, n. 22). See []ΝΙΕΥΣ below.
45. [] [] ΣΦΗΤΤΙΟΣ (I.G. II² 1733): Dated by Graindor to *init. s. I. p.?* (*Chronologie*, n. 23). See also ΑΡΙΣΤ]ΩΝ above. The dates of three related inscriptions can be arranged in a relative sequence on the basis of prosopographical evidence:

I.G. II ² 1962	ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ	ephebe
Agora XV, n. 303	ΑΠΟΛΛΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ	<i>prytanis</i>
	ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ	<i>prytanis</i>
	ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΦΑΤΕΥΣ	<i>prytanis</i>

<i>I.G.</i> Π ² 1733	ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΣ ΦΑΤΕΤΣ	secretary
<i>I.G.</i> Π ² 1729	ΠΑΜΦΙΛΟΣ ΦΑΤΕΤΣ	<i>thesmothetes</i>

According to this sequence *Agora* XV, n. 303 probably precedes *I.G.* Π² 1733 and 1729. If the individuals named as *prytaneis* were iterating, however, this sequence could be reversed.

46. [] [] *OR MEATEΤΣ* (*I.G.* Π² 4308): This archon is not listed by Graindor and does not appear in any of the standard lists. The text is discussed by Graindor in *Athènes sous Auguste*, 211. The archon must date sometime to the reign of Augustus. See ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ.
 47. [] *ΙΟΣ* (*I.D.* 2636):
 48. [.....] (*Hesperia* 26, 1957, n. 98, pp. 260-5): The date is uncertain. But the reference to Augustus gives a *terminus post quem* of 27 B.C. Graindor dates to near this year. Stamires suggests 22/1 B.C., the eve of Augustus' second visit to Athens, as more likely. The text is written in *stoichedon* which rules out ΑΠΟΛΗΞΙΣ (21/0 B.C.).
 49. [] *NETΣ ΚΥΔΑ*[] (*I.G.* Π² 1051): This name might be that of an archon (see Chapter 6), in which case his archonship must antedate the year of the decree. I restore ΑΠΟΛΛΟΓΕΝΗΣ (34/3 B.C.) as the archon in whose year the decree was passed. The only available years for [] *NETΣ ΚΥΔΑ*[] would then be 36/5 or 35/4 B.C. He may tentatively be dated to 35/4 B.C. with ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ in 36/5 B.C. But ΘΕΟΠΕΙΘΗΣ could date to after 34/3 B.C. in which case 36/5 B.C. would also be available for this archon.
 50. [] *NIETΣ* (*Hesperia* 51, 1982, n. 14, pp. 210-1): The letters form part of the demotic for the archon. Possible demotics are ΑΖΗΝΙΕΤΣ, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΤΣ, ΑΘΗΝΙΕΤΣ, ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΤΣ and ΣΟΡΝΙΕΤΣ. Traill dates the text to *aet. Rom.* Note that there is an archon [] [] ΣΟΡΝΙΕΤΣ from the time of Augustus (*I.G.* Π² 1732).
-

Bibliography

- Accame, S. *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*, Rome, 1946.
- Badian, E. "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," *AJAH* 1, 1976, pp. 105-28.
- Baslez, M.-F. "Déliens et étrangers domiciliés à Délos: 166-55," *REG* 89, 1976, pp. 343-60.
- Benjamin, A. and Raubitschek A.E. "Arae Augusti," *Hesperia* 28, 1959, pp. 65-85.
- Bengtson, H. *Griechische Geschichte*, Munich, 1971.
- . *Zur Geschichte des Brutus*, Munich, 1970.
- Berchem, D. van, "Les Italiens d'Argos et le déclin de Délos," *BCH* 86, 1962, pp. 305-15.
- Bernhardt, R. "Athen, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien," *AM* 90, 1975, pp. 233-7.
- Bickerman, F.J. *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London, 1968.
- Boethius, A. *Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athens und Delphi*, Upsala, 1918.
- Bottomore, T.B. *Elites and Society*, Middlesex, England, 1966.
- Bowersock, G. *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965.
- Bradley, K. "The Social History of the Roman Elite: A Perspective," *EMC* 28, 1984, pp. 481ff.
- Brinton, C. *The Anatomy of Revolution*, New York, 1952.
- Broneer, O. "Greek Inscriptions of Roman Date," *AJAH* 36, 1932, pp. 395-7.

- Broughton, T.R.S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, New York, 1951.
- Bruneau, P. *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970.
- . "Contribution à l'histoire urbaine de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale," *BCH* 92, 1968, pp. 635-709.
- Cargill, J. "I.G. II² 1 and the Athenian Kleruchy on Samos," *GRBS* 24, 1983, pp. 321-32.
- Cary, M. *A History of the Greek World from 323-146 B.C.*, London, 1970.
- Clairmont, C.W. *Patrios Nomos: Public Burials in Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, Oxford, 1983.
- Clinton, K. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia, 1974.
- Colin, G. *Le culte d'Apollon Pythien à Athènes*, Paris, 1905.
- Crawford, M. "Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century B.C." *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, ed. C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge, 1978.
- Culley, G.R. "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica, I.G. II² 1035," *Hesperia* 44, 1975, pp. 207-23 (with *Hesperia* 46, 1977, pp. 282-98).
- Daux, G. *Delphes au IIe et au Ie siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine*, Paris, 1936.
- . *Chronologie delphique*, Paris, 1943.
- Davies, J. *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford, 1971.
- Day, J. *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*, New York, 1942.
- Deininger, J. *Die politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland: 217-86 v. Chr.*, Berlin, 1971.
- Dinsmoor, W.B. *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, New York, 1939.

- — — — —. *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- — — — —. "The Monument of Agrippa at Athens," *AJA* 24, 1920, p. 83.
- Dow, S. "Archons of the Period after Sulla," *Hesperia* Supplement VIII, 1949, pp. 116-25.
- — — — —. "A Leader of the Anti-Roman Party in Athens in 88 B.C.," *CP* 37, 1942, pp. 311-14.
- — — — —. *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, Athens, 1937.
- — — — —. "The Lists of Athenian *Archontes*," *Hesperia* 3, 1934, pp. 140-90.
- Dumont, A. *Essai sur l'éphébie attique*, Paris, 1875-6.
- Ehrenberg, V. "Legatus Augusti et Tiberii," *Studies Presented to D.M. Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday*, II, eds. G.E. Mylonas and D. Raymond, St. Louis, 1953, pp. 438-44.
- Feaver, D. "Historical Developments in the Priesthoods of Athens," *YCS* 15, 1957, pp. 122-58.
- Ferguson, W.S. *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge, Mass., 1932.
- — — — —. *Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1911 (reprint ed. New York, 1969).
- — — — —. "Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents I-III," *Klio* 7, 1907, pp. 213-40; 8, 1908, pp. 338-55; 9, 1909, 304-40.
- Finley, M.I. *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 1983.
- Fisher, R.S. "A New Priest of Sarapis on Delos," *ZPE* 59, 1985, pp. 117-8.
- Flacelière, R. "Cicéron à Delphes," *BCH*, Supplement IV, 1977, pp. 159-60.
- Follett, S. *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris, 1976.

Fraenkel, F. "Namenwesen," *RE* 16, 1611-1648.

Geagan, D.J. "Imperial Visits: The Epigraphical Evidence," *Transactions of the International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, 3-9 October, 1982*, Athens, 1984, pp. 69-78.

———. "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 52, 1983, pp. 155-72.

———. "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture: 86 B.C. - A.D. 267," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. II.7.1, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin, 1979, pp. 371-437.

———. "The Third Hoplite-Generalship of Antipatros of Phlya," *AJP* 100, 1979, pp. 59-68.

———. "Ordo Areopagitarum Atheniensium," *Phoros: Tribute to B.D. Meritt*, eds. D.W. Bradeen and M.F. McGregor, Locust Valley, New York, 1974.

———. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, *Hesperia* Supplement XII, Princeton, 1967.

Giovannini, A. *Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au IIe siècle avant J.C.*, Basel, 1978.

Graindor, P. *Hérode Atticus et sa famille*. Cairo, 1930.

———. *Athènes sous Auguste*, Cairo, 1927.

———. *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'empire*, Brussels, 1922.

Gruen, E. "Rome and Rhodes in the Second Century B.C." *CQ* 69, 1975, pp. 58-81.

———. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley, 1974.

Guarducci, M. "Una nuova iscrizione di Delo," *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 14-16, 1952-4, pp. 175-84.

Guillaume, P. *Démographie historique*, Paris, 1970.

- Habicht, Ch. "Eine Liste von Hieropoioi aus dem Jahre des Archon Andreas," *AM* 97, 1982, pp. 173-84.
- . *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen, 1982.
- . "Vom gegenwärtigen Standard Wissenschaftliche Bemühen um eine Prosopographie der Athener," *Vestigia* 30, 1979, pp. 147-52.
- . "Zur Geschichte Athens in der Zeit Mithridates VI," *Chiron* 6, 1976, pp. 127-35.
- . "Beitraege zur Prosopographie der alt-griechischen Welt," *Chiron* 2, 1972, pp. 104-34.
- Hansen, M.H. "Rhetores and Strategoi in Fourth Century Athens," *GRBS* 24, 1983, pp. 151-80.
- . "The Athenian Politicians, 403-322 B.C.," *GRBS* 24, 1983, pp. 33-55.
- Helley, B. "Grandes dignitaires Attalides en Thessalie à l'époque de la 3e guerre de Macédoine," *AAA* 13, 1980, pp. 296-301.
- Hignett, C. *A History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford, 1952.
- Hollingsworth, T.H. *Historical Demography*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1969.
- Homolle, Th. "Les Romains à Délos," *BCH* 8, 1884, pp. 75-158.
- Jocelyn, H.D. "The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers," *Bulletin of the Rylands Library* 59, 1977, pp. 323-66.
- Jones, A.H.M. "The Greeks in the Roman Empire," *DOP* 17, 1963, pp. 3-19.
- . *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford, 1940.
- Jones, C.P. "Three Foreigners in Attica," *Phoenix* 32, 1978, pp. 222-34.
- Kaimio, J. *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki, 1979.
- Kapetanopoulos, E. "Some Remarks on the Athenian *Prytaneis*," *Ancient World* 4, 1981, pp. 5-15.

- _____. "Apolexis ex Oiou," *Athenaeum* 1974, pp. 343-7.
- _____. "The Early Expansion of Roman Citizenship into Athens during the first part of the Empire: 200 B.C. - A.D. 70," Dissertation, Yale University, 1964.
- Kirchner, J. *Prosopographia Attica*, Leipzig, 1901-3.
- Kuntz, D.C. and Boardman, J. *Greek Burial Customs*, New York, 1971.
- Lacey, W.K. *The Family in Classical Greece*, London, 1968.
- Laidlaw, W.A. *A History of Delos*, Oxford, 1933.
- Larsen, J.A.O. "The Policy of Augustus in Greece," *AC* 1, 1958, pp. 123-30.
- Lewis, D.M. "The Chronology of the Athenian New Style Coinage," *NC* 2, 1969, pp. 275-300.
- MacKendrick, P. *The Athenian Aristocracy from 332 B.C. to 31 B.C.*, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.
- Mahaffy, J.P. *The Silver Age of Greece*, London, 1887.
- Mattingly, H.B. "Some Third Mint Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Coinage," *JHS* 91, 1971, pp. 85-93.
- Meritt, B.D. "Athenian Archons: 347/6-148/7 B.C." *Historia* 26, 1977, pp. 161-91.
- _____. and Traill, J. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. XV: Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*, Princeton, 1974.
- Mitchell, B.R. *European Historical Statistics: 1750-1970*, New York, 1975.
- Mossé, Cl. *Athens in Decline: 404-86 B.C.* (trans. J. Stewart), London, 1973.
- Nicolet, C. "Prosopographie et histoire sociale: Rome et Italie à l'époque républicaine," *Annales* 25, 1970, pp. 1209-28.
- Notopoulos, J. "Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire," *Hesperia* 18, 1949, pp. 1-57.

- . "On the Method of Selecting Archons in the Roman Empire," *AJP* 65, 1944, pp. 149-66.
- Oliver, J. "Roman Emperors and Athens," *Historia* 30, 1981, pp. 412-23.
- . "From Gennetai to Curiales," *Hesperia* 49, 1980, pp. 30-56.
- . "A Peripatetic Constitution," *JHS* 100, 1980, pp. 199-201.
- . "Livia as Artemis Boulaia at Athens," *CQ* 60, 1965, p. 179.
- . *Democratia, the Gods and the Free World*, Baltimore, 1960.
- . "The Descendants of Asinius Pollio," *AJP* 68, 1947, pp. 147-60.
- Orme, B. *Anthropology for Archaeologists: An Introduction*, New York, 1981.
- Osborne, M.J. "Athenian Grants of Citizenship after 229 B.C." *Ancient Society* 7, 1976, pp. 107-25.
- Owens, E.J. "Increasing Roman Domination of Greece in the Years 48-27 B.C." *Latomus* 35, 1976, pp. 718-29.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, A. *Délos: recherches urbaines sur une ville antique*, Paris, 1981.
- Papalas, A.J. "Studies in Roman Athens: 29 B.C.-A.D. 180," Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1969.
- Pelekidis, C. *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 av. J.C.*, Paris, 1962.
- Peppas-Delmouzou, D. "A Statue Base for Augustus," *AJP* 100, 1979, pp. 125-32.
- Pritchett, W.K. and Meritt, B.D. *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, New York, 1940.
- Raubitschek, A.E. "Brutus in Athens," *Phoenix* 11, 1957, pp. 1-11.
- . "The Brutus Statue in Athens," *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigraphia greca e latina*, Rome, 1959, pp. 15-21.

- _____. "The New Homer," *Hesperia* 23, 1954, pp. 317ff.
- _____. "Sylleia," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A.C. Johnson*, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton, Princeton, 1951, pp. 49-57.
- _____. "Phaidros and his Roman Pupils," *Hesperia* 18, 1949, pp. 96-103.
- _____. "Octavia's Deification at Athens," *TAPA* 77, 1946, pp. 146-50.
- _____. "The Priestess of Pandrosus," *AJA* 49, 1945, pp. 434-5.
- Reinmuth, O. "The Attic Archons Named Apolexis," *BCH* 90, 1966, pp. 93-101.
- _____. "An Ephebic Text of ca. 43/2 B.C.," *Hesperia* 34, 1965, pp. 255-62.
- _____. "The Ephebate and Citizenship at Athens," *TAPA* 79, 1948, pp. 211-31.
- _____. *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebeia*, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1929.
- Rhodes, P.J. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981.
- _____. "Ephebi, Bouleutai and the Population of Athens," *ZPE* 38, 1980, pp. 197-201.
- Robert, L. "Les monnaies et un décret de Sestos," *RN* 15, 1973, pp. 43-53.
- _____. "Amphithaleis," *HSCP* Supplement 1, 1940, pp. 509-19.
- Roussel, P. "Remarques sur quelques inscriptions trouvées à l'agora d'Athènes," 58, 1934, pp. 91-100.
- _____. "La population de Délos à la fin de IIe siècle av. J.C.," *BCH* 55, 1931, pp. 438-49.
- _____. *Délos: colonie athénienne*, Paris, 1916.
- _____. "Les Athéniens mentionnés sur les inscriptions de Délos," *BCH*

32, 1908, pp. 306-66.

Rostovtzeff, M.I. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1972.

— — — — —. "Rhodes, Delos and Hellenistic Commerce," *Cambridge Ancient History*, eds. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock and M.P. Charlesworth, Cambridge, 1965, Vol. VIII, chap. xx, pp. 619-67.

Ruschenbusch, E. "Die soziale Herkunft der Epheben um 330," *ZPE* 35, 1979, pp. 173-76.

— — — — —. "Die soziale Zusammensetzung des Rates der 500 in Athen um 4. Jhdt." *ZPE* 35, 1979, pp. 177-80.

Samuel, A.E. *Greek and Roman Chronology, Calendars and Years in Antiquity*, Munich, 1972.

Sarikakis, Th. *The Hoplite-General at Athens: A Prosopography*, Chicago, 1976.

Shear, L. "Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town," *Hesperia* 50, 1981, pp. 356-77.

Sherk, R.K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus-Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*, Baltimore, 1969.

— — — — —. "Caesar and Mytilene," *GRBS* 4, 1963, pp. 145-53.

Sherwin-White, A.N. "The Roman Citizenship: A Survey of its Development into a World Franchise," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* Vol. I.2, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin, 1972, pp. 23-58.

Ste. Croix, G.E.M. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London, 1983.

Syme, R. *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1939.

Sundwall, J. *Nachtraege zur Prosopographia Attica*, Helsingfors, 1910.

— — — — —. *Epigraphische Beiträege zur sozial-politischen Geschichte Athens*, *Klio Beiheft* 4, Leipzig, 1906.

Thompson, M. *The Athenian New Style Silver Coinage*, New York, 1965.

- Toepffer, M. "Die attischen Pythaisten und Deliaisten," *Hermes* 23, 1888, pp. 321-32.
- Touloumakos, J. "Der Einfluss Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten des Festlandes und des Inseln im ersten und zweiten Jhdt. v. Chr." Dissertation, University of Göttingen, 1967.
- Toynbee, J. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, London, 1971.
- Tracy, S.V. *I.G. II² 2336: Contributions of First Fruits for the Pythais*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1982.
- _____. "Athens in 100 B.C." *HSCP* 83, 1979, pp. 213-35.
- _____. *The Lettering of an Athenian Mason*, *Hesperia* Supplement XV, Princeton, 1975.
- _____. "Notes on the Pythais Inscriptions F.D. III, 2, nn. 3-56," *BCH* 99, 1975, pp. 185-218.
- Traill, J. *The Political Organization of Attica*, *Hesperia* Supplement XVIII, Princeton, 1975.
- Travlos, J. *A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London, 1971.
- Vellek, G. "The Priesthoods of Athens: 86 B.C. to 267 A.D." Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1969.
- Vanderpool, E. "The *Genos* Theoinidai Honors a Priestess of Nympe," *AJP* 100, 1979, pp. 213-6.
- _____. "Three Inscriptions from Eleusis," *AD* 23, 1968, pp. 7-9.
- Vatin, C. *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris, 1970.
- Walbank, F.W. *The Hellenistic World*, Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1981.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von, "Athenion und Aristion," *Sitzb. Berlin* 1923, pp. 39-50.
- Wilhelm, A. "Zu einem Beschluss der Athener aus dem Jahre 128 v. Chr.," *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 224, 1947, pp. 27-54.

Will, E. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique: 323-30 av. J.C.*,
2 Vols., Nancy, 1962.

Wilson, A.J.N. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*,
Manchester, 1966.

Winter, F.E. "Sepulturae intra murem and the pre-Persian Walls of
Athens," *Hesperia* Supplement XIX, 1982, pp. 199-204.

Wrigley, E.A. *An Introduction to English Historical Demography*, London,
1969.

Young, R.S. "Sepulturae intra murem," *Hesperia* 20, 1951, pp. 67-134.