

10

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 131-173

April 14, 1906

---

THE PRIESTS OF ASKLEPIOS

A NEW METHOD OF DATING ATHENIAN ARCHONS

BY

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

BERKELEY  
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
PRICE \$0.50

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS

**Note.**—The University of California Publications are offered in exchange for the publications of learned societies and institutions, universities and libraries. Complete lists of all the publications of the University will be sent upon request. For sample copies, lists of publications or other information, address the **Manager of the University Press, Berkeley, California, U. S. A.** All matter sent in exchange should be addressed to **The Exchange Department, University Library, Berkeley, California, U. S. A.**

**CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY.**—Edward B. Clapp, William A. Merrill, Herbert C. Nutting, Editors. Price per volume \$2.00. Volume I (in progress):

No. 1.	Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry, by Edward B. Clapp.	Price, \$0.50
No. 2.	Studies in the Si-clause, by Herbert C. Nutting.	“ .60
No. 3.	The Whence and Whither of the Modern Science of Language, by Benj. Ide Wheeler	“ .25
No. 4.	On the Influence of Lucretius on Horace, by William A. Merrill	“ .25
No. 5.	The Priests of Asklepios (A New Method of Dating Athenian Archons), by William Scott Ferguson	“ .50

### AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY.

Vol. 1.	No. 1. Life and Culture of the Hupa, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pages 88, Plates 30, September, 1903	Price, 1.25
	No. 2. Hupa Texts, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pages 290, March, 1904.	Price, 3.00
Vol. 2.	No. 1. The Exploration of the Potter Creek Cave, by William J. Sinclair. Pages 27, Plates 14, April, 1904	Price, .40
	No. 2. The Languages of the Coast of California South of San Francisco, by A. L. Kroeber. Pages 72, June, 1904.	Price, .60
	No. 3. Types of Indian Culture in California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pages 22, June, 1904.	Price, .25
	No. 4. Basket Designs of the Indians of Northwestern California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pages 60, Plates 7, January, 1905.	Price, .75
	No. 5. The Yokuts Language of South Central California, by A. L. Kroeber (in press).	
Vol. 3.	The Morphology of the Hupa Language, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pages 344, June, 1905.	Price, 3.50
Vol. 4.	No. 1. The Earliest Historical Relations between Mexico and Japan, by Zelia Nuttall. Pages 47, April, 1906.	Price, .50

### GRAECO-ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY.

Vol. 1.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 1. Edited by Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and J. Gilbert Smyly. Pages 690, Plates 9, 1903	Price, \$16.00
Vol. 2.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 2 (in preparation).	
Vol. 3.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 3 (in preparation).	

### EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY.

Vol. 1. The Hearst Medical Papyrus. Edited by G. A. Reisner. Hieratic text in 17 facsimile plates in colotype, with introduction and vocabulary. Quarto, pages 48. Now ready.

Vols. 2-7 in press or in preparation.

## THE PRIESTS OF ASKLEPIOS

## A NEW METHOD OF DATING ATHENIAN ARCHONS

BY

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

## I.

The substance of this investigation can be presented best as a commentary on the following table:—

Year B.C.	Tribe of Secretary of the Treasurers of Athens	Tribe of Secretary and of Priest	Deme of Secretary	Priest of Asklepios
353/2		Antiochis	Pallene	
352/1		Erechtheis	Euonymon?	
351/0	Hippothontis	Aigeis		
350/9	Aiantis	Pandionis		
349/8	Antiochis	Leontis	Phrearrhoi	
348/7	Erechtheis	Akamantis		
347/6	Aigeis	Oineis	Acharnai	
346/5	Pandionis	Kekropis	Phlya	
345/4	Leontis	Hippothontis	Oion	Πάτα[ικος] ('Ελευσίνιος)
344/3	Akamantis	Aiantis		Λυσίθεος [Τρ]ικονύσιος
343/2	Oineis	Antiochis	Aigilia	Θουγέννης ('Αμφιτροπήθεν)
342/1	Kekropis	Erechtheis		
341/0	Hippothontis	Aigeis	Araphen	Ἐθνικίδης Ἀλαι(εύς)
340/9	Aiantis	Pandionis	Kytheros	Διοκλῆς
339/8	Antiochis	Leontis		Πολύξενος
338/7	Erechtheis	Akamantis	Bitea	Τεισίας
337/6	Aigeis	Oineis	Acharnai	
336/5	Pandionis	Kekropis	Xypete	[Τε]λεσί[ας] Φλυ(εύς)
335/4	Leontis	Hippothontis	Acherdus	
334/3	Akamantis	Aiantis	Phaleron	
333/2	Oineis	Antiochis	Pallene	
332/1	Kekropis	Erechtheis	Anagyros	

[This investigation was begun as a preliminary study to a work on later Athenian history for the prosecution of which the Carnegie Institution of Washington has generously provided the funds. Its general results were presented to the Philological Club of the University of California on February 26, 1906.]

Year B.C.	Tribe of Secretary of the Treasurers of Athena	Tribe of Secretary and of Priest	Deme of Secretary		Priest of Asklepios
331/0	Hippothontis	Aigeis	Kollytos		
330/9	Aiantis	Pandionis	Paiania		Φιλοχάρης Ὁαθεν?
329/8	Antiochis	Leontis	Eurytidai		
328/7	Erechtheis	Akamantis	Ilagnus		Ἀνδροκλῆς [ . . . . . ἐκ Κεραμ]έων
327/6	Aigeis	Oineis			Ὀνήτωρ Ὀνήτορος Μελι- τεῖς
326/5	Pandionis	Kekropis			
325/4	Leontis	Hippothontis	Eleusis		
324/3	Akamantis	Aiantis	Rhamnus		
323/2	Oineis	Antiochis	Alopeke		
322/1	Kekropis	Erechtheis	Kephisia		
Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Secretary	Tribe of Priest	Priest of Asklepios
307/6	Anaxikrates	Diomeia	Aigeis	Erechtheis	
306/5	Koroibos	Rhamnus	Aiantis	Aigeis	
305/4	Euxenippos	Alopeke?	Antiochis	Pandionis	
304/3	Pherekles	Gargettos	Antigonis	Leontis	
303/2	Leostratos	Phegus	Erechtheis	Akamantis	
302/1	Nikokles	Plotheia	Aigeis	Oineis	
301/0	Klearchos	Probalinthos	Pandionis	Kekropis	
300/9	Hegemachos		Leontis	Hippothontis	
299/8	Euktemon	Kephale	Akamantis	Aiantis	
298/7	Mnesidemus		Oineis	Antiochis	
297/6	Antiphates		Kekropis	Antigonis	
296/5	Nikias	Azenia	Hippothontis	Demetrias	
295/4	Nikostratos	Phaleron	Aiantis	Erechtheis	
294/3	Olympiodoros		Antiochis	Aigeis	
293/2	Philippos		Antigonis	Pandionis	
292/1	Kimion J		Demetrias	Leontis	
291/0	Charinos		Erechtheis	Akamantis	
290/9	Diokles	Halai	Aigeis	Oineis	
289/8	Diotimos	Paiania	Pandionis	Kekropis	
288/7	Isaios		Leontis	Hippothontis	Φιλέης Χαμρίων [ Ελευσ]ί- νιος
287/6	Euthios	Cholargos	Akamantis	Aiantis	
286/5	Xenophon		Oineis	Antiochis	
285/4	Urios	Aixone	Kekropis	Antigonis	
284/3	Telokles?		Hippothontis	Demetrias	
283/2	Menekles	Trikorynthos	Aiantis	Erechtheis	
282/1	Nikias Otr.	Alopeke	Antiochis	Aigeis	
281/0	Aristonymos	Aithalidai	Antigonis	Pandionis	
280/9	Gorgias		Demetrias	Leontis	
279/8	Anaxikrates		Erechtheis	Akamantis	
278/7	Demokles		Aigeis	Oineis	
277/6	— Iaios?		Pandionis	Kekropis	
276/5	Eubulos		Leontis	Hippothontis	
275/4	Polyenkto	Kephale	Akamantis	Aiantis	Ξενόκριτος [ Ἄ ] φιδ(ναῖος) [ . . . . σ ] ίδης Ἄλωπ(εκήθεν)
274/3	Hieron	Oe	Oineis	Antiochis	

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Secretary	Tribe of Priest	Priest of Asklepios
273/2			Kekropis	Antigonis	[Τε]μοκλή(ς) Ε[ίτρεαίος]?
272/1			Hippothontis	Demetrias	
271/0	Pytharatos		Aiantis	Erechtheis	Σμίκευθος Ἀναγ(υράσιος)
270/9			Antiochis	Aigeis	Νικόμαχος??
269/8			Antigonis	Pandionis	Λυσανία[ς Πιροβα]λί(σιος)
268/7	Philokrates	Melite	Demetrias	Leontis	. . . Σουνη(εύς)
267/6			Erechtheis	Akamantis	Ἄμειν—?!
266/5	Peithidemos		Aigeis	Oineis	Ἀρχικελῆς Λακιάδ(ης)
265/4			Pandionis	Kekropis	Λυσικ[λ]ῆς Συναλήτ(τιος)
264/3	Diognetos		Leontis	Hippothontis	[Προ]κλή(ς) Ηειρ[αιεύς]
263/2			Akamantis	Aiantis	Λυκίας Ραμνο(ύσιος)
262/1	Antipatros		{ Oineis	{ Antiochis	{ Φιλίας Είτρεαί(ος)
			{ Oineis	{ Antiochis	{ Καλλιιάδης Αίγιλ(εύς)
Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary		Tribe of Secretary and of Priest	Priest of Asklepios
261/0	Arrheneides			Antigonis	Θεόξενος Περγασ(ήθεν)
260/9				Demetrias	Θεόωρο(ς) Μελιτ(εύς)
259/8				Erechtheis	[. . . ος] Εύωνυμεις
258/7				Aigeis	[Φιλί]ππος Ἴωνί(δης)
257/6				Pandionis	Ἀύτοκλή(ς) Ὀαθη(ν)
256/5	Kleomachos	Kettos		Leontis	Φιλοκράτης Ἐκαλή(θεν)
255/4				Akamantis	Πραξιτελης [Τε]μάρχου Είρσιόδης
254/3				Oineis	Κτησωνίδης
253/2				Kekropis	Βοῖσκος Φλυ(εύς)
252/1	Diogeiton			Hippothontis	
251/0	Olbios			Aiantis	
250/9				Antiochis	
249/8		Eitea		Antigonis	
248/7				Demetrias	— — Ξυπέ[τ]α[ι]ώρ
247/6	Lysiades			Erechtheis	
246/5	Kallimedes	Plotheia		Aigeis	
245/4	Glaukippos?	Myrrhinus		Pandionis	
244/3	Thersilochos	Phrearrhoi		Leontis	
243/2				Akamantis	
242/1				Oineis	
241/0				Kekropis	
240/9				Hippothontis	
239/8	Charikles	Rhamnus		Aiantis	
238/7	Lysias			Antiochis	
237/6	Kimon II			Antigonis	
236/5	Ekphantos	Hippotomadaí		Demetrias	
235/4	Lysanias			Erechtheis	
234/3				Aigeis	
233/2				Pandionis	
232/1	Diomedon			Leontis	
231/0	Jason			Akamantis	

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Secretary	Priest of Asklepios
230/9		Epikēphisia	Oineis	
229/8	Heliodoros	Athmonon	Kekropis	
228/7	Leolauros		Hippothontis	
227/6	Theophilos		Aiantis	
226/5	Ergochares	Alopeke	Antiochis	
225/4	Niketes		Antigonis	
224/3	Antiphilos		Demetrias	
223/2	Kalli —		Erechtheis	
222/1	Menekrates		Aigeis	
221/0	Thrasysphon	Paiania	Pandionis	
220/9			Leontis	
219/8			Ptolemais	
218/7		Kephale?	Akamantis	
217/6	Chairephon		Oineis	
216/5	Pasiades		Kekropis	
215/4	Diokles	Keiriadai	Hippothontis	Εὐστρατος Οἰναῖος*
214/3	Euphiletos		Aiantis	
213/2	Herakleitos		Antiochis	
212/1	Archelaos	Kydathenaton	Antigonis	
211/0	Aischron		Demetrias	
210/9		Lamptrai	Erechtheis	
209/8	Philostratos		Aigeis	
208/7	Antimachos	Myrrhinus	Pandionis	
207/6	Phanostratos		Leontis	
206/5	Kallistratos		Ptolemais	
205/4			Akamantis	
204/3			Oineis	
203/2			Kekropis	
202/1			Hippothontis	
201/0			Ptolemais	
200/9			Akamantis	
199/8			Oineis	
198/7			Kekropis	
197/6			Hippothontis	
196/5			Aiantis	
195/4			Antiochis	
194/3			Attalis	
193/2			Erechtheis	
192/1			Aigeis	
191/0			Pandionis	
190/9			Leontis	
189/8			Ptolemais	
188/7	Symmachos	Thorikos	Akamantis	
187/6	Theoxenos		Oineis	
186/5	Zopyros	Aixone	Kekropis	
185/4	Eupolemos	Ilamaxanteia	Hippothontis	
184/3			Aiantis	

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Secretary	Priest of Asklepios
183/2	Hermogenes		Antiochis	
182/1	Timesianax	Probalinthos	Attalis	
181/0			Erechtheis	
180/9			Aigeis	
179/8			Pandionis	
178/7			Leontis	
177/6			Ptolemais	
176/5	Hippakos		Akamantis	
175/4	Sonikos	Pevithoidai	Oineis	
174/3			Kekropis	
173/2			Hippothontis	
172/1	Tychandros	Marathon	Aiantis	
171/0	De —		Antiochis	
170/9			Attalis	
169/8	Emikos	Kephisia	Erechtheis	
168/7	Xenokles	Teithras	Aigeis	
167/6			Pandionis	
166/5			Leontis	
165/4	Pelops	Hekale	Ptolemais	Πρωταγόρας Σικήτοι
164/3	Euerge—		Akamantis	Περγασήθεν*
163/2	Erastos		Oineis	
162/1	Poscidonios		Kekropis	
161/0	Aristolas	Eleusis	Hippothontis	
160/9	Aristaichmos		Aiantis	
159/8			Antiochis	
158/7	Anthesterios		Attalis	
157/6	Kallistratos		Erechtheis	
156/5	Mnesitheos		Aigeis	
155/4			Pandionis	
154/3			Leontis	
153/2	Phaidrias		Ptolemais	
152/1	Lysiades		Akamantis	
151/0	Archon		Oineis	
150/9	Epikrates	Sypalettos	Kekropis	
149/8	Theaitetos		Hippothontis	
148/7	Aristophon		Aiantis	
147/6			Antiochis	
146/5			Attalis	
145/4			Erechtheis	
144/3			Aigeis	
143/2			Pandionis	
142/1			Leontis	
141/0			Ptolemais	
140/9	Hagnotheos	Thorikos	Akamantis	
139/8			Oineis	
138/7	Timarehos		Kekropis	[Ζωίλος] Νικок[ράτου] Φλυεύς*

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribes of Secretary and Priest of Serapis	Deme of Priest of Serapis	Priest of Asklepios
137/6	Herakleitos	Anakata	Hippothontis	Eleusis	
136/5	Nikomachos		Aiantis	Trikorynthos	
135/4			Antiochis	Anaphlystos	
134/3			Attalis	Samion	
133/2	Metrophanes	Lamprai	Erechtheis	Lamprai	
132/1	Ergokles		Aigeis	Philaidai	
131/0	Epikles		Pandionis	Paiania	
130/9	Demostratos		Leontis	Leukonoe	
129/8	Lykiskos		Ptolemais	Phlya	
128/7	Dionysios		Akamantis	Keramcikos	
127/6	Theodorides		Oineis	Acharnai	
126/5	Diotimos		Kekropis	Melite	Θεόδωρος Ἐσ[ρι]αίθην*
125/4	Jason	Eleusis	Hippothontis		
124/3	Nikias and Isigenes		Aiantis	Marathon	
123/2	Demetrios		Antiochis	Alopeke	
122/1	Nikodemos	Oinoe	Attalis	Tyrmeidai	
121/0			Erechtheis	Pergase	
120/9	Eumachos		Aigeis	{ Myrrhinutta Otryne	
119/8	Hipparchos		Pandionis	Paiania	
118/7	Leucios	Skambonidai	Leontis	Kolone	
117/6			Ptolemais	Phlya	
116/5			Akamantis	{ Thorikos Sphettos	
115/4	Nausias		Oineis	Acharnai	
114/3	Herakleides?		Kekropis	Melite	
113/2	Paramonos		Hippothontis	{ Peiraieus Eroiadai	
112/1	Dionysios	Rhamnus	Aiantis	Rhamnus	
111/0	Sosikrates?		Antiochis	Anaphlystos	
110/9	Polykleitos		Attalis	Oinoe	
109/8	Jason	Lamprai	Erechtheis	Kephisia	
108/7	Demochares	Ankyle	Aigeis		
107/6	Aristarchos	Paiania	Pandionis		
106/5	Agathokles	Aithalidai	Leontis		
105/4	Monoites		Ptolemais	Phlya	
104/3	Sarapion	Iphistindai	Akamantis		
Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary		Deme of Priest of Serapis	Priest of Asklepios
103/2					
102/1	Theokles			Skambonidai*	
101/0	Echekrates				
100/9	Medeios	Eleusis*		Acharnai*	
99/8	Theodosios				
98/7	Prokles	Kothokidai*			
97/6	Argeios				

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Deme of Priest of Serapis	Priest of Asklepios
96/5	Argeios			
95/4	Herakleitos		Eitea*	
94/3				
93/2				
92/1				
91/0	Medeios			
90/9	Medeios			
89/8	Medeios			
88/7	Αναρχία			

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Priest of Asklepios	Priest of Asklepios
87/6	Philanthes		Erechtheis	
86/5	-ophantes		Aigeis	
85/4			Pandionis	
84/3			Leontis	
83/2			Ptolemais	
82/1			Akamantis	
81/0			Oineis	
80/9			Kekropis	
79/8			Hippothontis	
78/7			Aiantis	
77/6			Antiochis	
76/5			Attalis	
75/4			Erechtheis	
74/3			Aigeis	
73/2			Pandionis	
72/1			Leontis	
71/0			Ptolemais	
70/9			Akamantis	
69/8			Oineis	
68/7			Kekropis	
67/6			Hippothontis	
66/5			Aiantis	
65/4			Antiochis	
64/3			Attalis	
63/2			Erechtheis	Σωκράτης Σαραπίωνος Κηφισιεύς
62/1	Aristaios		Aigeis	Θεόδωρος Χαριδήμων ἐγ Μυρρινούττης
61/0	Theophemos		Pandionis	
60/9	Herodes		Leontis	
59/8	Leukios		Ptolemais	
58/7	Kalliphon		Akamantis	
57/6	Diokles		Oineis	
56/5	Koïntos		Kekropis	
55/4	Aristos		Hippothontis	
54/3	Zenon		Aiantis	

Year B.C.	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Tribe of Priest of Asklepios	Priest of Asklepios
53/2	Diodoros		Antiochis	
52/1	Lysandros	Halai*	Attalis	
51/0	Lysiades		Erechtheis	Διοκλῆς Διοκλέους Κηφισαίς
50/9	Demetrius		Aigeis	
49/8	Demochares	Apollonieis*	Pandionis	
48/7	— a —		Leontis	
47/6			Ptolemais	
46/5			Akamantis	
45/4			Oineis	
44/3			Kekropis	
43/2			Hippothontis	
42/1			Aiantis	
41/0			Antiochis	
40/9			Attalis	

## II.

1. Let us take I G II 836 as our starting point. From it we obtain the names, demes, and sequence of fourteen priests of Asklepios. They need only to be listed for the observation to obtrude itself that they follow one another in the official order of their tribes.<sup>1</sup> One exception alone occurs. Φιλίας Εἰπεαῖος and Καλλιάρχης Αἰγιεῖς, the fourth and fifth in the list, belong to the tribe Antiochis.

I G II Add. Nov. 373 b next demands our attention. The priest of Asklepios for the year preceding that of the archon Ly[si]a[de]s was — Ξυπε]π[α]ίων, from the tribe Demetrias.

Then we consider I G II 5 178 b from which it is clear that the priest of Asklepios and the prytany-secretary for 328 7 B.C. both belonged to the tribe Akamantis. In the same way I G II 766, when properly construed, shows that the priests of Asklepios for 341 0 B.C. and 336 5 B.C. were taken, like the secretaries for these years, from Aigeis and Kekropis respectively. Hence we conclude that the tribes of the priests and the tribes of the secretaries normally concurred in each year. The same

<sup>1</sup> Kirchner's timely demonstration (*Rhein. Mus.* 59, 1904, pp. 294 ff.) that Pergase was transferred to Antigonis between 307 and 201 B.C. removes the difficulty which Θεόξενος Περγασήθεν—the sixth in the list—would otherwise have presented.

conclusion is urged upon us by the fact that, when, in the second half of the second century B.C., the priests of *Serapis* and the secretaries both followed the official order, in this case too the same tribe was called upon each year for the two officials.

The dating of the priests of Asklepios of I G II 836 need not now detain us long. The tribe Pandionis is fixed for the secretaryship in 221 0 B.C. by the coincidence of the archon Thrasyphon and the Olympiad 142, 2.<sup>2</sup> Working back and forward from this point we must construct, as Kirchner saw,<sup>3</sup> the scheme of tribal rotation for the third century. It then appears that there are only two possibilities — one to ascribe the list of fourteen priests to 253 2—241 0, the other to date it in 265 4—253 2 B.C. The choice is not difficult. For by locating the list in 265 4—253 2 it results that the two priests from Antiochis fall in 262 1 B.C. That they belong to the same year may be taken for granted. It is analogous to what we find upon considering the reconstructions made in the board of Amphictyons in 377 6 ff.,<sup>4</sup> and is in accord with the practice repeatedly attested for the election of *suffecti* to the priests of Serapis.<sup>5</sup> Twice — in 319 8<sup>6</sup> and in 296 5<sup>7</sup> — a similar substitution of magistrates took place in the middle of the year. On each occasion the archon-eponymos was re-elected. The same was done with one at least of the generals in 296 5, Phaidros of Sphettos being *strategos* twice in Nikias' archonship.<sup>8</sup> We have long since concluded,<sup>9</sup> from evidence which until recently was perhaps inadequate,<sup>10</sup> that in the year which ended the Chremonidean War Antigonos Gonatas, like the revolutionists in 319 8 and 296 5 B.C., substituted for the old magistrates a new set congenial to himself. Moreover we have lately learned that this war was ended in 262 1 B.C.; for Athens surrendered in Antipatros' archonship;

<sup>2</sup> DITTENBERGER: *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup> 256, ll. 12 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900, pp. 433 ff.

<sup>4</sup> DITTENBERGER: *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup> 86; cf. *Classical Review* XV, 1901, pp. 38 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See above, pp. 136 f.

<sup>6</sup> For Apollodoros *deútepos* see I G II Add. 299 b; cf. II 5 299 c.

<sup>7</sup> For Nikias *úστερος* I G II 299; I G II 5 299 c.

<sup>8</sup> I G II 331, l. 21.

<sup>9</sup> DROYSEN: *Gesch. d. Hellenismus* III I<sup>2</sup> p. 246; BELOCH: *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 § 172.

<sup>10</sup> Hegesandros in Athenaeus IV 167 f.; cf. below p. 154.

Antipatros was the immediate predecessor of Arrheneides, and Arrheneides followed Klearchos (301/0) by an interval of 39 years and three months. By *exclusive* reckoning Arrheneides thus falls into 261/0.<sup>11</sup>

For these reasons we must date the list of fourteen priests in 265/4—253/2 B.C.

The dating of I G II Add. 373 b is not so easy. The limits are 253/2 and 230/29, and, since the priest is from Kekropis, it is possible for Lysiades to occupy either 247/6 or 235/4. His rival for either of these positions is Lysanias, the successor of Ekphantos. One is tempted to regard these two archons as the same, since I G II Add. Nov. 373 b gives us only Ly[si]a[de]s—a very easy misreading for Ly[sa]n[ia]s. But the temptation to identify them must be resisted; for the secretaries are different, one being Ἄριστόμαχος Ἄριστο—, the other Εὐμηλος Ἐμπεδίωτος Εὐωνυμεύς. Hence a place must be found for both Lysiades and Lysanias. The decision comes from considering the predecessor of Lysanias. His name occupies eight spaces<sup>12</sup>—precisely the number required for the archon of 236/5 B.C. Lysiades therefore belongs to 247/6 and the priest from Xypete to 248/7. Since Θεόδωρος Μελιτεύς would occupy this year, if the list of fourteen were assigned to 253/2 ff., its location in 265/4 ff. is thus made doubly sure.

Now we can proceed farther. But first let us remark that the official order of the priests was not broken by the Chremonidean War, and that by a curious coincidence a priest from Antigonis—the tribe established by the Athenians in honor of Antigonos Gonatas' grandfather and namesake—was due for 261/0. Our next stopping place is I G II Add. Nov. 567 b. This precious stone yields us a priest of Asklepios for the tribe Hippothontis and the archon Isaios. The official order of the priests of Asklepios locates this priest, Φυλεὺς Χαίριον [Ἐλευσ]ίτιος,<sup>13</sup> in 288/7, and thus settles a much debated problem in favor of the view originally proposed by me and rashly (so they said)

<sup>11</sup> See below pp. 153 ff.

<sup>12</sup> KOLBE: *Festschrift f. Otto Hirschfeld* p. 317 has settled this point.

<sup>13</sup> The restoration is undoubtedly right. The decree is one of the tribe Hippothontis.

accepted by Kirchner.<sup>14</sup> For the usefulness of the official order of the secretaries' tribes as a canon in dating the archons of the first third of the third century B.C. depended upon the maintenance of the archon Isaios in 288/7 B.C. And since 288/7 is demanded for Isaios by the official order of the priests' tribes, when we work backward from 262/1 and by the official order of the secretaries' tribes, when we work forward from 303/2—293/2, there is no longer any room for discussion as to the location of this archon, and very little for difference of opinion upon the archon-list between 293/2 and 271/0 B.C.

Finally we observe that upon the re-establishment of democratic government in 307/6 B.C. the tribe from which the priest of Asklepios was chosen was Erechtheis—the first in the official order prior to the creation in that year of Antigonis and Demetrias.<sup>15</sup>

2. Let us leave the priests of Asklepios at this point and turn to the prytany-secretaries. Here too the official order, which had continued without an interruption from 353/2 B.C., was thrown aside with the establishment of the aristocratic government in 322/1, but, unlike that of the priests was not re-established till three years after 307/6, in 304/3. In the summer of this year Demetrius Poliorketes, at the command of his father Antigonos, abandoned the siege of Rhodes in order a second time to rescue Athens from Kassander, and it was doubtless to commemorate his victorious entry into the city that his father's tribe, Antigonis—the first in the official order—was given the privilege of possessing the secretaryship for the year then commencing. In the year 303/2, however, his own tribe, Demetrias, was passed by and the secretaryship was given to Erechtheis. The reason for this is not hard to find. It was seemingly in the early part of the year 303, while Poliorketes was absent in the Peloponnesus,<sup>16</sup> that the Stratokles-Demetrius' government

<sup>14</sup> *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900, pp. 436 ff.; *Prosopographia Attica* II, p. 636.

<sup>15</sup> The election of the priest took place some nine weeks prior to the beginning of the official year (I G II Add. 489 b)—as did that of the archon and the other ordinary magistrates (II 416). Antigonis and Demetrias began to exist presumably on the first day of the official year. Cf. BATES: *Cornell Studies* VIII, p. 1.

<sup>16</sup> *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* V, p. 174, n. 3.

was overthrown at Athens, on the issue of subservience to the Macedonian prince, and Demochares and the democratic opponents of Demetrius took affairs into their own hands.<sup>17</sup> To be sure the deposed government was soon reinstated and Demochares was forced into exile, but the elections and the beginning of the official year, we may assume, came in the interval and Stratokles did not think it worth while to take the secretaryship from the person whom the lot had designated to hold it.

A dislocation of the two systems thus occurred. And I take this opportunity to remark that there was probably a small group of annual single officers lined up with both the priests and the secretaries. The dislocation was such that when Antigonos Gonatas came to reconstruct the state in 262/1 Oineis had the secretaryship and Antiochis the priesthood. The displacement was no doubt awkward and senseless. It was not perpetuated, and in 261/0 we find Antigonis, the first in the official order, and at the same time the tribe of which the conqueror was, as it were, the living eponymos, in possession of both the offices.

Thus is explained the first break in the official order of the secretaries' tribes—a break which has been used by many scholars to reject all archon-lists constructed with it as the guiding principle. The second break concerns us next; for between the last years of the third century and 188/7 B.C. a breach occurred by which some seven tribes were omitted. This I believe can now be explained also. The disturbing event in this interval is, as has all along been affirmed, the abrogation of the tribes Antigonis and Demetrius and the introduction of a new tribe, Attalis. We have abundance of literary evidence that Attalis was established in 200 B.C. Moreover V. von Schoeffer has recently shown us that, between the disappearance of Antigonis and Demetrius and the creation of Attalis, a short period intervened during which there were but eleven tribes in Athens.<sup>18</sup> Antigonis and Demetrius were therefore abolished in 201—in all

<sup>17</sup> PLETARCH: *Demetrius* XXIV. In this way the omission of Demetrius can be explained, whether the official order began, for some unknown reason, with Aiantis in 306/5 or, as assumed above, with Antigonis in 304/3. Demochares was doubtless opposed to the creation of the two new tribes and in 303/2 they had not yet got securely established.

<sup>18</sup> See PAULY-WISSOWA: V, 1, p. 32 and pp. 38 ff.

likelihood. The important occurrences in Athenian history during this year were the Acarnanian-Macedonian raid into Attica, the outbreak of hostilities between Athens and Philip, and, what has been insufficiently emphasized in this connection, the assurances of aid given to Athens by Ptolemy of Egypt — with whose court the city had been on the most friendly terms for over twenty years — apparently in 201,<sup>19</sup> at any rate before the collapse of Egyptian power at the battle of Paneion in the first half of 200 B.C.

The official order of the secretaries' tribes is amply demonstrated for the greater part of the second century. We work back, according to Kirchner's method, from the fixed points to the uncertain period at its start. The system is attached to the Roman consul-lists or the Olympiads in 110 9, 112 1, 125 4, 140 39, 168 7, and, when continued to 201 0, the interesting fact is revealed that in this year the tribe in the secretaryship was Ptolemais. Everything is now clear. The outbreak of indignation which caused the Athenians to throw aside Antigonis and Demetrias<sup>20</sup> took place in 201. The machinery for tribal distribution of offices was thereby thrown out of working, and in starting anew in 201/0<sup>21</sup> the Athenians acted as they did in 261/0 and gave the honor of leading off the tribal procession to Ptolemais, of which too the living eponymos was the ruling king of Egypt, the benefactor from whom at that moment the Athenians confidently expected aid against Macedon. For less than a year there were eleven tribes in Athens. Then came the visit of

<sup>19</sup> Livy: XXXI, 9, 1; cf. NIESE: *Gesch. d. griech. u. maked. Staaten*, II, p. 580 and pp. 589 f.

<sup>20</sup> Livy (XXXI, 44; cf. DION CHRYS.: XXXVII, 41) relates how in the year 200, after the creation of Attalis (XXXI, 15; cf. POLYBIUS: XVI, 25) the Athenians cut from the stones all memorials of the Macedonian rulers and otherwise indulged their indignation against Philip. Either this occurrence is misplaced by Livy, or the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were not among the Macedonian institutions at that time cast aside. It is quite possible that upon the first violation of Athens' neutrality by the Macedonians and Acarnanians (Livy: XXXI, 14) the Athenians discarded these two tribes. Polybius says nothing of their abrogation where he describes in detail the circumstances under which Attalis was created. Besides, I G II 391 shows that Antigonis and Demetrias were non-existent for some time before the creation of Attalis.

<sup>21</sup> Of course the disbanding of Antigonis and Demetrias may have taken place in the course of the year 201/0. Ptolemais will in that case have given the secretary (and other single annual officials) for the latter part of 201/0 only.

Attalos in 200, and the creation of the new tribe Attalis. The official order, which thus started afresh in 201/0, continued without interruption till the constitutional changes of 103 2 B.C.<sup>22</sup> It was then abandoned, apparently forever.

3. We must now revert to our priests of Asklepios. There are many of them belonging to the period from the fourth century B.C. to the second century A.D. to whom no year can be assigned with any certainty. It will be sufficient to append a list of these.<sup>23</sup> The priests who are dated exactly between 229 and 88 B.C. are four in number. They fall in 215 4, 165 4, 138/7 and 126 5 B.C. and came from the demes Oinoe, Pergase, Phlya, and Hestiaia. These demes belonged at this time to Ptolemais, Erechtheis, Ptolemais, and Aigeis respectively. Since the maintenance of the official order for the priests concurrent with that for the secretaries demands for these years priests from Hippothontis, Ptolemais, Kekropis, and Kekropis, it is clear that the two systems were not kept together at this time. Nor do the intervals between the priests allow us to insert these officials either as a whole or in pairs upon any orderly scheme of tribal sequences. In other words the official order was disregarded in the selection of the priests of Asklepios during the time when it was maintained most rigidly for the prytany-secretaries, and for this reason our loss, for chronological purposes, is not a very great one.

Proceeding down into the first century B.C. we have evidence from the years 63/2, 62/1, and 51/0 that the priests of Asklepios were again succeeding one another in the official order of their tribes. There can be no doubt as to these dates, or as to the maintenance of the sequence at this time; for the arrangement of the whole group of archons between 62 1 and 47 6 is demonstrated by the combination of I G III 1015 and 1014, and one of the group, Herodes, is fixed in 60/59 by his synchronism with OL 180. 1.<sup>24</sup> In order to determine the point at which the regu-

<sup>22</sup> *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* IV, pp. 1 ff.

<sup>23</sup> See below pp. 172 ff.

<sup>24</sup> DIODORUS I, 4, says: τούτου δ' (Julius Caesar) αἱ πρῶται πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν Ὀλυμπιάδος τῆς ἑκατοστῆς καὶ ὀγδοηκοστῆς κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος ἐπ' ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἡρώδου. It is confirmatory that Theophemos, the predecessor of Herodes, is assigned by Kastor (in Eusebius I p. 183, 8, p. 295, 33 Schoene) to 61/0 B.C.; cf. KIRCHNER: P.A. 7092.

lar succession was resumed we have again to work backward from 63.2 as a fixed point, and this time we have not far to go. It is obvious that what happened before in 262/1 and 201.0 B.C. happened again at this time. In 88.7 the Athenian democrats, looking for the coming of Mithridates the Great, overturned the pro-Roman aristocratic government which had existed from 103.2 B.C. on. They put themselves into the hands of two military leaders—so-called tyrants,—and offered a desperate resistance to Sulla in 87.6. When the Roman proconsul captured the city the aristocrats were restored,<sup>25</sup> the preceding year was marked on the list of the *eponymi* as ἀναρχία, and the offices were reassigned. The priest of Asklepios for 87/6 was taken, as in 307/6 and 261.0, from the first tribe in the official order—Erechtheis. At what time the scheme of sequences, begun in 87/6, ceased to exist, I cannot at present determine.<sup>26</sup>

### III.

We must now return and take up a number of points in detail.

1. The list of secretaries to the treasury-board of Athena is given to bring out the fact that their official order does not concur with that of the prytany-secretaries and priests. At what times the three sets began cannot be determined.

2. Πάταικος (P.A. 11677) was priest shortly before 343.2 (archon Pythodotos). The name being rare, it is perhaps admissible to identify him with Πάταικος Ἐλευσίνιος I G II 834 b, col. I, 50 (329.8, P.A. 11679).

Λυσίθεος Τρικυρῶσιος (P.A. 9407) appears in I G II 767 l. 19, and 1459. He must have been priest in 334.3, if this fragment—a list of donations to Asklepios—followed I G II 766; but that is impossible, for the list for 334/3 is extant in 766 itself, and 767 certainly formed no part of 766. Hence 767 must precede 766, in which case it should probably be joined with Add. Nov. 766 b. Lysitheos is therefore assigned to 344.3 B.C.

<sup>25</sup> *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* IV, p. 17.

<sup>26</sup> A hurried survey of the data for the first two centuries A.D. revealed nothing conclusive on this point.

For Θουγένης [Ἄμφιτροπήθεν], who is closely associated in I G II Add. 766 b with the archon Pythodotos (343/2), see P. A. 6699 and 6700. The *epimeletes* of 282/1, who also made a dedication to Asklepios in c. 252, was the grandson of the priest.

Εὐνικίδης Ἀλαιεύς appears in the Asklepios-list for 341/0 in the following connection: Μυννίου Γ· ταύτας ἔφη ὁ ἱερε(ὺς) Εὐνικίδης Ἀλαι(εὺς) παλαιὰς εἶναι I G II 766 ll. 7 ff.; cf. l. 3: Μνησαρέτη Δ, ἐλλείπει |—|—, ταύτας δεῖ[ν] ἔφη ἀποδοῦναι Διοκλέα Μυρρι(νούσιου). Such an affirmation could have been made by no one except the priest in charge for the year.

Πολύξενος, priest in 339/8, seems to be missing in the *Prosopographia*.<sup>27</sup> He is possibly to be identified with Πολύξενος Πολυκρά(τους) Σουμειεύς I G II 864 (P. A. 12066).

For Τεισίας priest in 338/7 cf. Τεισίας Κεφαλήθεν (P. A. 13478).

Τελεσίας Φλυ(εὺς) (P. A. 13520) is mentioned as priest in the list of donations I G II 766 ll. 66 and 67. No priest appears elsewhere in this or the similar lists except the priest of Asklepios. If the donations arrived with about the same frequency in 338/7 (ll. 29 ff.) and 337/6 as in 340/39 and 339/8 (ll. 8 ff.), we should expect the priest for 336/5 to appear anywhere in the neighborhood of l. 66.

3. Φιλοχάρης Ὀαθεν and Ὀνήτωρ Μελιτεύς are mentioned in the catalogue of donations published in I G II 835. This list follows that of which part—for the years 341/0–336/5 ff.—is extant in I G II 766. Since lines 8 ff. of 766 belong to 340/39, and lines 66 and 67 deal with dedications in 336/5, it is clear that line 119, with which the catalogue ended, reached to about 332/0. We can therefore place the beginning of II 835 at about that time. Consequently the seventeen priests mentioned in it belong in the main after 330 B.C. Hence I G II 835 cannot have been published before 313/2 B.C. It undoubtedly was set up much later. Since Onetor's public career does not extend beyond 322 B.C.,<sup>28</sup> he can be assigned to 326/5 with considerable certainty. Philochares, his neighbor in I G II 835, may be located conjecturally in 330/29. The deme of none of the other fifteen

<sup>27</sup> Similarly Ἐπικράτης (I G II 835 l. 61) and Ηυθόμικος (*ibid.* l. 50) have been omitted.

<sup>28</sup> KIRCHNER, P. A. 11471.

priests in this group is determinable—a fact the less to be deplored, since many of them belong between 322 and 307, when, as we have seen, the official order was generally discarded in the election of magistrates.

Beyond the fully extant beginning (265/4) of I G II 836 (which is written on the back of the stone on which I G II 835 is inscribed) lie the years of nine priests, who as ex-officials made donations to Asklepios in 266/5 and 263/2. Seven of them appear together at the end of the catalogue for 263/2. At this point the commissioners placed in the inventory a lot of miscellaneous items—the weight of gold on hand, the *ἀργυρώματα οἷς οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐχρῶντο* etc. Perhaps an assortment of cult-furniture which had been contributed by the priests themselves was put out of service at this time, a censer, a ladel, several *ἡδυπότια*, a bowl, etc. Or it may be that the commissioners chose this point to list the articles of the permanent outfit which were donated by priests who held office prior to the year in which Athens fell; for all but three items in this part of the inventory concern objects donated by priests, while of the others one was apparently the property of Asklepios himself, and a second came as a gift from the *δῆμος* of Athens.

It is not important to decide whether this nest of dedications is the result of something done in 262/1 or of the cataloguing in 232/1. In any case its insertion just before the first year of the Macedonian regime checks in a decisive way our chronology of the whole period.

The first dedication by the *δῆμος* was listed in 263/2; the next was made in 256/5 and this seems to have established a precedent; for in the two following years (for which alone a complete catalogue is extant) the state likewise made a gift to the shrine. Was the precedent set in the year in which Athens regained her freedom? That is given by Eusebius (II 120) as 255/4, but, as Beloch has remarked,<sup>29</sup> this has for us merely the value of an approximation.

Macedonian money appears among the dedications for the first time in what we have determined to be 261/0. Thus during

<sup>29</sup> *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 p. 436.

the priesthood of Theoxenos of Pergase (l. 45) a [τέτραχμον Ἀντιγόνειον] was given as an offering by Euaigion. In 256/5 four τέτραχμα Ἀντιγόνεια were dedicated (l. 80), in 255/4 three (l. 86), and some more in 254/3 (l. 93).

After a period during which Athens had lost her right of coinage the mint was reopened in 229 and the *new style* of Attic coins began. Head determines the period of suspension to be from 322 to 229.<sup>30</sup> That is assuredly wrong. It is impossible to believe that between 307 and 262/1 Athens coined no money in her own name. The first appearance of Ἀντιγόνεια τέτραχμα in 261/0 tells clearly enough when it was that the *old style* of Attic coins, or, for anything that I know, one of the series of the *new style*, was abandoned. Head,<sup>31</sup> following J. P. Six,<sup>32</sup> attributes the τέτραχμα Ἀντιγόνεια of our catalogue to Antigonos, the father of Demetrius Poliorketes. This view is based on a false dating of I G II 836. The coins belong, as is now clear, to Antigonos Gonatas, and can probably be identified by the numismatists. In any case we have again a decisive check upon our chronology in the fact that these τέτραχμα Ἀντιγόνεια make their first appearance in the priesthood which we have dated in the year after the fall of Athens.

Before assigning to precise years the nine priests who made dedications as ex-officials it will be well to look to the limits of the inscription in which they occur. Its beginning is extant in a fragmentary condition, and, judging from the normal number of lines required for a year, it appears that at least five annual catalogues preceded that from 265/4. How many more there were depends upon the extent of the *lacuna* between fragments *ab* and *d*. Since, as will be seen in a moment, the earliest year required by the tribes of the nine priests involved is 275/4, it is conceivable that the list began at about that time. It ended in 232/1 B.C. Hence about 45 years were included. Since it is to be supposed that the inscription on the front of the stone was equally long, it is probable that the two sides contained a con-

<sup>30</sup> *Historia Nummorum* p. 316.

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 201.

<sup>32</sup> *Annuaire de Numismatique* 1882 p. 27. I have not had access to this serial or to any other of the numismatic journals.

tinuous narrative, and together listed the dedications from about 330 to 232/1 B.C., the juncture being at about 276/5 B.C. And this proves to be not an approximate but the exact date: for I G II 835 was set up in the archonship of Β[ύ- and the secretaryship of Κλελυ[ένης]. Between 332/1 and 274/3 officials whose names begin in this way are possible only twice. In 277/6 or 284/3—laios<sup>2</sup> was archon. His secretary is unknown. Hence there is nothing to exclude his year. But there is nothing to commend it either. Whereas 276/5, the year which preceded that of the earliest priest in I G II 836, and the year of a most important change of government in Athens,<sup>3</sup> has for archon Eubulos. His secretary has not been known hitherto. We may therefore safely conclude that I G II 835 was inscribed in 276/5. That being the case we have found a reason for its peculiar arrangement; for this catalogue differs from the rest in that the donations are grouped, not under the names of the priests in whose year they were made, but according to their location in the shrine. This was natural, if the articles were listed in 276/5 B.C. The many changes of government and the abandonment of the official order during the preceding fifty years made it at that time impossible to arrange the dedications chronologically.

Since it is certain that the ex-priests belong to the period immediately preceding 265/4 B.C. I have assigned them to the years into which their demes distribute them. In the process I have made two restorations, one rash, the other probable. [Τι]μοκλή(ς) 'Ε- belongs to 273/2, 272/1, 270/69, or 267/6, and in the tribes which are involved by these years only four demes begin with 'Ε, viz. Erehia and Erikeia (Aigeis 270/69), Eiresidai (Akamantis 267/6), and Eitea (Antigonis 273/2). Because of Τιμοκλής Είτειαίος (P. A. 13733) the last possibility has been preferred.

The case of Δυσανία[ς . . . .]λι leaves less for guesswork. The space calls for six or seven letters between A and A. The

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* V pp. 167 f., 170, 173, and below pp. 159 and 166. It will be observed that the change from the financial board *οἱ ἐπὶ τῆ διοικήσει* to the single officer, which was made in 276/5, was accompanied by the transfer, in part at least, of certain of the duties of the college, *e. g.*, the payment for inscribing documents, to the *ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν*. The earliest mention of the military treasurer in this connection is still I G II 835; cf. LARFIELD II 2, p. 722.

possible years are the same as for Timokles, but the possible demes are simply *Αἰθαι* ]*λί(δης)* (*Antigonis* 273/2), *Κονθυ* ]*λί(δης)* and *Προβα* ]*λί(σιος)* (*Pandionis* 269/8). *Aithalidai* is ruled out because of its length, and a reference to P. A. 9321, 9322 will suffice to justify us in preferring *Probalinthos* to *Konthyle*.

4. A few remarks may now be made on the archon-list.

It should no longer be doubted that *Philippos* belongs in 293/2 B.C., and that no name is lacking in the list given by *Dionysius* of *Halicarnassus*; for between *Philippos* and *Diokles* (290/89) place must be found for *Kimón* and *Charinos*. The reference in the letters of *Epicurus*—*ἐπὶ δὲ Χαρί[νον καὶ ἐπὶ] Διοσίμ[ου]*—makes it practically impossible, as *Kolbe* rightly remarked,<sup>34</sup> to locate *Charinos* after *Diokles*.

*Kimón* I will have to be assigned to 292/1 rather than to the following year (or to the preceding) because of the connection between the policy of *Phaidros* in this archonship and the situation inevitably arising out of the revolt in *Boeotia* in 292/1 B.C.<sup>35</sup> *Phaidros* was doubtless moderate in his politics. He held the generalship between 301 and 296/5, and in 296/5 under both the aristocracy and *Lachares*. He continued to serve under the democracy of 295/4–276/5, and was publicly commended in 275/4 after the moderates again assumed control.

Moderate counsels were much needed in Athens in the year which followed that of *Philippos*, for the extreme oligarchs were then back from exile<sup>36</sup> and many reasons urged the city to join in the unfortunate *Boeotian* rebellion (292/1). That Athens maintained peace, freedom, and a liberal government was, it seems, due to the influence of *Phaidros* in *Kimón*'s year (292/1). The passage from which we learn this is worth quoting in full. *Χειροτονηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα στρατηγὸς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Κίμωνος ἀρχοντος διετέλεσεν ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ περιστάτων τεῖ πόλει καιρῶν δυσκόλων διεφύλαξεν τὴν εἰρήνην τῇ χώρῃ, ἀποφαινόμενος αἰεὶ τὰ κράτιστα, καὶ τὸν σῆτον ἐκ τῆς χώρας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καρποὺς αἴτιος ἐγένετο*

<sup>34</sup> *Ith. Mitt.* XXX p. 103.

<sup>35a</sup> *KOLBE: loc. cit.* pp. 103, 108; *BELOCH: Griech.* III 1 p. 234 n. 1.

<sup>35</sup> *DION. HAL. De Dinarcho* IX = p. 651; cf. *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* V p. 161.

εἰσκομισθῆναι, συμβουλευσας τῶι δήμῳι συντελέσαι (erasure of c. 38 letters in which there was some reference to Demetrius) καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην αὐτόνομον παρέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους κυρίου τοῖς μεθ' ἑαυτὸν (erasure of c. 71 letters).<sup>35a</sup> That is to say, in spite of the crisis peace was maintained, but contributions of money were necessary to gather in the harvest. The penalty for indiscretion would have been the destruction of the legal safeguards of life and property, and a rabid oligarchy upheld by the drawn sword of Macedon.

If I G II 310 is a correct reproduction of the stone, it seems impossible to restore the archon-name found in line 24 except as Ὀλυμπιοδώ]ρον. In that case the decree which occupies the earlier part of the stone precedes 301 B.C.: for the ταμίας was instructed to pay the cost. This can be either the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου or the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. The ταμίας τ. δ. was abolished in 301: the ταμίας τ. σ. was first entrusted<sup>36</sup> with the payment for the inscribing of documents on the change of government in 276/5. Αἰσχρων Προξένου, to whom the decree in question renders praise, was given Athenian citizenship in 290/89 or the following year. Hence it is much the most likely thing that the ταμίας τ. δ. is meant. I G II 310 was passed εἰρήνης δὲ γενομένης. The end of the "four years' war" is probably referred to. Αἰσχρων, the leader perhaps of a pro-Athenian party in Delphi, was according lauded by Stratokles and his friends in c. 303/2 and by the same government upon its restoration in 294/3 (Olympiodoros). For befriending Athenians in Delphi, probably at the time the Aetolians seized the shrine,<sup>37</sup> he was finally given the citizenship in 290/89. Aischron was in all likelihood the most prominent man among the out and out democrats in Delphi.

We shall have to reconcile ourselves after all to dating the return of Demochares from exile, the revolt of Athens from Demetrius Poliorketes, and the storming of the Museion in

<sup>35a</sup> I G II 331.

<sup>36</sup> See above p. 149 n. 33.

<sup>37</sup> PAULY-WISSOWA: IV p. 2568; *Jahrb.* 1897 p. 187. Pomtow concludes that Aischron was not a Delphian because his name is wanting in the Delphian inscriptions. The same argument would convict Laehares of ξενίας in Athens.

289 B.C.,<sup>38</sup> and Plutarch will have to be corrected where he narrates the revolt of Athens after the expulsion of Demetrius from Macedon,<sup>39</sup> the only alternative being that some fallacy exists in our calculation of the limits of Demetrius' reign.<sup>40</sup>

Urios must precede Eubulos; for I G II 331 must have been passed in the year immediately after Eubulos—not a few years later, as Kolbe assumes. Certainly no one who accepts Beloch's very plausible dating of Eubulos in 276/5 should attribute I G II 331 to any year but that of his successor, since it is upon the observation that the year of this document was the second of an Olympiad that Eubulos is assigned to the first.<sup>41</sup> This being so, a single officer ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει appears in 275/4, whereas in Urios' year the board still existed. Hence Urios belongs to 285/4.<sup>42</sup>

It is likely that both Telokles and —laios? precede Eubulos; for after Eubulos no archon-name, unless it be these, appears in Epicurus' correspondence. That would seem to have ceased with the infirmities of the philosopher's latter days. The only posi-

<sup>38</sup> The *agonothetes*, Philippides of Kephale, in 288/7, ἐπίθετον ἀγῶνα κατεσκεύασεν τεῖ Δῆμ[ητρι καὶ τεῖ Κορσε]ι [πρ]ῶτος ὑπόμνημα τῆς τοῦ δήμου [ἐλευθερίας].

<sup>39</sup> See *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* V, pp. 176ff.

<sup>40</sup> Kolbe's (*loc. cit.*, pp. 91ff.) criticism of Beloch's conclusion (*Griech. Gesch.* III 2 p. 80) that Demetrius Poliorketes was expelled from Macedon in 288 B.C. is not fatal. The attack on Demetrius can well have been delivered in the early summer of 288. His abdication was naturally made on his departure for Asia in 288/7 or later.

<sup>41</sup> This Kolbe seems to have overlooked.

<sup>42</sup> In I G II 325, which Kolbe in contradiction to Kochler, who after seeing the stone (II 5 325) decided for Arrheneides, locates in Kallimedes' archonship, appears, as between 295/4 and 276/5, the board of officers entitled οἱ ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει. In II Add. Nov. 373 b (248/7), II 305 (Glaukippos), and II 334 (Diomedon) we find on the other hand ὁ ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει. Again after 229 B.C. οἱ ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει recurs, and before 201/0 ὁ ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει succeeds. It is easy to understand that in 229 the democracy reverted to the practice of the earlier democrats of 295/4–276/5 B.C., and then dropped it when the first zeal of the restoration wore away and the advantages of one responsible administrator prevailed over sentiment. But how explain the isolated appearance of the college in the middle of the century? We have Kolbe's assurance that the stone has τοῦ[s], otherwise the easiest way would be to assume a misreading. It is, however, possible that a college was reappointed when the Chremonidean War began, and that it remained in charge till the Athenian pro-Macedonians came to have a free hand in 255. In that case II 325 should be assigned to Arrheneides and the *Mss.* of Diogenes Laertius (WILAMOWITZ: *Antigonos von Karystos* p. 341) which yield τὸν ἐπι τῆς διοικήσεως, corrected to τοὺς ἐπι τῇ διοικήσει. But the whole matter is uncertain.

bilities are 284/3 and 277/6, and there is no means of deciding which of these comes to each.

5. Beloch has assigned Antipatros to 263/2 and Arrheneides to 262/1. The determining passages are as follows:<sup>43</sup>

Καὶ Ἀπολλό[δω]ρος δὲ τὸ κα[θη-  
ρ]ῆσθαι [τίθησι τ]ῆν πόλιν [ἐπ' Ἀν-  
τιπ]άτρον τ[οῦ] πρὸ Ἀρρηνειδ[ου  
καὶ φρουρὰ[ν εἰς] τὸ Μουσείον[τότε  
εἰσῆχθ[αι ὑπ'] Ἀντιγόνον [καὶ τὰς  
ἀρχὰς [ἀνηρῆσθ]αὶ καὶ πᾶν ἐν[ι  
βουλευ[ειν? ἐφ]εῖσθαι.

Καθ' ἕπερ ἐν τῇ[ι] πε-  
ριεχούσῃ τὰ περὶ Ἀντιφῶν[τος  
ἐπιστολῆι λέγεται[ι], γίνεται[ι βε-  
βιωκῶς ὁ Ζήνων . . . ἰδε . . . .  
'α τῶν ῥ καὶ ᾠ ἐτῶν. ἀπὸ  
Κλεάρχου γὰρ ἐπ' Ἀρρ]ενε[ι-  
δην, ἐφ' οὗ σημ[ειωθ]ῆναι [τε-  
τελευτηκεία[ι] Ζήνωνι, ἔτη  
ἔστιν ἐννέα κα[ι] τριάκ[οντα  
καὶ μῆνες τρεῖς.

[γεγονέναι Κλε-]  
άνθην ἐπ' ἄρχον[τος]  
Ἀριστοφάνους κα[ι] [ι]  
τὴν σχολὴν δια[κατα-]  
σχεῖν ἐπ' ἔτη τριάκ[οντα]  
καὶ [ε]ν.

ἀπὸ ἀλλάγῃ[δ] ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Ἰ-]  
άσωνος ἐτ[ῶ]ν τὰ μ[άλιστα] ῥ[ε].

The sequence of Antipatros and Arrheneides is thus clearly established. Klearchos was archon in 301/0 B.C. Thirty-nine years bring us to the beginning of 261/0. Three months can carry us as well into the year 261/0 as into that of Klearchos. Hence Beloch's<sup>44</sup> calculation is not the only one possible.

<sup>43</sup> For a more exact presentation of Crönert's reading of these papyrus-fragments see BELOCH II 2 pp. 424, 39, 472f. The text here given does not indicate the varying degrees of certainty of particular letters.

<sup>44</sup> *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 p. 424.

The public tomb was decreed to Zeno in the latter part of the fifth month, Maimakterion,<sup>45</sup> and, since he was already dead some time (Antigonos requested the monument),<sup>46</sup> it is probable that his death occurred two months earlier, in the third month of 261/0. Zeno's successor, Kleantes, was head of the Stoa for upward of thirty-one years. By *inclusive* reckoning this brings us to 231/0 for his death and for the archon Jason. The lack which ἐπὶ calls for is explained by the three months of Arrheneides' year given to Zeno. The calculation is then verified by the equation 331/0 (Aristophanes) *minus* 231/0 (Jason) = about 100. We need not concern ourselves here with other computations as to the lives and headships of Zeno and Kleantes, since it is through the one which he himself gives that the years of Philodemus' archons must be arrived at.

Since it was not till 262/1 B.C., and, if the distribution of the dedications to Asklepios is any criterion—3½ lines to Phileas, 4 to Kalliades<sup>47</sup>—in the late fall of 262 at the earliest, that Athens came into the hands of Antigonos, it is apparent that the surrender of the city took place at the time that the young king Antiochos II came to the throne of the Seleucids (between July 262 and July 261),<sup>48</sup> and declared war upon Ptolemy Philadelphus<sup>49</sup>—the champion and chief hope of the Athenians. This new entanglement destroyed the last prospect of Egyptian aid, and the city could do nothing but yield. The marriage of Antigonos' heir to Antiochos' sister, Stratonike, was the consummation of the alliance which cost Athens its independence. The war, in which the siege and fall of Athens formed but an episode, continued for some time after 262, and resulted in the downfall of the sea-power of Philadelphus.<sup>50</sup>

Antigonos, we observe, is said τὰς ἀρχὰς [ἀνημῆσθ]αι καὶ πᾶν ἐν[ὶ] βουλευ[ειν?] [ἐφ]είσθαι.

<sup>45</sup> DIOGENES LAERTIUS: VII 10-12.

<sup>46</sup> DIOGENES LAERTIUS: VII 15; cf. WILAMOWITZ: *Antigonos v. Karystos* pp. 118, 344.

<sup>47</sup> I G II 836 ll. 36ff.

<sup>48</sup> BEVAN: *The House of Seleucus* I p. 168.

<sup>49</sup> BELOCH: *Griech. Gesch.* III 1 p. 615.

<sup>50</sup> BELOCH: III 1 p. 618; III 2 pp. 423ff.

6. The archons between 261/0 and 230/29 form a group by themselves and deserve a special study. Leaving out of account Sosistratos and Philoneos,<sup>51</sup> who belong before 262/1, and Philostratos, Antimachos, and Phanostratos, whom Kolbe<sup>52</sup> has, I believe rightly, assigned to 209/8ff., there remain for the thirty-one years involved twenty-two archon-names: Kleomachos, Diogeiton, Olbios, Lysiades, Kallimedes, Glaukippos,<sup>53</sup> Thersilochos, Charikles, Lysias, Kimon, Ekphantos, Lysanias, Diomedon, Jason, Alcibiades, Hagnias, Lykeas, Pheidostratos, Philippides, Theophemos, Thymochares, . . . bios? and, as a possible twenty-third, Aristeides. Of these the first fourteen are assigned in the table to a definite year. These assignments require a word of justification.

Diomedon has been dated by Kirchner in 232/1, for obvious and adequate reasons. That leaves only 244/3 and 256/5 open to a secretary from Leontis i.e. to Thersilochos and Kleomachos. Kallimedes precedes Thersilochos by a clear year; hence a decision between 256/5 and 244/3 involves all three archons. It is hard to make. But first it should be remarked that Kolbe's effort<sup>54</sup> to carry Kallimedes and Thersilochos back to 290/89 and 288/7 was most ill-advised. The decrees of these archons contain a formula of allegiance to Macedon which is found only between 276/5 and 230/29 B.C.,<sup>55</sup> and in the second place one of them exhibits the form *γίνομαι*, which does not appear till after 261/0 and then only in unofficial documents.<sup>56</sup> *Γίνομαι* demands as late a year as possible for Thersilochos. The contents of the documents of Thersilochos' year demand that Macedon be on friendly terms with both the Boeotian League and Athens; for each of these accepts arbitrators for a dispute from the Macedonian depen-

<sup>51</sup> Philoneos cannot be located in 265/4; for *Ἀσκληπῆος Συναλήττης*, priest of Asklepios in 265/4 and *ἀκουσιστῆς* in Philoneos' archonship, cannot have held these two offices in the same year.

<sup>52</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 76ff. An additional and conclusive argument may now be added to those given by Kolbe. There is no other place in the third century B.C. for the three archons whether Antimachos was the first or middle one of the three. He doubtless occupied the middle place.

<sup>53</sup> The reason for dating Glaukippos in 245/4 rather than in 257/6 or 233/2 is the similarity of content in II 305 and II 325. The prosopographical data given in *Cornell Studies* X p. 34 also favor 245/4.

<sup>54</sup> *Ath. Mitt.* XXX 1905 pp. 98ff. <sup>55</sup> See LARFIELD: II 2 pp. 684f. <sup>56</sup> See MEISTERHANS: *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*<sup>2</sup> pp. 177f. n. 1478.

dency, Lamia. The condition thus imposed was not fulfilled between the revolt of Alexander Krateros' son in c. 252 and the defeat of Abacokritos at Chaeronea in 245.<sup>57</sup> There is no unlikelihood that it was met in 256/5: it was admirably fulfilled in 244/3. After the battle of Chaeronea the Boeotian League entered into *sympolity* with Aetolia, and thus came over to the Macedonian camp.<sup>58</sup> It had sympathized with Alexander,<sup>59</sup> and had been in alliance with Achaëa up to 245. During this time its relations with Athens were undoubtedly strained, and upon the change of policy in 245 it is natural to find disputes referred to a Macedonian dependency for arbitration.

Between 262 and 255 Athens was very completely under Macedonian tutelage,<sup>60</sup> and it is less natural to find a group of decrees extant from this period than from 246ff. Hence for these various reasons 246/5 and 244/3 should be assigned to Kallimedes and Thersilochos, and 256/5 to Kleomachos.

In a decree of Kallimedes' year (I G II 306) we read *στρ]ατος ὁ πατή[ρ. . . .] βασιλέως Δημ[ητρίου. . .]* "As far as one may judge, it is here said that the father of the person eulogized in the decree did some services to Athens during the reign of Demetrios Poliorketes." This interpretation, made in *Cornell Studies* X p. 31, Kolbe (*Ath. Mitt.* XIX 1905 p. 100) regards as *gekünstelt* and a *Vertegenheitsauskunft*. To me it seems most natural as well as correct. Did Kolbe forget such documents as I G II 331, in which the earlier part of the decree enumerates the services rendered to Athens by the (grandfather and) father of the benefactor to whom the body of the psephisma is devoted? Over forty years had elapsed in 246/5 since Demetrius had ceased to be a king. That is also natural. The benefactor of 246 could well have been a boy of 10 or 15 in 290 B.C. while his father was still in the prime of life.

7. The appearance in the archonships of Kallimedes and Glaukippos of a cult of Zeus Soter in Athens as well as in the

<sup>57</sup> BELOCH: *Griech. Gesch.* III 1 p. 642.

<sup>58</sup> NIESE: *Gesch. d. griech. u. maked. Staaten* II, p. 250.

<sup>59</sup> BELOCH: III 1 639; NIESE: II, p. 249; *cf.* however BELOCH: III 2 p. 438.

<sup>60</sup> SUIDAS: Philochoros. BELOCH: III 2 pp. 435f.

Peiraiæus should be noted:<sup>61</sup> for the finding in Athens of the stones, on which were written I G II 305 (Glaukippos), 325 (Kallimedes, according to Kolbe), 326 (same time as 325) 616 (middle of third century) and 1387 (dateless),<sup>62</sup> demonstrates this point clearly enough. It is significant that all these stones belong to the period 262–229. The same duplication of worship is demonstrable in this period for still another cult—that of Bendis. From an interesting inscription published by Wilhelm in 1902<sup>63</sup> we learn that in Polystratos' archonship (with which Lykeas from an unpublished document must be closely associated)<sup>64</sup> a branch cult of this goddess had recently been established among the Thracians in the city, and that by formal resolution the old organization agreed to assume a friendly attitude toward it—*καὶ νῦν οἱ ἡ[ρη]μένοι ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερόν οἴονται δεῖν οἰκείως διακεῖ[σθ]αι πρὸς ἀλλήλους*. Provision is made for cooperation between the two societies in the *πομπή* from Athens to the Peiraiæus which formed so characteristic a feature of the Bendis worship. The *ἐπιμεληταί* in the Peiraiæus were to provide sponges, basins, and wreaths for the members of both clubs upon the arrival of the procession in the harbor-town.

Furthermore it is to be observed that between 260/59 and 229 not a single person from either the Peiraiæus<sup>65</sup> or Phaleron appears in any capacity whatsoever in the Athenian documents.

One is tempted to believe that the Peiraiæus and its environs were taken away from the rest of Athens in 255 and put under the military government of the Athenian strategos, "tyrant," Herakleitos Asklepiades' son of Athmonon.<sup>66</sup> But on close examination this view is proved untenable; for the Athenian archon was eponymos in the Peiraiæus in Polystratos' year, and the Thracians there resident claim certain exclusive rights on the

<sup>61</sup> WACHSMUTH: *Die Staat Athen im Alterthum* II p. 145 denies the existence of a separate cult in Athens. MOMMSEN: *Die Feste der Staat Athens*, p. 524 stoutly maintains it. JUDEICH: *Topographie von Athen* p. 302 agrees with Mommsen.

<sup>62</sup> The provenience of I G III 167 (c. 134 A.D.) is disputed.

<sup>63</sup> *Oesterr. Jahrbuch* V pp. 127 ff.

<sup>64</sup> WILHELM: *loc. cit.* p. 136.

<sup>65</sup> The restoration Πειρ[αι]εῖς? in I G II 330 (Kimon II 237/6) is quite uncertain.

<sup>66</sup> Καθεστῆκώς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ταπτομένων μετὰ τοῦ Πειραιέως. I G II 5 591 b.

strength of the Athenian laws.<sup>67</sup> Moreover in 239/8 (Charikles) the ekklesia met in the Peiraiæus,<sup>68</sup> and again in 230/29? (I G II 5 373e) the senate was convened there. The Peiraiæus was thus more than an ordinary deme still.

The solution of these various problems is undoubtedly this, that the citizen population in the Peiraiæus had diminished very greatly in numbers, and had perhaps accepted another political creed than that dominant in the city. It moreover had lost constant touch with the city through the destruction or delapidation of the long walls. It was still possible for processions to go from the one town to the other, and for the populace or the senate to proceed to the harbor when local business made that expedient. But all this could be done only in time of peace, and there was no longer the unbroken intercourse between the two places which made it possible for men resident in Athens to render daily worship to deities resident only in the Peiraiæus.

8. Since the ekklesia met in the Peiraiæus in Charikles' year it is clear that in 239/8 the war with Aratos, which in Plutarch's narrative is described for us as a series of disconnected incidents, had not yet begun. A similar state of peace is presupposed for the time<sup>69</sup> of I G II 5 373 e, i.e. for Skirophorion of 229—after the withdrawal of the Macedonian garrison, and after a good understanding had been reached with the Achaean League. That Ptolemais did not yet exist is no objection to this date: for it is now certain that this tribe was created in the course of 225/4 or in 224/3 or in 223/2; for while it was not in existence at the beginning of Niketes' archonship, it already received officers under Menekrates. By far the most likely year in this interval is 224, not so much for the reason urged by Kirchner and Zhebelev (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900 p. 450), that the archon-eponymos for 224/3 was taken from Aphidna, a deme of Ptolemais, but because of the mention of king Ptolemy in connection with the gymnasiarch for 224/3. Unfortunately the document (*'Eφ. 'Aρχ.* 1897 p. 43) is badly damaged, but the conjecture is

<sup>67</sup> *Oesterr. Jahreshefte* V, 1902, pp. 127 ff.

<sup>68</sup> *'Eφ. 'Aρχ.*, 1901, p. 52.

<sup>69</sup> The possibilities are 254/3, 242/1, and 230/29.

obvious that we have to do with the donation of the gymnasium named from its founder the Ptolemaion—*die erste grosse Baustiftung aus hellenistischer Zeit*.<sup>70</sup> The establishment of the tribe was Athens' way of rendering thanks for the gift. The interest of Ptolemy in Athens was doubtless due in part at least to the good understanding reached by Antigonos Doson and the Achaean League. The same event forced Athens to secure the good will of Ptolemy.<sup>71</sup>

The formula and usages which prove Kolbe's location of Kallimedes and Thersilochos in 290/89 and 288/7 to be wrong, prove with equal cogency his dating of Lysias and Kimon II to be right. The chief inscription of these years<sup>72</sup> has the notice of sacrifices offered for the Macedonian rulers—king Demetrios II and queen [Phthia]—and also the late form *γίνομαι*. Now that there is absolutely no room for Lysias before Kimon I in 292/1 it is certain that this pair belongs in 238/7 and 237/6. As already pointed out their immediate successors were Ekphantos and Lysanias.<sup>73</sup>

The attempts which Aratos and the Achaean League had made prior to 239 to capture the Peiraiens were renewed upon the death of Antigonos Gonatas, and a war broke out in 238/7 which had not yet come to an end in 236/5.<sup>74</sup> The Athenians are censured by Plutarch for indecently rejoicing over the reported death of their distinguished adversary, and indeed Athenian troops joined the Macedonian garrisons in protecting the country.<sup>75</sup> The struggle was one in which, according to

<sup>70</sup> JUDEICH: *Topographie von Athen* p. 315 n. 27.

<sup>71</sup> BELOCH: *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 p. 61.

<sup>72</sup> I G II 5 614b; cf. KOLBE: *Festschrift f. Otto Hirschfeld* p. 314.

<sup>73</sup> See above p. 30. <sup>74</sup> For a description of this struggle see KOLBE in *Festschrift für Otto Hirschfeld* pp. 315f.

<sup>75</sup> I G II 5 614b is the only document relating to garrisons in Eleusis in which a detachment of foreign mercenaries appears. The others belong between 318/7 and 276/5? and after 229. The nationality of the mercenaries of 238ff. is worth noticing. So far as the extant names permit a judgment it seems that there were no Celts among them. They are mainly Greeks. One is designated *Ἀχαιός*—a deserter or traitor.

One of the soldiers' decrees (Éφ. Ἀρχ., 1896, p. 33) found at Eleusis begins as follows: *Ἐπειδὴ Ἀντι[γρον]ς ὁ [βα]σιλεὺς ἀφικόμενος*. Unfortunately nothing further is extant. The *orator*, however, was *Ἀμεινοκλῆς Ταχύλλου Κυδαθηναεὺς*. The same name appears in I G II 1024 l. 9—a list which belongs before 307. The probabilities, given by the name-connections, are

Aratos's usual tactics, his enemies had more to fear from surprises—night attacks, ambuscades, etc., than from drawn battles. It seldom came to a regular campaign, but the destruction of the crops had constantly to be expected by the Athenians, and on at least one occasion Aratos marched even into the suburbs of Athens. In 236/5 it is said of the general ἐπ' Ἐλευσίνος, Aristophanes, ἐπεμελήθη δὲ καὶ ὄπω[ς ἐκ τῆς χώρας οἱ σί]τοι μετ' ἀσφαλείας εἰσενεχθῶσιν. The situation had not essentially changed in 232/1. On the last of Elaphebolion of this year a subscription was started to provide the ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν with funds.<sup>77</sup> The purpose of the contribution is stated to be [ἵνα κατὰ τὸν κ]ατάλοιπον χρόνον τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ συνκ[ομισθῶσιν οἱ ἐκ γῆς? κ]αρποὶ μετ' ἀσφαλείας. The inference to be made is that in the earlier part of the year the harvesting had been molested or at any rate accompanied by danger. A study of the provenience of the subscribers will, I believe, show where the exposed crops lay. 9 of them came from Erechia, 5 from Paiania, 5 from Sphettos, 3 from Halai, 3 from Phlya, and 3 from Kephisia. Of these Phlya and Kephisia lay in the eastern side of the Athenian plain, placed at the entrance of the valley which led into the Mesogöia proper. The others were in the heart of the Mesogöia itself, and constituted its most important villages. The only other deme, which in the extant portion of the list furnished more than two subscribers, was Phyle. From the six city demes Melite, Skambonidai, Kerameikos, Kollytos, Kydathenaion, Kolonos, there came a total of only four or five. There were none for Phaleron

that it belongs before 320, and a grandson of one of the men in the catalogue, Χαῖρῶνδος Θρασυῖδου Αἰθαλίδης, was ephor in 283/2 while the *akme* of the grandson of another, Ἐπιγένης Ἐπιγένους Κυδαθηναίου, came according to Kirchner in c. 268 B.C. There is, therefore, no unlikelihood that the Ameinokles of II 1024 and of *Eph. Arch.* 1896, p. 33, are grandfather and grandson—if the time of the latter document is 276/5–266/5. And at what other time could a king Antigonos come in contact with Athenian troops in garrison at Eleusis? Between 262/1 and 240/39 mercenaries would have been associated with Athenians and Eleusinians in the decree. Antigonos the One-Eyed was king between 306 and 301, but was never near Athens in that interval. Antigonos Doson was not on such terms with Athens as to make a visit (what else does ἀφικόμενος mean?) possible. On the other hand our tradition represents Antigonos Gonatas as a frequent visitor of Athens between 276/5 and 261/0 (death of Zeno), i.e. 266/5 B.C. (outbreak of Chremonidean War).

<sup>76</sup> I G II 5 614b ll. 66f.

<sup>77</sup> I G II 334.

or Peiraieus, and only one each from Eleusis and Sunion. It is true that the list as we have it is fragmentary, but the demes in it are not arranged on any principle, nor are the individuals from one deme listed together. We have no reason, therefore, to suppose that a different proportional distribution would result from an analysis of the entire catalogue.

The explanation of these facts would seem to be that the crops which could still be preserved and harvested in 232/1 B.C. lay for the most part in the Mesogeia. Those in the Athenian plain itself, we may suppose, were already destroyed in whole or in part. And what was true in 232/1 was, we may safely assume, true in a great many instances in the course of the third century. While the rest of Attica was exposed to the ravages of war, from pirates on the coast places,<sup>78</sup> from the soldiers of Alexander Krateros' son in c. 252ff., and of Aratos, and the Achaean League during the latter part of Antigonos Gonatas' reign and the whole of Demetrios II's, the Mesogeia proper, protected by Pentelikon and Hymettos and by the flanking position which Athens and the Peiraieus assumed to an invader of the trans-Hymettos region, enjoyed practical immunity from devastation, and came in consequence to be politically the most important section of Attica.

The *κοινὸν τῶν Μεσογείων* meets us in the inscriptions for the first time in one of Olbios' archonship and for the last time in a contemporary document.

Olbios must necessarily occupy the year 251/0; for 239/8, the only other place between 261 and 229 open to an archon whose secretary was from Aiantis, must be assigned to Charikles. The reason for this is as follows: Aristokreon, the nephew of the philosopher Chrysippos, who is commended for various services to Athens in Charikles' year, cannot possibly have been old enough for such a distinction in 251/0, yet the decree was passed prior to 229.<sup>79</sup>

The constitution of the *κοινόν* lies for the most part beyond our ken. It undoubtedly embraced men from demes which belonged to different tribes and trittyes in the Kleisthenian system.

<sup>78</sup> I G II 5 591b.

<sup>79</sup> WILHELM: 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1901, pp. 52, 55.

Curiously enough the chief officer (*ἄρχων*) for the only two occasions on which he is known came from Bate and Kydathenaion, suburban or city demes. The patron deity of the *κοινόν* was Herakles, and, since two of the three stones which have inscriptions relating to the association were found in Diomeia, it is clear that the temple in which the decrees of the *κοινόν* are said to have been set up, was the famous one of Herakles in Kynosarges.

Although the *κοινόν τῶν Μεσογείων*, like that of the "four cities, (*Τετράπολις*) was primarily a religious federation, its creation or revival in about 250 cannot have lacked some political significance. The union of the demesmen it involved must have given them increased influence in the *ekklēsia*. Their material prosperity came into relief now that the shipping and trade of the Peiræus and Athens had diminished, and the weakening of Athens' predominance in Attica must have strengthened the separatist tendencies always latent in a mountainous country. The Mesogeia was exposed to spoliation because Athens was of necessity involved in all of Macedon's wars. It could not escape them by making the state join Macedon's enemies. It got no help from Athens' walls, nor did the recovery of sea-power lie within the range of its ambition. And now for the first time since the days of Kleisthenes the Mesogeia determined the policy of Athens. Of this there can be little doubt. The three most influential families in the state before and after 229 came, Dromeas-Diokles from Erechia, Mikion-Eurykleides from Kephisia, Zenon-Asklepiades from Phyle—all from demes located in the Kleisthenian Mesogeia. These were the men who foiled Aratos of his hope of bringing Athens into the Achaean League, and carried through the policy of strict neutrality which gave the country respite from wars and devastation for nearly thirty years.

9. From Kimon's year we possess a list of epehebes.<sup>80</sup> It contained from twenty to thirty names. It is the last of the kind till we reach the second half of the second century B.C. The disposition of the names in the list is like that of I G II 338

<sup>80</sup> I G II 330.

(Philoneos), and 324 (Polyenktes 275/4), and all three differ in a significant point from the catalogue of 283/2 (I G II 316 Menekles). In the earlier list the deme is used to segregate the names into groups; in the later ones the tribe alone performs this function. Since the number of names is about equally small in each case, the classification of them in about 150 deme-groups is absurd—explicable only on the supposition that it is the survival of an idea, sensible in the not very distant past. In 305/4 (I G II 5 251b) the same system is employed, and it meets us again in 334/3 (I G II 5 563b), but in each of these instances it is applied to a much larger number of names.

In 334/3 the ephebe system described by Aristotle<sup>81</sup> was in existence. All the young men in their eighteenth and nineteenth years were obliged to serve as ephebes. Upon attaining legal maturity they were entered by the demarchs in the official list of citizens, and became thereby attached till their sixtieth year for ephebe, military, and judicial service to the archon-eponymos for the year of their registration. They were put as ephebes under the supervision of state officials, the most important of whom were one *kosmetes*, chosen from all the citizens, and ten *sophronistai*, taken from thirty reputable and qualified citizens nominated by the tribes.

The list for 334/3 contained οἱ ἔ[φηβοι] (τῆς Κεκροπίδος) οἱ ἐπὶ Κτησικλέο(υ)ς ἀρχοντος ἐνγραφέντες.<sup>82</sup> In it there were from forty-four to fifty names.<sup>83</sup> There were therefore about 500 ephebes enrolled under the archon Ktesikles, and as many more are to be added for the archon of the preceding year; so that the young men of Athens in their 18th and 19th years numbered about 1000.<sup>84</sup> Since there were only 33 in 283/2 it is clear that the compulsory service has already become voluntary. The term too was seemingly reduced to one year, and the *sophronistai* exist no longer. We have to do with a most important change in the

<sup>81</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 42.

<sup>82</sup> The technical term for registration with the demarchs; cf. ARISTOTLE: *loc. cit.*

<sup>83</sup> FOUCART: B C H XIII p. 263 thinks that col. 1 of I G II 5 563b had more than 22 names. Col. II had 22.

<sup>84</sup> So GIRARD: article "Ἐφηβοι" in *Daremberg et Saglio*.

life and institutions of Attica. It was equivalent to the abandonment of universal conscription as a national system of defense, and in the case of Athens that meant the confession of the city's inability to protect herself with her own resources.

When in an age of war Athens renounced the effort to train her young men in the highly technical profession of arms, it was over with her days as a free-acting political agent.

The time of this confession of impotence is surely worth investigating. Its determination rests largely with the ephēbe-list I G II<sub>5</sub> 251b. This is like that of 334/3 in giving us the ephēbes for one year only. What we have is a catalogue of τοὺς ἐφήβους τοῦ]ς ἐνγ[ραφέντας ἐπὶ Κοροΐβου ἄρχοντος. Moreover two sons of Ergokles from the same deme, if the restorations are correct, which is doubtful, and two sons of Kephisokles of Kikymina, if the restorations again are correct, appear in it. Unless these are in both cases twins, or mere coincidences, or false restorations it is imperative for us to assume that in 305/4 the term of office was already reduced, as in 283/2ff, to one year.

The number of ephēbes must next be ascertained. The stone is so badly damaged that an approximation is all that is possible. Eighteen names are extant in part or in whole from the tribe Erechtheis and fourteen from the tribe Akamantis. How many are lost?

It is known that the population of the tribes<sup>85</sup> and demes is quite evenly represented in the surviving names, and that it is the big demes that have the largest representation in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica*. A comparison of the relative strength of the demes in the P. A. and in the prytany-lists will show this to be the case. Enonymon had eleven ephēbes in 305/4: it has 208 names out of a total of 929 for the tribe Erechtheis in the P. A. That suggests a total of slightly over fifty for the ephēbe-list of this tribe. In the case of Akamantis, Thorikos had 1 ephēbe to a total representation of 129: Kerameikos had 3 to 143, Kephale had over 5 to 120, and Kikymina had 2 to 56. The four have over 11 to 448, which yields about 26 for the whole tribe with 979. A comparison of the ephēbe-list with the list of the

<sup>85</sup> See KOERTE: *Gott. gel. Anz.* 1903 pp. 829f.

prytanies will probably yield a safer result. Part of Paiania was assigned to Antigonis. It was undoubtedly the smaller part,<sup>86</sup> which, in a prytany of fifty, got but one member in I G II 871 and 865, while the other part, which remained in Pandionis, had regularly 12. We do not know how many Παιανιείς from Pandionis were ephebes in 305/4, but from Antigonis there came three. This suggests that the ephebe-list was much larger than the prytany-list. So too Phegus had one ephebe in 305/4, whereas it had no senator at all in I G II 5 871b. There are four names and one fragment of a name extant in I G II 5 251b frg. k from an unknown deme. Since there were so many, the deme can have been only Kydathenaion, Oe, or Myrrhinus. It was certainly Myrrhinus; for three<sup>87</sup> of the four names are found among the Μυρρινοῦσιοι in Kirchner's *Prosopographia*, and none among those from either of the other two demes. Hence there were at least five ephebes from Myrrhinus in 305/4. This deme was represented by six members in the senate in the fourth century.

All this evidence goes to show that there were as many names in each tribal list in 305/4 as in 334/3, and that the total number must have been between five and six hundred. At the time of the census of Demetrius of Phaleron there were 21,000 citizens in Athens. This, on the ratio of the Belgian census,<sup>88</sup> calls for 1176 young men in their 18th and 19th years, or about 588 for either of these ages. It is thus likely that I G II 5 251b contains a list of young men of only one age,<sup>89</sup> and it is to be observed that this document takes cognizance of the registration in the

<sup>86</sup> BATES: *Cornell Studies* VIII, p. 12.

<sup>87</sup> For Kallisthenes cf. P. A. 8103; for Athenodoros P. A. 276, and for Aristokrates P. A. 1921.

<sup>88</sup> FRANCOUPE: *L'industrie dans la Grèce ancienne (Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie de l'université de Liège, Fasc. VII, 1900, p. 164)*.

<sup>89</sup> Among the . . ε]ίς of Demetrius appear side by side the ephebes— Ερ]γοκλέους and —'Εργο]κλέους. The last name may be restored in many ways, e.g., Φίλο]κλέους, Θέμιστο]κλέους, Ἱερο]κλέους, etc. Among the Κικωννείς are [Λ]άμαχος Κηφισοκλ[έους] and [Βῦ]βουλος Κηφισοκ[λέους]. Here too there is possible a number of different restorations of one name, e.g., Κηφισο[δότου] Κηφισο[φώντος] Κηφισο[δώρου] κτλ. It is simply through the assumption that we have to do with two pairs of brothers that the restorations in the *Corymbus* became current. Brothers are, of course, common in the same ephebe-lists when the service was for one year only and there was no compulsion as to age-limits or registration.

demes (οἱ ἐνγραφέντες ἐπὶ Κοροΐβου ἄρχοντος), just as I G II 5 563b does, whereas in 283/2 the young men are referred to as τοὺς ἐφηβεύσαντας ἐπὶ Μενεΐο κλέους ἄρχοντος. If the service were voluntary in 305/4 and in 283/2 it is impossible to explain why 1100 (at least 5–600) came forward in the earlier year and only 33 in the latter; for the city was equally popular in its government and equally involved in a serious foreign war in the two years.

I conclude therefore that the national ephebe system was still in existence in 305/4, and this result finds substantial confirmation in that the *sophronistai*, who are lacking in 283/2ff., are found in this year still. The *sophronistai* appear in 303/2 also (I G II 5 565b), so that the change had not occurred at that date. It therefore took place in the following twenty years. Had a national ephebe system been in existence when Athens regained her independence in 289, it would never have been abolished by the democrats in the war-time which followed. Nor is it conceivable that it was abolished in 289 itself. On the other hand, if done away with prior to 295/4, the democrats on recovering the government in that year would have been unable to restore it because of their relations to Demetrius Poliorcetes. A Macedonian garrison in Museion and a restoration of universal conscription do not harmonize. The only occasion suitable for this momentous change came in 301 B.C. In this year a government was established in Athens on a moderately aristocratic basis—its enemies called it an oligarchy—which had as its foreign policy the abandonment of all imperialistic notions, and, without sacrifice of independence, the maintenance of friendly, neutral relations with all the powers.<sup>90</sup> It was this government which made the ephebe system voluntary. The number of ephebes instantly fell to a mere handful. Ten *sophronistai* for about three times as many charges seemed absurd. The *sophronistai* were therefore dispensed with. But the old habit of registering the ephebes under deme-captions persisted. It existed in 283/2, but upon the change of government in 276/5, it was also discarded, and in 275/4ff. the tribe-captions alone are used. Had Kimon II

<sup>90</sup> *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* V, pp. 155ff.; EDUARD MEYER: *ibid.* pp. 180ff.

belonged in 292/1 the old system should have been employed in I G II 330.

10. I G II 5 371c will have to be dated in either 250/49 or 249/8; for the secretary's deme began with 'Ει, which can be restored only as *Είρεσιδης* or *Είτειαίος*. For Akamantis, the tribe of Eiresidai, there is no place between 255/4 and 243/2. Eitea, which at this time belonged to both Antiochis and Antigonis, has a place in 250/49 or 249/8. The decree was passed at the conclusion of the war between Athens and Argos, friends of Antigonos Gonatas, on the one side, and Alexander, his rebellious nephew, on the other. It commends Aristomachos of Argos for insisting on including Athens in the peace he had purchased from the successful rebel. Alexander was dead in 243:<sup>91</sup> he had not rebelled in 255 *i.e.* when Antigonos withdrew his garrison from Museion. Hence the dating above given. It is obvious that the *akme* of Alexander's success was reached a short time before the passing of the decree *i.e.* in either 250 or 249.

Diogeiton has been assigned to 252/1 because 'Ακρότιμος Διολίου 'Ικαριεύς, who moved the passing of I G II Add. Nov. 352b in this archonship, was *ταμίης* (*τῶν στρατιωτικῶν*?) in 255/4. Twelve years earlier is out of the question, for that takes us back of the Macedonian regime. Twelve years later in 240/39 is possible, but much less probable.

It is evident that the archon-list I G II 859 was begun, as Zhebelev and Kirchner claimed,<sup>92</sup> in the year 230/29 with the officers for the first year of Athenian independence.

Three boys who were 18 in Phaidrias' archonship were *τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας* in the year of Anthesterios.<sup>93</sup> Anthesterios was archon in 160/59 or 158/7—156/5; for a boy *τῆς δευτέρας ἡλικίας* in 161/0 won the boxing-match open to boys of all ages in Anthesterios archonship. 159/8 is excluded, because comic exhibitions, which were not given in two successive years, were given in 161/0 and in the year which preceded that of Anthesterios. The possibilities are Phaidrias in 154/3 and Anthesterios in

<sup>91</sup> Corinth was taken by Aratos in 243 from Antigonos, not from Alexander.

<sup>92</sup> *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1900, p. 448.

<sup>93</sup> For the references see *Cornell Studies* X, pp. 67f.

160/59, or Phaidrias in 153/2 and Anthesterios in 158/7. A boy of 15 has little chance in a boxing match with others of 19. A boy of 17 is a much more likely winner. Hence the last possibility is to be preferred. It is assumed with Rangabe (*Ant. Hell.* II 678ff.) that *παῖδες τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας* were 12 and 13, *παῖδες τῆς δευτέρας ἡλικίας* 14 and 15, and *παῖδες τῆς τρίτης ἡλικίας* 16, 17, 18, and 19 years old.

The result of Wilhelm's combination<sup>94</sup> of I G II 5 385c, 496c, and II Add. 453b is that the name of the priest for Timarchos' year (138/7 B.C.) was . . . . . ? Νικο[υ. . . . .] Φλυεύς. No Attic names begin with Νικο[υ], and, in fact, what is read by Koehler as Υ can be equally well Κ. Then the restoration [Ζωῖλος] Νικοκ[ράτου] Φλυεύς may be made. No other name among the Φλυεῖς in the *Prosopographia* fulfills the conditions. Ζοῖλος' father Νικοκράτης Ζωῖλου Φλυεύς was an ephebe in 172/1 (I G II 1224). His cousin Ζωῖλος Ζωῖλου Φλυεύς was priest of Serapis in 117/6 (P.A. 6251) and of ἀγνῆς Ἀφροδίτης at about the same time. In I G II 5 373c (230/29?) Ζωῖλος Ζωῖλου Φλυεύς is found. One item in the catalogue of dedications to Asklepios given in I G II 403 (Thrasysphon 221/0) is as follows: τύπον οὐ ανέθηκεν Ζωῖλος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδίου. The two are probably the same. The priest of Asklepios in 138/7 will be the great-grandson of the donor of 221/0 B.C.

It is a far cry from Finland to California! None the less while this study was in the press I received through the kindness of the author, Johannes Sundwall of the royal Alexander-University in Helsingfors, an admirable monograph, entitled *Epigraphische Beiträge zur sozial-politischen Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Demosthenes* (Leipzig: Kreysing, 1906).<sup>95</sup> Sundwall has also made the discovery (pp. 47f.) that the official order was employed to distribute the priesthood of Asklepios among the tribes, and in §9 (pp. 75ff.) he tabulates the extant priests. The matter had only a subsidiary interest for him, however, and his failure to examine I G II 836 with sufficient thoroughness has

<sup>94</sup> *Berl. phil. Woch.* 1902, pp. 1908f.

<sup>95</sup> Also published in *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* as Beiheft IV.

made his list for the most part incorrect. His cardinal error was in not distinguishing between the priests and ex-priests of Asklepios found in this document. And yet they are marked off with all reasonable precision. The annual offerings to the temple are invariably catalogued under the headings *καὶ τὰδε ἐφ' ἱερέως Προκλέους Πειραιέως* (l. 22), *Φιλέου Εὐταίου* (l. 36) etc., thus clearly designating the priests in office for each year. The ex-priests simply make dedications like other people, *e.g.* *σκάφιον, ἱερεὺς Λυσικλῆς Συπαλήττιος* (l. 22) etc., and when the officiating priest donates anything this too is recorded by entering it regularly as an item in the section to which his name gives the date. There is not the least difficulty in deciding which is a priest and which an ex-priest, and yet their confusion vitiates the entire disposition of the priests in Sundwall's table.

Sundwall (p. 76 n. 1) suggests that the archon-name Ε[ὺ- of II 835 l. 8 be restored Euxenippos (305/5). This is practically impossible. The secretary for 305/4 was [. . . . .]ος Λύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθε[ν] (I G II Add. 252b; II 5 252c): that for the year of II 835 *Κλεγγ[ένης]*, no other restoration of line 1 being possible. It is true that [. . . . .]ος Λύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν is found only in inscriptions from which the archon-name is lost, but *Εὐξενίππου* fills the *lacuna* in these exactly, and there is absolutely no place, except 305/4, in the entire neighborhood in which a secretary from Alopeke can be placed. There can be no doubt that Ε[ὺ- must be restored Eu[bulos].

In regard to *Λυσανία[ς Με]λι(τεὺς)* Sundwall says (p. 78 n. 3): *Die Ergänzung ist ganz sicher. Von M ist noch eine Spur übrig.* It is true that a faint scratch like the lower limb of a M appears in the *lacuna* of l. 33. But the space certainly calls for more than three letters, and on other grounds also the restoration *Λυσανία[ς Προβα]λί(σιος)* is much preferable.<sup>96</sup>

The juxtaposition of Nikomachos (l. 33) and Nikomachos *Παιανεύς* of II 839, though it tempted me to make the same restoration as Sundwall has made (p. 78 n. 2), is probably deceitful. It would require Nikomachos to have been priest prior to 276/5.

<sup>96</sup> See above pp. 149 f.

The restoration Τιμοκλῆς Ε[ἰτειαῖος] (l. 16) Sundwall also makes. So too he assigns Telesias of Phlya to 336/5 and Eunikides of Halai to 341/0. To Teisias (338/7) he likewise gives the demotikon Κεφαλήθεν and to Pataikos that of Ἐλευσίτιος. The reasons given above (p. 145) show that Lysitheos of Trikorynthos was not priest in 334/3.

Finally it must be insisted that Sundwall's investigation of the priests of Asklepios, apart from calling attention to the official-sequence, and confirming my observations in the points just enumerated, yields no tenable results. Nor does it, I am sure, in any way weaken my conclusions.

Number V3 of *Klio* (the new and convenient title of *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*) also reached me after my study had gone to the printer. I am pleased to find that Beloch in his article *Griechische Aufgebote* (p. 352) arrives at approximately the same conclusion, though by a slightly different method, as to the number of epebes listed in I G II5 251b. The comparison which I have instituted between this epebe-list and the prytany-lists can now be carried further by the aid of Sundwall's tables (*op. cit.* pp. 86ff.). It is perhaps worth noting that this same scholar (p. 89) has proved the correctness of Bates' conjecture (*Cornell Studies* VIII p. 12) that the part of Paiania transferred to Antigonis (see above p. 165) was the smaller one of the two.

C. F. Lehmann-Haupt (the distinguished historian C. F. Lehmann; the *Beiträge* and its founder being, it seems, rebaptized at the same time) in his well-considered article *Zur attischen Politik vor dem Chremonideischen Kriege*, which this number of *Klio* also contains (pp. 375ff.), has doubtless done a good service in showing that Athens in 274/0 had the same foreign policy as in 301ff.—the establishment of friendly relations with all the great powers of the time. Its embassy to Pyrrhus (Justin XXV. 4. 4.) probably sought respect for its neutrality. And in fact the city had the friendship of Ptolemy and his allies, the Spartans and others; of Antigonos, at this time Ptolemy's friend; and seemingly of Pyrrhus, for it was not molested by him.

Lehmann-Haupt's explanation of the estrangement of Ptolemy and Antigonos—the designs of Arsinoe upon the throne

of Macedon—is also plausible. And I do not think that it is invalidated by the fact that the Chremonidean War did *not* begin in 268. Philokrates cannot now be ejected from 268/7, and since the capture of Athens came in the fall of 262, five military seasons had then elapsed, if the war began in the summer of 266 (Peithidemos). Pausanias' remark that the Athenians resisted for a very long time (*ἐπὶ μακρότατον*) calls for no more than this. It is, of course, none the less possible, as Lehmann-Haupt maintains, that the treaty made between Athens and Ptolemy in 266 was the deferred result of an understanding *aimed at*<sup>97</sup> in 274/0 while Arsinoe was still alive.

The war begun by Antiochos Soter in 268 (Lehmann-Haupt: *Klio* III pp. 509f., V pp. 248, 386) we shall have to leave to its discoverer to orientate. I should like simply to ask the questions: Is there any good evidence that Antiochos I was more likely to be combating Ptolemy than Antigonos in 268? Are the *τέτραχμα Ἀντιγόνεια* of 261/0 (see above p. 147 f.) the well known tetradrachms struck by Antigonos Gonatas to commemorate his naval victory at Cos? If so, Lehmann-Haupt's objection (*Klio* V<sub>3</sub> p. 391 n. 1) to Beloch's dating of this engagement will have to be endorsed, and my remarks at p. 154 above will have to be modified.

<sup>97</sup> This is better than Lehmann-Haupt's *reached*; for the alliance with its point against Macedon doubtless did not issue from the moderate government of 276-267? but from the radical democracy which at this time replaced it.

## APPENDIX I—LIST OF PRIESTS.

## IV century B.C.

- Ἄν... I G II 835.  
 Ἀρίσταρχος Κοθωκίδης II 1466, 1468.  
 Ἀρχ? ..δου [ἐκ Κοίλ]ης II 1479.  
 Ἀρχέστρατος II 835.  
 Διοφείθης II 835.  
 Ἐ[λ]πίνης II 1446.  
 Ἐπικράτης II 835.  
 Εὐδ— II 835.  
 Εὐδίδακτος II 835.  
 Εὐθύδημος Ἐλευσίσιος II 1651.  
 Εὐμνηστος II 835.  
 Θεο— II 835.  
 Θερασύβο[υλος] II 835.  
 Κτησικλῆ[ς Ἄ]γνούσιος II 1481; III 144.  
 Λυσίας II 835.  
 Μελάνωπος Χολαργεύς II 1472.  
 Μενέστρατος Ἀγγελήθην II 1447, 1448, 350-49?  
 Νικόδημος II 1440.  
 Πυθόνικος? II 835.  
 Τίμων II 1473.  
 Φαίδριππος II 835; 1480.  
 Φανόμαχος II 835.  
 Φ[ιλ]ι[ππ]ος II 835.  
 Φιλοκλῆς Ξυπεταιών II 1475.  
 Φιλόκτημων II 835.  
 Χαρίνος II 835.

## IV or III century B.C.

- Ὀλύμπιχος Κυδαθημαιοῦς II 1491.

## III century B.C.

- Ἀισχρωνίδ[ης] II 1496.  
 Εὐθύδημο[ς] Ἀντικλέους ἐξ [Ὀζου] II 1496.  
 Νικωνίδης Φλυεύς II 1495 301 0, 289/8.

- Σίμ]υλος Νικοστράτου [ἐκ Κ]οίλης II 1500.  
 Φίλιος Φαληρεῖς II 1505. End of century.  
 Φορμ[ίω]ν Ἡδύλου [Ἐλ]ευσίνιος II 1504. End of century.

## II century B.C.

- Ζήνων Ἀθηναγόρου Μελιτεὺς II 1204.  
 Λεωνίδης Φλυεὺς II 840. Archon Pleistainos.

## I century B.C.

- Νε[κ]όστρατος Ἀφιδναῖο[ς] II 1511.  
 Σοφοκλῆς Φιλώτου Σουνιεὺς, γόνυ δε Διονυσοδώρου Δειρα-  
 διώτου *Ath. Mitt.* XXI, p. 297, c. 100 B.C.  
 — Μυρριν(ούσιος)? I G II Add. 477 c. Archon Kal—. Is it  
 Kallikratides? 36 5.

## I and II centuries A.D.

- Ἀγαθόπους Φλυεὺς III 693. Archon Peiso c. 175 A.D.  
 Ἀσωπ[όδωρος] Κλεομένους Φλυ(εὺς) III 102a. c. 61 A.D.  
 Διόφανης Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀξηγιεὺς III 228, 228 a, 229, 229 a.  
 Θεό[φιλος] Εὐδόξου Ἐλευσίνιος III 132 n.  
 Φλά(ουιος) III 729.  
 — Κ]ολλυτεὺς III 181 h. Archon Q. Trebellius Rufus  
 c. 100 A.D.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS—(CONTINUED)

**ASTRONOMY.**—W. W. Campbell, Editor.

**Publications of the Lick Observatory.**—Volumes I–V completed. Volume VI (in progress).

- No. 1. A Short Method of Determining Orbits from Three Observations, by A. O. Leuschner.
- No. 2. Elements of Asteroid 1900 GA, by A. O. Leuschner and Adelaide M. Hobe.
- No. 3. Preliminary Elements of Comet 1900 III, by R. H. Curtiss and C. G. Dall.

**Contributions from the Lick Observatory.**—Nos. I–V.

**Lick Observatory Bulletins.**—Volumes I–III completed. Volume IV (in progress).

**BOTANY.**—W. A. Setchell, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volume I (pp. 418) completed. Volume II (in progress).

- No. 7. Teratology in the Flowers of Two Californian Willows, by William Warner Mott. . . . . Price. .50
- No. 8. The Resistance of Certain Marine Algæ to Changes in Osmotic Pressure and Temperature, by W. J. V. Osterhout. )
- No. 9. The Rôle of Osmotic Pressure in Marine Plants, by W. J. V. Osterhout. ) In one cover. Price. .25
- No. 10. On the Importance of Physiologically Balanced Solutions for Plants, by W. J. V. Osterhout. )
- No. 11. The Antitoxic Action of Potassium on Magnesium, by W. J. V. Osterhout. )

**EDUCATION.**—Elmer E. Brown, Editor. Price per volume \$2.50.

- Volume I (pp. 424). Notes on the Development of a Child, by Millicent W. Shinn . . . . . Price, 2.25
- Vol. II (in progress).—No. 1. Notes on Children's Drawings, by Elmer E. Brown . . . . . Price, .50
- Vol. III (in progress).—No. 1. Origin of American State Universities, by Elmer E. Brown . . . . . Price, .50
- No. 2. State Aid to Secondary Schools, by David Rhys Jones . . . . . Price, .75

**GEOLOGY.**—Bulletin of the Department of Geology. Andrew C. Lawson, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volumes I (pp. 428), II (pp. 450) and III (475), completed. Volume IV (in progress).

- No. 6. New or Imperfectly Known Rodents and Ungulates from the John Day Series, by William J. Sinclair. . . . . Price, .25
- No. 7. New Mammalia from the Quaternary Caves of California, by William J. Sinclair. . . . . Price, .25
- No. 8. Preptoceras, a New Ungulate from the Samwell Cave, California, by Eustace L. Furlong. . . . . Price, .10
- No. 9. A New Sabre-tooth from California by John C. Merriam. Price, .05
- No. 10. The Structure and Genesis of the Comstock Lode, by John A. Reid. . . . . Price, .15
- No. 11. The Differential Thermal Conductivities of Certain Schists, by Paul Thelen . . . . . Price, .25
- No. 12. Sketch of the Geology of Mineral King, California, by A. Knopf and P. Thelen . . . . . Price, .35
- No. 13. Cold Water Belt Along the West Coast of the United States, by Ruliff S. Holway . . . . . Price .25

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS—(CONTINUED)

**PATHOLOGY.**—Alonzo Englebert Taylor, Editor. Price per volume \$2.00  
Volume I (in progress):

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| No. 5. On the Autolysis of Protein, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor.           | } In<br>one<br>cover. |
| No. 6. On the Reversion of Tryptic Digestion, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor. |                       |
| No. 7. Studies on an Ash-Free Diet, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor.           |                       |

**PHILOSOPHY.**—Volume I, completed. Price, \$2.00.

**PHYSIOLOGY.**—Jacques Loeb, Editor. Price per volume \$2.00. Volume I  
(pp. 217) completed. Volume II (pp. 215) completed.  
Volume III (in progress):

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| No. 1. On Chemical Methods by which the Eggs of a Mollusc ( <i>Lottia Gigantea</i> ) can be caused to become Mature, by Jacques Loeb.                                       | } In<br>one<br>cover. |
| No. 2. On the Changes in the Nerve and Muscle Which Seem to Underlie the Electrotonic Effects of the Galvanic Current, by Jacques Loeb.                                     |                       |
| No. 3. Can the Cerebral Cortex be Stimulated Chemically, by S. S. Maxwell.  |                       |
| No. 4. The Control of Galvanotropism in Paramecium by Chemical Substances, by Frank W. Bancroft.  |                       |
| No. 5. The Toxicity of Atmospheric Oxygen for the Eggs of the Sea-Urchin ( <i>Strongylocentrotus Purpuratus</i> ) After the Process of Membrane Formation, by Jacques Loeb. |                       |
| No. 6. On the Necessity of the Presence of Free Oxygen in the Hypertonic Sea-Water for the Production of Artificial Parthenogenesis, by Jacques Loeb.                       |                       |
| No. 7. On the Counteraction of the Toxic Effect of Hypertonic Solutions upon the Fertilized and Unfertilized Egg of the Sea-Urchin by Lack of Oxygen, by Jacques Loeb.      |                       |

**ZOOLOGY.**—W. E. Ritter, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volume I completed. Volume II completed. Volume III (in progress). Commencing with Volume II, this series contains Contributions from the Laboratory of the Marine Biological Association of San Diego.

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| No. 1. Some Observations on the Nervous System of Copepoda, by C. O. Esterly. Pages 12, Plates 2. Price, . . . . . | .25                            |
| No. 2. Ostracoda of the San Diego Region. I.—Halocypridae, by Chancey Juday. Pages 26, Plates 4. Price, . . . . .  | .30                            |
| No. 3. The California Shore Anemone, <i>Bunodactis Xanthogrammica</i> , by Harry Beal Torrey. Pages 6, Plate 1     | } In<br>one<br>cover.<br>Price |
| No. 4. Sexual Dimorphism in <i>Aglaophenia</i> , by Harry Beal Torrey and Ann Martin. Pages 7, text-figures 9.     |                                |

**UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.**—An official record of University life, issued quarterly, edited by a committee of the faculty. Price, \$1.00 per year. Current volume No. VIII.

Address all orders, or requests for information concerning the above publications (except Astronomy) to **The University Press, Berkeley, California.**