



<https://publications.dainst.org>

---

# iDAI.publications

---

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Alan Henry

## Lyandros of Anaphlystos and the Decree for Phaidros of Sphettos

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **22 • 1992**

Seite / Page **25–34**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1098/5465> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1992-22-p25-34-v5465.2

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

ALAN HENRY

## Lyandros of Anaphlystos and the Decree for Phaidros of Sphettos\*

In an earlier attempt in this Journal<sup>1</sup> to determine the date of the decree in favour of Phaidros of Sphettos (ii<sup>2</sup> 682) I argued that a plausible case could be made for the Great Panathenaic year 258/7 and that this same year could well have been the year of the archonship of Phaidros' son Thymochares.<sup>2</sup> In the present paper I propose, after an examination of the recent arguments of MICHAEL OSBORNE for an assignation of our decree to the year of Philinos,<sup>3</sup> to restate the case for Thymochares, but with an upward adjustment to the year 259/8.

### I

Although the prescript of ii<sup>2</sup> 682 is lost, the probouleumatic formula (vv.66–71) ensures that the orator was a *bouleutes*. The amendment (vv.92 ff.) moved by Lyandros son of Lysiades of Anaphlystos, with its reference to τὸ πρότερον ψήφισμα ὃ Λύανδρος εἶπεν (vv. 95–96), leads to the almost inescapable – and wide-

---

\* I make reference to the following works by short title: HABICHT, Untersuchungen = CH. HABICHT, Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Munich, 1979; HABICHT, Studien = CH. HABICHT, Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit, Göttingen 1982; HENRY, Honours and Privileges = A. S. HENRY, Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees, Hildesheim 1983; HENRY (1984) = A. S. HENRY, Athenian Financial Officials After 303 B. C., Chiron 14, 1984, 49–92; HENRY (1988) = A. S. HENRY, The Archons Euboulos and the Date of the Decree for Phaidros of Sphettos, Chiron 18, 1988, 215–224; OSBORNE (1979) = M. J. OSBORNE, Kallias, Phaidros and the Revolt of Athens in 287 B. C., ZPE 35, 1979, 181–194; OSBORNE (1981) = M. J. OSBORNE, Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens, ZPE 41, 1981, 153–170; OSBORNE (1985) = M. J. OSBORNE, The Archonship of Nikias Hysteros and the Secretary Cycles in the Third Century B. C., ZPE 58, 1985, 275–295; OSBORNE (1989) = M. J. OSBORNE, The Chronology of Athens in the Mid Third Century B. C., ZPE 78, 1989, 209–242. I also employ the following abbreviations: MT = B. D. MERITT and J. S. TRAILL, The Athenian Agora, XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors, Princeton 1974 (references to inscriptions in the form MT 85.11 = no. 85, line 11). In referring to inscriptions in the Corpus I omit the letters IG: thus ii<sup>2</sup> 682 = Inscriptiones Graecae vol. ii<sup>2</sup> no. 682. All dates are B. C.

<sup>1</sup> HENRY (1988), especially 222–224.

<sup>2</sup> For a prior, ill-starred assignation to the year 251/0, see the Addendum below (pp. 32–33).

<sup>3</sup> See OSBORNE (1989), especially 230–233.

ly accepted – conclusion that this πρότερον ψήφισμα is in fact the principal motion of the decree itself, and that therefore Lyandros proposed both the motion and the amendment.<sup>4</sup> If so, then Lyandros was a member of the Boule in the year of ii<sup>2</sup> 682.

But Lyandros was also certainly a *bouleutes* in the archonship of Philinos, for in that year he also moved a decree in honour of the prytaneis of Aigeis (MT 89), a document in which Lyandros is mentioned, in the decree of the Boule (vv. 25–26, 31–32), as Treasurer of the Boule in that year. It is therefore an economical and appealing hypothesis to conclude, as OSBORNE does, that Lyandros moved both decrees (ii<sup>2</sup> 682 and MT 89) as *bouleutes* in the same year, that year being the year of Philinos.<sup>5</sup> The added advantage of this hypothesis is that it avoids the complication – if such it is – of a double tenure of office by Lyandros within what must certainly have been a very brief period. For the year of Philinos must fall in the 250s – possibly not later than the middle of the decade<sup>6</sup> – and, on any reckoning, Phaidros' decree will have been passed early rather than later in the same decade.

Leaving aside for the moment the issue of rapid bouletic iteration, let us first consider the date of the year of Philinos. In his forthcoming volume of the Agora decrees<sup>7</sup> WOODHEAD will describe him as «one of the nomads among Athenian archons of the third century». And nomadic indeed he has been, although future archontic studies are most unlikely to allow him to stray beyond the confines of the 250s.<sup>8</sup> OSBORNE in his latest pronouncement places him, without cyclic constraint, in 255/4, and so, as we have seen, dates Phaidros' decree to this year.<sup>9</sup> But it is to be noted that not only is Philinos employed to date Phaidros' decree, on the assumption that Lyandros as *bouleutes* moved both ii<sup>2</sup> 682 and MT 89 in the

<sup>4</sup> For parallels in which the mover of an amendment is also the mover of the main decree, cf. ii<sup>2</sup> 109 and 110, both of the year 363/2.

<sup>5</sup> The late B. D. MERITT argued similarly in *Hesperia* 38, 1969, 433, with Philinos at that time cyclically assigned to the year 254/3. Cf. HENRY (1988) 223.

<sup>6</sup> So HABICHT, *Untersuchungen* 126–128 and 145, placing Philinos earlier than 254/3 (MERITT's date in 1969) and hardly later than the middle of the decade. MERITT's final verdict (*Hesperia* 50, 1981, 95) was 252/1.

<sup>7</sup> The Athenian Agora: Volume XVI, *The Inscriptions, The Decrees*. I am greatly indebted to GEOFFREY WOODHEAD for allowing me to see and use in advance successive drafts of this important work. I wish to thank him also for help with various aspects of this paper. He is not, of course, inculpated in any way.

<sup>8</sup> Philinos has fluctuated from as late as 210/9 (W. K. PRITCHETT and B. D. MERITT, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge Mass. 1940, xxv: cf. W. B. DINSMOOR, *Hesperia* 23, 1954, 316) to as early as 269/8 on the basis of the lettering of a text published in *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 213–214 no. 8 (cf. SEG 21.371), before settling down in the relative security of the middle to late 250s as a result of the discovery in 1968 of MT 89 with its complete prescript of Philinos' year.

<sup>9</sup> See note 3 above.

same year, but Phaidros' decree is itself applied to focus the date of Philinos.<sup>10</sup> For, apart from the reasonable expectation that, given his age, Phaidros will have submitted his *aitesis* as early as possible after the fall of the democracy at the end of the Chremonidean War,<sup>11</sup> the specific instructions in the decree (vv. 75–78) that the honours are to be proclaimed at the City Dionysia and the Great Panathenaia have led some to conclude that our decree must fall in a year preceding a year in which the Great Panathenaia were celebrated.<sup>12</sup> For the 250s the pertinent years would then be 259/8, 255/4 and 251/0. Of these OSBORNE finds 259/8 «impossibly early, since Euboulos II and surely Antiphon and Thymochares must precede Philinos»,<sup>13</sup> and 251/0 too late. That leaves for him 255/4 as the year of Philinos and so the year of ii<sup>2</sup> 682.

OSBORNE is prepared to concede<sup>14</sup> that, if the Euboulos of ii<sup>2</sup> 682.58 is Euboulos I, the archon of 274/3,<sup>15</sup> then the «not unattractive possibility» would arise of Phaidros' decree being passed in the archonship of his son Thymochares, whose year OSBORNE considers was probably 259/8. He proceeds, however, to dismiss this possibility in the light of what he believes to be the strength of the case for the retention of Euboulos II. My own conclusion was to banish the putative Euboulos II from the lists altogether and to place Thymochares tentatively in the Great Panathenaic Year 258/7.<sup>16</sup>

OSBORNE's principal defence of Euboulos II rests, in fact, on the evidence of ii<sup>2</sup> 682.<sup>17</sup> For, in assessing the basis of the existence of Euboulos II, he follows HABICHT<sup>18</sup> in assigning MT 87 (= ii<sup>2</sup> 702) to the year of Ankylos,<sup>19</sup> and tentatively places MT 85 (= ii<sup>2</sup> 678) – and MT 86, which must go with it – in the year of Eubou-

<sup>10</sup> OSBORNE (1985) 288–292 had argued that the earliest possible date for Philinos was 252/1 (with Polyeuktos placed in 246/5) or 253/2 (with Polyeuktos in 247/6).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. HENRY (1988) 223.

<sup>12</sup> I had argued in my earlier paper (op. cit. 222) that, provided the decree was passed early in Hekatombaion, the year of Phaidros' honours might have been *in*, rather than immediately before, a Great Panathenaic Year. But see now below pp. 25–32.

<sup>13</sup> See OSBORNE (1989) 233.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. note 114.

<sup>15</sup> For the designation and differentiation of the various archons Euboulos, see HENRY (1988) 215–216.

<sup>16</sup> OSBORNE places Antiphon, Thymochares, Euboulos (II), Diogeiton and Alkibiades in the span 260/59 – 256/5, without insisting on a precise order for the five (see his Table II, op. cit. 241). Antiphon and Thymochares, however, form a sequential pair (see OSBORNE op. cit. 227 note 89) and should be placed early in the decade. In 1961 (*The Athenian Year*, 140–142) and 1977 (*Historia* 26, 175) MERITT favoured 258/7 for Thymochares, but by 1981 had moved him down to 257/6 (see *Hesperia* 50, 1981, 93). HABICHT (*Untersuchungen* 141 and 144) places Thymochares «mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit in die frühen fünfziger Jahre».

<sup>17</sup> See OSBORNE (1989) 228 note 90.

<sup>18</sup> *Studien* 171–172.

<sup>19</sup> For a discussion of ii<sup>2</sup> 702, see HENRY (1988) 219–221.

los I, 274/3.<sup>20</sup> It is the reference in ii<sup>2</sup> 682.58 to Phaidros' assistance in the matter of his son Thymochares' *agonothesia* [εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄρχοντος which convinces him of the need to have a second Euboulos in the 250s. For, he argues, if this Euboulos is the archon of the year 274/3, then

(i) Thymochares will have been in his twenties when he performed his *agonothesia*

(ii) Phaidros' *aiteisis* for *sitesis* – the minimum requirement for which was thirty years of public service – will have been illegal and

(iii) there is an inflexible problem with the restoration of the archon's name in Rhamnonte no. 7,<sup>21</sup> of the early 250s, if the name of Euboulos (II) is not inserted there.

On closer examination, however, none of these three objections is sufficiently compelling to guarantee the existence of a Euboulos II in the 250s:

(i) OSBORNE maintains that, in 274/3, Thymochares will not only have been in his twenties but «surely in his early twenties», given that his son, Phaidros, was ephebe in 220/19 and therefore born c. 238.<sup>22</sup> But this is perhaps to overstate the case. Granted that Thymochares is hardly likely to have reached the age of thirty by 274/3, he could nevertheless have been around twenty five. If so, he will have been just over sixty at the time of the birth of his son Phaidros, an advanced age for fatherhood but not impossibly so. In any case, there is nothing unconstitutional about such an early tenure of the *agonothesia*, nor is there any particular *political* significance in the office itself. There would thus be nothing remarkable if Thymochares performed this function during the family's years in the political wilderness (286–261).<sup>23</sup>

(ii) The contention that Phaidros' claim for *sitesis* would have been «flagrantly illegal» since, by the year 274/3, it would have covered a career of only twenty two years is also open to challenge. The alleged requirement of a minimum thirty years of commendable political service before a legal claim for *sitesis* could be lodged is, in fact, merely an inference drawn from the wording of the comparable decree in favour of Kephisodoros: πεπολιτευμένος πρὸς τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη.<sup>24</sup> Since Kephisodoros' public career is generally agreed to have commenced in 229/8 and the decree in his honour is dated in 196/5 (archon Charikles), it is clear that his period of qualifying service stretches over more than thirty years. Yet there is no compelling reason to give the definite article in the phrase πρὸς τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη the force «for

<sup>20</sup> I have suggested that ΡΟCΟCΚΕ's garbled reading at MT 85.11 may not, in fact, conceal the name Euboulos at all (see HENRY op. cit. 217–219).

<sup>21</sup> See J. POUILLOUX, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris 1954, 118–120.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. J. K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford 1971, 528.

<sup>23</sup> Certainly, of course, it was only after their political rehabilitation after 261 that Thymochares could aspire to the archonship, but that is clearly quite a different matter.

<sup>24</sup> SEG 25.112.9. See OSBORNE (1981) 160–162.

about the *requisite* thirty years». It may merely be an example of the common insertion of the article with approximate or round numbers after ἀμφί, περί, εἰς and the like,<sup>25</sup> thus yielding no more than «for about thirty years».<sup>26</sup> Thirty years may therefore represent a generally accepted minimum rather than a firm legal requirement. In the case of Phaidros, a calculation commencing with his generalship in 296/5 will admittedly yield by the year 274/3 only twenty two years of itemized public service. But even if that is felt to be not close enough to the standard thirty years, the balance can surely be subsumed under the unspecified liturgies and contributions of his later career mentioned in the closing lines of the motivation clause of the decree (vv. 61–62). Even if Phaidros' later *curriculum vitae publicae* is lacking in items of sufficient substance to warrant individual mention, his case for *sitesis* is at worst thin; it is not illegal.

(iii) The potential complication if the name Euboulos is not restored in line 9 of Rhamnonte no. 7 should not be exaggerated either. It is unclear whether the missing archon's name there ended in -ου or -ος: and the editor can only comment that it «ne compte vraisemblablement que 6 lettres avant -ο[υ] ou -ο[ς]». However, if the restored ἐπί was to be elided, this would increase the potential length of the archon's name by one more letter, and the simple fact is that there are too many uncertainties here for us to use this evidence to bolster the case for a second Euboulos in the 250s.

## II

Apart from negative case that can thus be made against the placing of Phaidros' decree in the year of Philinos and the related identification of the Euboulos of v. 58 as Euboulos II of the early 250s, there are also in my opinion positive indications within the decree itself to justify the assumption that our Euboulos is rather Euboulos I of 274/3. These indications are revealed not only in the sequence of items in Lyandros' citation of Phaidros' public service but also in the very manner of the wording.

At vv. 18 ff. of our decree Lyandros<sup>27</sup> claims that Phaidros has continued (διατετέλεκεν) to display the same policy of goodwill towards the Demos as his ancestors did. We note the perfect tense: the implication is that, at the moment of the proposal for Phaidros' honours being moved in the 250s, this policy of goodwill still manifests itself. There follows (vv. 21–56) an itemized series of the highlights of Phaidros' career, all expressed, as we would expect, in the aorist:<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> For πρὸς used in the sense «about», cf. Polybius 16.7.5: ἄνδρες δὲ τῶν μὲν Ῥοδίων ἀπέθανον εἰς ἐξήκοντα, τῶν δὲ παρ' Ἀττάλου πρὸς ἑβδομήκοντα, τῶν δὲ τοῦ Φιλίππου Μακεδόνες μὲν εἰς τρισχιλίους τῶν δὲ πληρωμάτων εἰς ἑξακισχιλίους.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Xenophon Anab. 4.8.22: ἔμειναν ἡμέρας ἀμφὶ τὰς τριάκοντα.

<sup>27</sup> I assume that it was he (see p. 26 above).

<sup>28</sup> For the details of Phaidros' career cf. DAVIES op. cit. (note 22 above) 526–527.

- (i) 296/5 (archon Nikias I)<sup>29</sup>  
 general ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν δίς<sup>30</sup> (vv. 21–24)
- (ii) date unspecified, but presumably between 295 and 288  
 general ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν πλεονάκις and ἐπὶ τοὺς ξένους τρίς (vv. 24–25)<sup>31</sup>
- (iii) date unspecified, but presumably before the archonship of Kimon in 288/7  
 ambassador to Ptolemy Soter, bringing back food and money for the People  
 (vv. 28–30)<sup>32</sup>
- (iii) 288/7 (archon Kimon)  
 general ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα (vv. 30 ff.)
- (iv) 287/6 (archon Xenophon)  
 general ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα πρῶτος<sup>33</sup> (vv. 44 ff.)
- (v) 282/1 (archon Nikias II)  
*agonothetes* (vv. 53 ff.).

Here we see a steady stream of well-distributed service over fourteen years, rounded off (vv. 56–59) by the disputed reference to the assistance rendered to his son Thymochares in the latter's *agonothesia* in the year of Euboulos. The motivation clause then closes with mention of all the liturgies and subscriptions in which Phaidros, in unspecified years, has been involved, the repeated πάσας (61) and πασῶν (62–63) and the use of the perfect tense (λελειτούργηκεν [61], μετέσχηκεν [62]) deliberately drawing attention to both the magnitude and the continuing nature of Phaidros' generosity to the State.

In the itemized list the wording is almost monotonous: the services simply follow one after another seriatim. It is only when we reach the reference to Thymochares' *agonothesia* in the year of Euboulos that we find the insertion of the modifying adverb ὕστερον. Immediately following upon the citation of Phaidros' own *ago-*

<sup>29</sup> For the sequence of archons by which Phaidros' services are dated, see HENRY (1988) 216 note 7.

<sup>30</sup> For the significance of δίς, see OSBORNE (1985) 275–282, and cf. DAVIES op. cit. (note 22) 526.

<sup>31</sup> As SHEAR notes (*Hesperia Suppl.* 17, 1978, 66 note 193) the wording ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν χειροτονηθεὶς πλεονάκις καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ξένους γενόμενος τρίς is probably best interpreted to mean that in three of his several commands ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν Phaidros was designated commander of the mercenaries. The total number of these commands is thus a minimum of four, and possibly, but not necessarily, a maximum of seven.

<sup>32</sup> In order not to disrupt the chronological sequence OSBORNE (1979) 185 note 14 suggests that the reference may not be to the proposal of Demochares to send an embassy to Ptolemy in 286/5, but to some embassy to Ptolemy prior to the year of Kimon. Cf. DAVIES op. cit. 526–527.

<sup>33</sup> OSBORNE (1979) 188 argues that πρῶτος carries «the obvious implication that Phaidros was the first to be elected after the revolution» (which OSBORNE places in the early summer 287). See contra SHEAR op. cit. 66–67, who, following TARN (*Antigonos Gonatas* 422), argues that πρῶτος implies that Phaidros was deposed in the archonship of Xenophon and replaced by Olympiodoros.

*nothesia* in the archonship of Nikias (II), we read: καὶ ὕστ[ε]ρον τοῦ ἰοῦ Θυμοχάρου ἀγωνοθέτου χειροτονηθέντος | [εἰς τ]ὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄρχοντος συνεπεμ[ε]λήθη καὶ τούτων πάντων (vv. 56–59). Why is the adverb included here and here only? And how much «later» is ὕστερον?

With Phaidros' cooperation in his son's *agonothesia* located in the early 250s (Euboulos II), that is indeed ὕστερον – one might say πολλῶι ὕστερον – than his own execution of the same office in 282/1. With the assistance placed in 274/3 (Euboulos I), that is still, relatively speaking, ὕστερον, but has the added attraction of nicely linking father and son in the performance of the same function within a comparatively short period. Moreover, since few would object to the placing of the decree in the mid to early 250s – let us say, argumenti causa, not later than 255/4, OSBORNE's year for Philinos – then, in citing an activity from as recently as three or four years ago (the year of the putative Euboulos II), would not «and recently» be a more suitable choice of expression than «and later» in referring to the second of two activities allegedly some twenty four years apart?

### Conclusion

This re-examination of the evidence for the dating of the decree in favour of Phaidros of Sphettos leads me to conclude, as I did in my earlier paper, that, whether or not there ever was an archon Euboulos II, the Euboulos of ii<sup>2</sup> 682.58 is the archon of the year 274/3 and the decree itself is like as not to have been passed in the archonship of Phaidros' son Thymochares.

OSBORNE sees the mention of Phaidros' assistance to his son as a «desperate attempt to find something for one who had been «in the wilderness» for little short of thirty years». It could equally well be argued that drawing attention to such a minor service after such a lengthy gap would have had the counter-productive effect of highlighting the weakness of Phaidros' later case. On the other hand, if this item is merely appended as a coda (in 274/3) to his block of substantial service in the 290s and 280s, this lays much less emphasis on the deed itself and does not disrupt the plain flow of the wording of the motivation clause. Phaidros' claim may possibly be viewed as comparatively unimpressive but only to the extent that there is an uneven balance in a long career of public service, with the most significant contributions concentrated in the first half of his career.

If I am right, and if Lyandros was the orator of Phaidros' decree, then Lyandros will of necessity have been a *bouleutes* in the years of Thymochares and of Philinos. Amid the uncertainty of the mid-third century archon list there is, fortunately, general agreement that Thymochares is to be placed early in the 250s and Philinos somewhat later and at least as late as the middle of the decade. The usually assumed minimum gap between his two terms of office will therefore be assured.<sup>34</sup> There is

<sup>34</sup> RHODES reminds us (ZPE 57, 1984, 201) that «it is only a modern assumption, not an



also, pace OSBORNE,<sup>35</sup> nothing inherently impossible – or even unacceptably unlikely – in such a rapid iteration of bouletic service within a quinquennium. As RHODES has pointed out,<sup>36</sup> such cases may be explicable in terms of men who have chosen to serve again at an early opportunity.

There is therefore still much to be said for placing Phaidros' decree in the year of his son Thymochares' archonship. The case for attributing the decree to the year of Philinos (255/4 on OSBORNE's reckoning) is less than compelling and is more than counterbalanced by an unbiased reading of the wording of the motivation clause, which strongly suggests that the Euboulos of v. 58 is the archon of 274/3.

I now accept, however, that it may be better to place the decree in a year preceding a year in which the Great Panathenaia were celebrated. With my allocation of the decree to the year of Thymochares, that will mean 259/8 rather than 258/7. This will have two distinct advantages: it will bring the proposal even earlier in the 250s – and, as we have seen, given Phaidros' age, the earlier the better; and it will also reflect the sequence of words in the instructions at vv. 75–78. For Phaidros' crown is to be proclaimed at the City Dionysia and at the Great Panathenaia in that order. It is natural to take that to refer to the City Dionysia of the current year (259/8 on my reckoning) and the Great Panathenaia in Hekatombaion of 258/7.

I conclude therefore that Phaidros' decree was passed before the time of the City Dionysia in the year 259/8, the year of the archonship of his son Thymochares.<sup>37</sup>

### *Addendum*

Before I leave this reconsideration of the nexus of events surrounding the decree for Phaidros it would not be inappropriate for me to attempt, once and for all, to clear up a confusion I contrived to engender not once but twice before in earlier publications.

Shortly before my *Honours and Privileges* was about to appear I added a last-moment corrigendum (or what I intended as such) in order to take account of ME-

---

attested rule, that a man's two permitted years in the boule should not be consecutive», but rightly urges that, without clear evidence to the contrary, that assumption should be maintained.

<sup>35</sup> See OSBORNE (1989) 231–232.

<sup>36</sup> ZPE 38, 1980, 193–194; cf. *ibid.* 57, 1984, 201. RHODES also emphasises the fact that men known to have served twice in the boule are not concentrated in the smallest demes. There is therefore no substance in the objection (see OSBORNE *op. cit.* 232) that a deme as large as Lyandros' Anaphlystos would have been unlikely to have had a shortfall of candidates for the boule.

<sup>37</sup> Also, as it happens, the date for Thymochares in OSBORNE (1989) 241 Table II. As noted above (note 16), however, apart from placing Antiphon before Thymochares and assigning the pair early in the 250s, OSBORNE specifies no exact order for the archons of the years 260/59 to 256/5, although he considers it probable that 259/8 was in fact the year of Thymochares.

RITT's re-dating of Euboulos II to 254/3,<sup>38</sup> urging that, as a consequence, Phaidros' decree might be located in 251/0. I later repeated this suggestion.<sup>39</sup>

What I had failed to notice, however, was that, with the archon Philinos placed in 252/1, as he then was by MERITT,<sup>40</sup> this produced the highly unlikely situation of a double tenure of office as *bouleutes* by Lyandros of Anaphlystos in consecutive years. For not only (as we have seen above) is Lyandros beyond reasonable doubt the mover of the main motion as well as of the amendment of the probouleumatic decree ii<sup>2</sup> 682 and thus a *bouleutes* in that year, he is also revealed by the evidence of MT 89 as a *bouleutes* in the year of Philinos. Lyandros would thus have been *bouleutes* in 252/1 and then again in 251/0.

However, both in Honours and Privileges and in Chiron 14, 1984 I drew the mistaken conclusion that Lyandros was *bouleutes* in the years of Euboulos (II) and Philinos, and so served in the years 254/3 and 252/1. PETER RHODES<sup>41</sup> was therefore absolutely correct in observing that what I had done – however unwittingly – was to add to the number of those who served in the years of Euboulos and Philinos,<sup>42</sup> and, contrary to my plea,<sup>43</sup> he remains quite untainted by any contamination flowing from my faulty pen.

*Department of Greek*  
*University of St. Andrews*

*Department of Classical Studies*  
*Monash University*  
*Australia*

---

<sup>38</sup> See *Hesperia* 50, 1981, 89–91 and 95.

<sup>39</sup> See HENRY (1984) 76 note 140.

<sup>40</sup> See *Hesperia* 50, 1981, 85, 93 and 95.

<sup>41</sup> *ZPE* 57, 1984, 201–202.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *ZPE* 38, 1980, 197ff.

<sup>43</sup> See HENRY (1988) 224 note 60.

