



<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 S. Henry

The Archons Euboulos and the Date of the Decree for Phaidros of Sphettos

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **18 • 1988**

Seite / Page **215–224**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1176/5543> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1988-18-p215-224-v5543.1

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 / Web: 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).

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).

ALAN S. HENRY

The Archons Euboulos and the Date of the Decree for Phaidros of Sphettos*

It is with more than a little trepidation that I venture into the quicksands of the chronology of Hellenistic Athens. However, my Melbourne colleague, MICHAEL OSBORNE, has already shown the way with an important paper¹ in which, *inter alia*, he has demonstrated the dangers inherent in the assumption that the secretary cycles operated throughout the third century regardless of the nature of the current régime.

It is the main purpose of this paper to re-examine the evidence for the two archons named Euboulos, who, it is claimed, held office within the space of some twenty years in the second quarter of the third century. For convenience, these will be referred to as Euboulos I and II, following the convention adopted by, for example, OSBORNE² and HABICHT.³ It should not be forgotten, however, that, since a *third* Euboulos held the eponymous magistracy in the fourth century in 345/4, the two later bearers of the name should in fact more properly be design-

* I make reference to the following works by short title:

DINSMOOR, Archons = W. B. DINSMOOR, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge/Mass., 1931

DINSMOOR, List = W. B. DINSMOOR, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, New York, 1939

DOW, Prytaneis = S. DOW, *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, *Hesperia Suppl.* 1 (1937)

HABICHT, Studien = C. HABICHT, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen, 1982

HABICHT, Untersuchungen = C. HABICHT, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Munich, 1979

I also employ the following abbreviations:

H. = *Hesperia*

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 ii² 678 = *Inscriptiones Graecae* vol. ii² no. 678.

All dates are B. C.

¹ *ZPE* 58 (1985) 275–295.

² *Art. cit.*, *passim*.

³ *Untersuchungen*, *passim*.

nated Euboulos II and III, and this differentiation is indeed observed by SHEAR in his study of Kallias of Sphettos:⁴ his Euboulos III is our Euboulos II.⁵

I shall also examine the circumstances surrounding the passing of the decree in favour of Phaidros of Sphettos (ii² 682)⁶ and attempt to suggest a possible date.

I. The Archons Euboulos

The decree for Phaidros of Sphettos offers unchallengeable evidence for an archon Euboulos somewhere in the second quarter of the third century. For at vv. 56–60 we read that Phaidros had assisted in the *agonothesia* of his son Thy-mochares during the archonship of Euboulos: τοῦ υἱοῦ Θυμοχάρου ἀγωνοθέτου χειροτονηθέντος [τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἀρχοντος. Immediately prior to this entry we hear at vv. 53 ff. that Phaidros himself had been elected *agonothetes ἐπὶ* Νικίου ἀρχοντος, and this is generally – and, in my view, correctly – taken to refer to Nikias II, archon in the year 282/1.⁷ Further, since the decree states explicitly that Phaidros' assistance to his son was ὕστ[ερον] (vv. 56–57) than his own *agonothesia*, the Euboulos of v. 58 must have held office in a year subsequent to 282/1.

The candidate who springs immediately to mind is the archon Euboulos mentioned by Epicurus (Philodemos, in Herc. Pap. 1005).⁸ Since Epicurus died in the archonship of Pytharatos,⁹ long since firmly anchored in the year 271/0,¹⁰ this Euboulos must occupy a year earlier than that, and currently received wisdom points to the year 274/3.¹¹

There is, however, a clear indication in the decree for Phaidros that it was passed during a period of Macedonian control; for the stele (and the crown) are to be paid for by the Single Officer of Administration,¹² a sure sign of the non-

⁴ T. LESLIE SHEAR, JR., Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B. C., *Hesperia* Suppl. 17 (1978).

⁵ So too DINSMOOR, *List* (1939). In his *Archons* (1931), before Euboulos III had been «discovered», Euboulos II identifies the (at that time) only candidate in the third century in contradistinction to the archon of 345/4. (Note that B. D. MERITT in his latest archontic contributions, *Historia* 26 [1977] 168–191 and *H. 50* [1981] 78–99, does not differentiate the archons Euboulos with Roman numerals).

⁶ Conveniently reprinted by SHEAR, *op. cit.*, Appendix pp. 87–89.

⁷ The reference is certainly not to Nikias III (266/5), since the name here is not further qualified by the demotic Otryneus. And in the sequence of archons Nikias (v. 21), Kimon (v. 31), Xenophon (v. 45), Nikias (v. 53), by which the major offices of Phaidros are dated, the later Nikias is *ipso facto* distinguished from the former. Cf. SHEAR, *op. cit.*, 65–66.

⁸ See W. CRÖNERT, *Rh. Mus.* 56 (1901) 617; and cf. DINSMOOR, *Archons* 80.

⁹ *Diog. Laert.* 10.15; Cicero, *de fato* 19.

¹⁰ See DINSMOOR, *H. 23* (1954) 284 ff.

¹¹ With the exception of the archons Peithidemos and Philippides there is now little dispute about the list for the years 291/0 to 266/5 (see HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 113 ff.).

¹² See vv. 78–80 (crown) and 90–91 (stele).

democratic nature of the prevailing government.¹³ If then the Euboulos of v. 58 is the archon of 274/3 but the decree itself was not passed until after the capitulation of Athens to Antigonos in the spring of 261 B.C.,¹⁴ there will appear to be a gap of at least a dozen years between the last dated¹⁵ mention of Phaidros' public services and the date of the enactment of the decree in his honour. This has encouraged some scholars to seek another Euboulos, closer in time to the approximate date of the decree.

Evidence for this desired Euboulos II is alleged to exist in MT 85 (= ii² 678), a fragment of a lost prytany decree preserved only in POCOCKE's less than accurate transcription of 1752,¹⁶ and in MT 86, another prytany fragment probably, but not certainly, of the same year. The arguments for this common assignation¹⁷ are based on the probable identity in each of Neoptolemos as Secretary of the Boule and Demos and on the possibility that Epikles, the Undersecretary in MT 86.114 underlies the ΣΙΚΛΗΝ reported by POCOCKE in MT 85.99. Moreover, as DOW noted, even if one were to reject this evidence, prosopographical considerations would combine to place the two documents «within one short period.»¹⁸

Now, although such prosopographical indicators can also be employed to suggest a date later than 271/0 (and thus later than Euboulos I [274/3]) for MT 85 and 86,¹⁹ a prior consideration in our enquiry is: does the name Euboulos in fact occur in MT 85? For, if it does not, then, even accepting the contemporaneity of the two texts, this will no longer be evidence for a second Euboulos, archon in the 250s.

In a special third decree (MT 85.10–18), passed in the twelfth prytany, the motion is for the Boule to commend Nikokrates *qua* Treasurer of the Boule. Nikokrates, it appears, has served in one and the same year both in this capacity and as treasurer of the prytaneis of Aigeis.²⁰ Perhaps in order to emphasize that his generosity has manifested itself throughout the year²¹ the name of the year is inserted (v. 11), reported thus by POCOCKE: ΤΩΝΕΝΑΥΤΟΝΤΟ.Ε.ΥΒΟΥΛΟΥ-

¹³ I cannot accept the view that seeks to dispense with the appearances of the Single Officer and the Plural Board as valid indicators of the nature of the current régime (see my article in *Chiron* 14 [1984] 49–92. I hope to write further elsewhere on this point).

¹⁴ I follow H. HEINEN, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 20, Wiesbaden 1972, 139–140. Cf. also HABICHT, *Studien*, 13, and MERITT, *H. 50* (1981) 97 ff.

¹⁵ Vv. 60–64, however, speak in general of liturgies and contributions (not specifically dated by archon years) on the part of Phaidros, for which he has been crowned by the people.

¹⁶ RICHARD POCOCKE, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Graec(arum) et Latin(arum) Liber I: Inscriptiones Antiquae*, London 1752, p. 56 no. 63.

¹⁷ First noticed by MERITT, see DOW, *Prytaneis*, 51.

¹⁸ *Prytaneis*, *ibid.* Cf. HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 123.

¹⁹ See DINSMOOR, *List*, 144.

²⁰ Not Oineis, as DOW says, *op. cit.*, 50.

²¹ So DOW, *ibid.*

ΑΡΚΟΝΤΟΣ, universally interpreted ever since as τ(ὸ)ν ἐν(ι)αυτὸν τὸ[ν] ἐ[π'] Ε]ὐβούλου ἄρ(χ)οντος.²²

No-one can doubt that the name of the archon in whose year²³ MT 85 was passed stood here, but which archon? Euboulos may be tempting, but Dow very properly sounded a note of caution: «To question this [i. e. the presence of the name Euboulos] may be idle, but it is the part of caution to note that Ροσοκκε gives other upsilons for I and K, other omicrons for Θ, Π, or Ω, and other lambdas for Α, Δ, or Ρ; and he made several interpolations or omissions of one or two letters each.»²⁴

So far then the case for Euboulos II has proceeded like this: (i) Euboulos is the archon of MT 85; (ii) MT 85 and 86 belong in the same year; (iii) prosopographical considerations point to a date nearer the middle of the century;²⁵ hence (iv) a second Euboulos, distinct from the archon of 274/3 must be assumed.

As regards the date, the lost MT 85 could obviously furnish no evidence as regards lettering; nor did it contain the provisions for publication of the stone. The lettering of MT 86, however, suggested to Dow «a date in the middle decades of the third century,»²⁶ and he restored the formula in vv. 6–8²⁷

εις δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν κ]
αὶ τὴν στήλῃ[ν μερίσαι? τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικήσει τὸ γενόμενον]
ν ἀνάλωμα.

We note Dow's hesitation – the mark of interrogation is his – about the restoration of μερίσαι with the Single Officer of Administration, a restoration imposed by his preconceptions about the period to which the text should belong viz. during Macedonian control after the capitulation of Athens to Antigonos. A strict stoichedon 45 line²⁸ would, of course, require δοῦναι, but the formula δοῦναι τὸν ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει belongs to the period before the revolt of Athens against

²² The use of square brackets here in I. G. and MT to enclose letters both wrongly transcribed and mistakenly omitted is less than satisfactory. However, the reader should not be greatly misled and can consult the photostatic copy of Ροσοκκε's transcription in Dow, *Prytaneis*, 49.

²³ *Pace* OSBORNE, art. cit. (note 1 above), 293. Cf. Dow, op. cit., 50, and DINSMOOR, List, 144.

²⁴ Op. cit. 48. The note was sounded too loud for DINSMOOR (List, 144), who considered Dow's caution «excessive.» Some considerable doubt must, however, remain. (If an alternative interpretation of Ροσοκκε's transcript be demanded, it would not be impossible, using the clues provided by Dow, to defend an original reading, *exempli gratia*, ἐπ' Ἀλκιβιάδου, explaining thus: Ροσοκκε had difficulty with the reading after Ε [of ἐπ'] and miscalculated the number of letters before ΙΒΙΑΔΟΥ, which he recorded as ΥΒΟΥΛΟΥ after omitting Α and «seeing» ΥΒΥΛΟΥ).

²⁵ Between c. 260–245 B. C. (HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 123).

²⁶ *Prytaneis*, 46.

²⁷ His vv. 4–6 (see *Prytaneis* 44).

²⁸ Not stoichedon 46. PRITCHETT noted this in his review of *Prytaneis*, *AJPh* 60 (1939) 259.

Demetrios Poliorketes²⁹ (and thus impossibly early for the archon Euboulos of ii² 682), and the squeezing in of an extra letter is entirely consistent with the practice of this cutter who is less than conscientious about preserving vertical stochoi.³⁰ (Dow also considered the possibility of reading *μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπι τετ διοικήσει*, a formula current in the period of Athenian freedom between the revolt of Athens and its capitulation to Antigonos,³¹ only to reject this as a counsel of despair because of the need to squeeze in *two* extra letters).³²

The truth of the matter is that we have no sure way of determining the correct reading of MT 86.7, and that in turn cannot therefore be used as a complementary factor in deciding the date of MT 85 and 86. Moreover, not only is the connection of the former with an archon Euboulos at the very least questionable, but even should we accept the restoration in MT 85.11, there is still the possible objection that this hypothetical archon of the early 250s is not formally distinguished from his homonym of 274/3. For, as is well known, homonymous archons of relative chronological proximity are differentiated either by the addition of the demotic to the successor (so, e.g., Nikias III Otryneus, 266/5, as opposed to Nikias II, 282/1)³³ or by the qualification «the one after X» (so, e.g., Diodotos after Phanarchides, 192/1, as distinct from Diodotos of 205/4).³⁴ Since there is manifestly no room at MT 85.11 for the qualification *τοῦ μετὰ τὸν δεῖνα*, this could be seen as further evidence against the likelihood that the (alleged) Euboulos here is distinct from the Euboulos of the 270s. However, it must be conceded that the qualification could have appeared already in the missing prescript of this stone, so that the drafter could well have considered it otiose to define Euboulos yet again at v. 11.

Nevertheless, some doubt must still remain about the case for a second, later Euboulos on the basis of these two texts alone. Yet his existence is now not only taken for granted, but it is even claimed that he can be assigned to a specific year in accordance with the (assumed) secretary cycles in the mid 250s. The evidence for this claim depends on yet another prytany decree, MT 87 (= ii² 702), and it is to this text that we must now turn, a text in which, let it be emphasized, the name Euboulos does not appear but is *entirely restored*.

²⁹ Late in the year of Kimon (288/7): see HABICHT, *Untersuchungen*, 48 ff., and cf. OSBORNE, *ZPE* 35 (1979) 181–194. For the formula see my article in *Chiron* 14 (1984) 68–71.

³⁰ Cf. MT p. 96: «There was slight crowding of the letters in lines 7, 14, 16, 18 and 19, resulting in violation of the stochedon order.» MERITT and TRAILL assume that the letters IOI of *διοικήσει* were cut in two letter-spaces.

³¹ See my article (note 29 above) 71–74.

³² *δοῦναι τοὺς* is *not* considered by Dow, and rightly so, in my opinion (*pace* PRITCHETT, loc. cit. [note 28 above]): see my article, 73 with note 120.

³³ OSBORNE, art. cit. (note 1 above) 278, plausibly suggests that Nikias I, 296/5, was known to the democrats only as Nikias ὕστερος, and was thus adequately differentiated from Nikias II.

³⁴ For a convenient survey of the evidence for the official designation of homonyms see OSBORNE, *ibid.*, note 11.

letters required for Εὐβόλου; that Euboulos II is *not* demonstrably two years distant from Philinos; and that, in any case, the secretary cycles were most probably not operating in the 250s. To this list of doubts may be added the point, already alluded to above in connection with MT 85,⁴⁰ that, with Euboulos II in 256/5 (or 254/3), we would certainly expect him to be qualified *in the prescript* as «the one after X» in order to distinguish him from his homonymous predecessor of 274/3. But manifestly there is no room for such a qualification in ii² 702.2.

Furthermore, STEPHEN TRACY has argued that this fragment should be removed completely from the 250s and placed two generations later among the works of his «Cutter of II² 913.»⁴¹ MERITT has sought to dismiss this claim,⁴² urging a proximity of the letter-forms of ii² 702 and MT 89 (archon Philinos), and, of course, appealing to his arguments from the secretary cycles and the two-year time gap between the years of Euboulos II and Philinos. But the latter arguments, it now appears, have no sure basis, and, on the matter of epigraphical «hands», we may well hesitate to ignore TRACY's opinion. Of course, neither should we lightly dismiss the authority of MERITT's verdict, particularly in such a contentious area as dating by reference to the working life of a particular mason; however, it should not be forgotten that as long ago as 1937 Dow's conclusion was that «the lettering itself suggests 194/3 B. C.»⁴³

TRACY considered two alternative placings for ii² 702, according to the demands of the secretary cycles in MERITT's *The Athenian Year*⁴⁴ and within the working limits of his II² 913 Cutter. These were 213/12, requiring a secretary from tribe XIII (and so correct for Antiochis in that period), and 195/4, requiring a secretary from tribe XI (again correct for Antiochis at that time).⁴⁵ Of these TRACY rejected the former on the grounds that Herakleitos, archon in that year, would not fit the space available in v. 2, and thus concluded that ii² 702 should be placed in 195/4. Since, however, as MERITT has pointed out,⁴⁶ this would result in a succession of three intercalary years (196/5–194/3), the date of ii² 702 must still remain open.

⁴⁰ See page 219 above.

⁴² H. 50 (1981) 90–91.

⁴¹ H. 47 (1978) 257.

⁴³ Prytaneis, 64.

⁴⁴ University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961.

⁴⁵ There is a certain confusion here in OSBORNE's statement that 195/4 is «the only year in this cutter's life when the secretary cycle would require a secretary from tribe XII and the archon's name would be of appropriate length» (art. cit., 294). In 195/4 the cycles demand a secretary from tribe XI (not XII), and the length of the archon's name is relevant only to the possibility (also considered by TRACY) that Herakleitos, archon in 213/12 (tribe XIII), might be a possible candidate for ii² 702. If ii² 702 is placed in 195/4 (tribe XI), the length of the archon's name is irrelevant.

⁴⁶ H. 50 [1981] 90. In an *addendum* to his *Untersuchungen* HABICHT too welcomed this suggestion, and in his later *Studien* (171–172) tentatively assigned both the year and ii² 702 to the archon Ankylos.

Nevertheless, I would argue that such evidence as has been mustered so far for Euboulos II is far from conclusive. In the present state of knowledge it seems preferable to eliminate him from the lists, and to work with only one Euboulos in the third century.

II. *The Date of the Decree in Honour of Phaidros of Sphettos ii*² 682

From the internal evidence of the decree itself it is usually argued⁴⁷

(i) that the decree must belong to the period of Macedonian control after the defeat of Athens in the Chremonidean War

(ii) that the decree must be later than the year of the archon Euboulos, in whose year Phaidros assisted in the *agonothesia* of his son Thymochares

(iii) that the decree was probably passed in a year immediately preceding a celebration of the Great Panathenaia.

Now, as we have already seen,⁴⁸ the principal evidence for contention (i) is the presence of the Single Officer of Administration as the disbursing official, and further support for a background of Macedonian domination may be found in what DINSMOOR referred to as «the wealth of excised reference [vv.36–37, 40–41, 42–44, 47–52] to Demetrios and Antigonos.»⁴⁹ Contention (ii), however, will no longer be able to bring a narrower focus to bear on the period after 261 B.C., if, as I have argued above, the Euboulos of v.58 is the archon of 274/3 and not a later homonym somewhere in the 250s.

Contention (iii) depends on the fact that Phaidros' crown is to be proclaimed at the City Dionysia and the Great Panathenaia (vv.75–78). Thus it has been argued⁵⁰ that our decree belongs in the second year of an Olympiad, immediately prior to the celebration of a Great Panathenaia in the third year. For the 250s this would bring into play the years 259/8, 255/4 and 251/0. However, the reasoning here is less compelling than it might seem at first sight; for, even if we accept (which is by no means proved) a close chronological conjunction between the passing of the decree and its subsequent proclamation, the decree could in fact have been passed *in* (rather than immediately *before*) a year in which the Great Panathenaia were celebrated. For, since the festival did not fall until the third decade of the month of Hekatombaion,⁵¹ the decree could well have been passed in the opening days of the year in question.

⁴⁷ Cf., e.g., SHEAR, *op. cit.*, 10–11.

⁴⁸ See above pp.216–217.

⁴⁹ Archons, 168.

⁵⁰ Cf., e.g., BELOCH, *Gr. Gesch. IV*², ii, 85–87; DINSMOOR, Archons, 168–9 (but contrast List, 146).

⁵¹ See J.D. MIKALSON, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton, 1975, 34. Although there is no consensus about the number of days occupied by the Panathenaia, the central day was Hekatombaion 28 and the maximum limits would appear to be Hekatombaion 23–30.

From the decree itself then we can deduce little more than that its occasion must be in some year after 261 B. C. A consideration, however, of the age of the honorand may take us a little further. There can be little doubt that Phaidros was born c. 330 B. C.;⁵² thus by 260 he will have been at least in his late sixties, if not early seventies. A date for a favourable consideration of his αἵτησις (v. 94) is therefore more than likely to have been in the *early* 250s.⁵³

Can we go further? Strictly speaking no, because the uncertainties are too great. Nevertheless, there are two further points which perhaps deserve consideration in any assessment of the exact year.

In the first place, we may note that both the decree and its amendment were moved by Lyandros son of Lysiades of Anaphlystos.⁵⁴ He is known from another document (MT 89), where he moved a decree in honour of the prytaneis of Aigeis, and where he is also mentioned (vv. 25–26, 31–32), in the decree of the Boule, as Treasurer of the Boule in that year. The year is the archonship of Philinos, and MERITT has suggested that Lyandros may also have moved our decree in the same year.⁵⁵ However, not only is this pure supposition, it would also place the decree in favour of Phaidros much later in the 250s than is perhaps desirable, since the year of Philinos is to be fixed not earlier than 252/1 (or perhaps 253/2).⁵⁶

More promising, however, may be the track that leads us towards Phaidros' son, Thymochares. Not only do we know that he was agonothete in the year of Euboulos (vv. 57–58; 274/3 on my reckoning), we learn also that he was elected to the panel of three who were chosen to supervise the setting up of Phaidros' statue (vv. 99–100). We know further that Thymochares was archon in the early 250s, probably in or very close to 258/7,⁵⁷ and thus an appointee of Antigonos Gonatas.

⁵² See J. K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford, 1971, 526.

⁵³ As OSBORNE notes (art. cit., 294 note 67), Phaidros' application for *sitesis* was on the basis of 30+ years of public service. If one calculates from his generalship in 296/5, then Phaidros will have been an eligible candidate for *sitesis* from the middle 260s on. (For a discussion of grants of *sitesis* see OSBORNE ZPE 31 [1981] 158 ff., especially 160–161, and cf. my *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, *Subsidia Epigraphica* 10, Hildesheim, 1983, 275–278).

⁵⁴ In moving his amendment at vv. 92 ff. Lyandros urges acceptance of the motion κατὰ τὸ πρότερον ψήφισμα δ' Λυάνδρος εἶπεν.

⁵⁵ H. 38 (1969) 433, with the date of 254/3 for the year of Philinos.

⁵⁶ See OSBORNE, art. cit. (note 1 above), 288–292. In a complicated but perucid examination of the evidence with reference to the career of Thoukritos of Myrrhine (4 generalships listed in ii² 2856 and a hipparchy restored in his name in ii² 1279 [see SEG 22.125]) OSBORNE is able to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the secretary cycles did not operate in the 250s and that the earliest possible date for Philinos' archonship is 252/1 (with Polyeyktos placed in 246/5) or 253/2 (Polyeyktos in 247/6, so MERITT).

⁵⁷ For once there is general agreement between MERITT and HABICHT. Over the years MERITT has favoured 258/7 or 257/6 (most recently the latter, see H. 50 [1981] 93); HABICHT

A possible – no more than that – scenario is as follows: Phaidros' early career (between 295 and 287) under régimes of less than democratic persuasion could be construed «to represent a lack of enthusiasm for the democratic cause.»⁵⁸ As a result, he was not only no longer prominent politically in the years after the departure of Demetrios – his services then, as his decree shows, being confined, apart from assisting his son's *agonothesia* in 274/3, to financial contributions through liturgies and subscriptions (vv. 60–64) – but the political climate was unfavourable for a sympathetic response to an *aitesis* on his part for *sitesis*. After the fall of Athens, however, the time was ripe for the recognition of his loyal services to the Demos even under non-democratic régimes. It may be no coincidence, therefore, if his decree is moved very early in the year of the archonship of his son, perhaps shortly before the Great Panathenaia of 258 B.C.,⁵⁹ and if his son Thymochares and their fellow demesman Straton comprised two of the three members of the panel chosen to supervise the erection of the statue.⁶⁰

Such a reconstruction, hypothetical as it is, would fit all the known facts and adequately account for the gap between the last dated event of Phaidros' career (274/3) and the year of the passing of the decree in his favour (? 258/7).⁶¹

*Department of Classical Studies Monash University
Clayton 3168, Victoria, Australia*

contends that Thymochares belongs «mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit in die frühen fünfziger Jahre» (Untersuchungen, 141; cf. 144).

⁵⁸ So OSBORNE, ZPE 35 (1979) 189, where he convincingly argues (*pace* SHEAR, *op. cit.*, 69 ff.) that Phaidros should be seen not so much as «pro-Macedonian» but as someone who pursued a policy of cautious co-existence which nevertheless included loyal patriotism to his country.

⁵⁹ DINSMOOR (Archons, 168/9) came to a similar conclusion, placing Thymochares in 259/8 (a year *before* the Great Panathenaia), but later abandoned this idea (List, 145–6) after the «discovery» of Euboulos II. RHODES (ZPE 57 [1984] 201 note 7) also noticed that, with the Euboulos of ii² 682.58 identified with the archon of 274/3, Thymochares became a candidate for archon in the year of Lyandros' decree for Phaidros.

⁶⁰ This may be an appropriate place to correct a mistake committed by myself in an over-hasty *corrigendum* to my Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees (see note 53 above) and repeated in Chiron 14 (1984) 76 note 140. With Euboulos II in 256/5 (so MERITT, *Historia* 26 [1977] 175) SHEAR placed ii² 682 c. 255/4; with Euboulos II shifted to 254/3 (so MERITT, *H.* 50 [1981] 95) I attempted to put ii² 682 in 251/0, but neglected to see that that still left Lyandros of Anaphlystos as councillor in two consecutive years. RHODES, ZPE 57 (1984) 201–202, rightly censured this carelessness, but seems himself to have been contaminated by it; my faulty reasoning produced Lyandros as councillor in both 252/1 (MT 89) and 251/0 (ii² 682), but did *not*, as RHODES would have it, add «to the number of those who served in the years of Euboulus and Philinus.» On my present arguments as presented above we must now assume that the archonships of Thymochares and Philinos were at least two years apart.

⁶¹ I wish to thank GEOFFREY WOODHEAD for reading and criticizing an earlier draft of this paper. He bears no responsibility for the views expressed herein.