



<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

## Alfred S. Bradford The Synarchia of Roman Sparta

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **10 • 1980**

Seite / Page **413–426**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1346/5695> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1980-10-p413-426-v5695.6

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)).

ALFRED S. BRADFORD

## The Synarchia of Roman Sparta

The Spartan *gerousia* in classical times was composed of twenty-eight *gerontes* and two kings.<sup>1</sup> If τῶν κη' γερ[όντων] in IG V 1, 16 has been restored correctly (but *ger[onton]* has been restored from traces of the first three letters only) and correctly interpreted, there were still twenty-eight *gerontes* as late as the time of Augustus; the few complete lists of *gerontes*, however, give the names of twenty-three members.<sup>2</sup> The word *gerousia* itself does not appear (without the aid of a restoration) in a Spartan inscription of imperial times; instead we sometimes find the word *synarchia* where we would expect to find *gerousia*.<sup>3</sup>

K. M. T. ATKINSON believes that the term *synarchia* implies a composite body, which, in fact, (she concludes), comprised the *gerousia* and part of the *patronomia*, which, in turn, comprised a superior board of six – the eponymous *patronomos* and five associates (called properly <the *patronomi*>) – and an inferior board of six, <the *synarchoi*>, further, that the five *patronomi* and the twenty-three *gerontes* together composed the twenty-eight member *gerousia*; finally, that the *grammateus* and the eponym bring the number up to the traditional thirty.<sup>4</sup> She rejects the suggestion that the ephors (or any board of magistrates other than the *patronomi*) could have been *ex officio* members of the *gerousia*.

The first difficulty in accepting this reconstruction involves the nature of the *patronomia*; quite simply, with the exception of the eponymous *patronomos*, the *patronomia* just does not appear to be important.<sup>5</sup> It is mentioned infrequently. We are certain of the names of only twenty-one men who were ordinary non-epo-

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 6, 2.

<sup>2</sup> IG V 1, 93, 94 – I B.C.; SEG XI 564 – late I A.D.; SEG XI 585 – mid II A.D.; SEG XI 569 lists only twenty-one members, but there appears to be one name, at least, omitted, line 15: II *vacat*.

<sup>3</sup> IG V 1, 448, or *boule*, IG V 1, 541.

<sup>4</sup> Ancient Sparta, Manchester 1949 (reprinted 1952), 142–149. With this book K. M. T. ATKINSON (Chrimes) opened up a new approach to that city's history. She was the first to establish beyond doubt that the Sparta of Roman times, once the structure of its society is understood, can tell us something about earlier Sparta. She formulated many of the essential questions, and, if I often disagree with her answers, and I do, nevertheless I must affirm that I am following a path which she first pointed out.

<sup>5</sup> B. SHIMRON, *The Original Task of the Spartan Patronomoi*, *Eranos* 63, 1965, 155–158.

nymous *patronomi*<sup>6</sup> (compared to almost one hundred-eighty ephors and one hundred-fifty *nomophylakes*); the difference in the numbers, as an indication of the relative importance of the offices, seems too great to be due to an accident of survival.

There are, to be sure, other individuals known who may have been *patronomi*, but of these, three come from an inscription without a heading and may not be *patronomi* at all;<sup>7</sup> one, who is called *ton patronomon*, was probably eponym,<sup>8</sup> as are two others;<sup>9</sup> six, who held posts of special distinction (deputy to the eponym, *epimeletes* for Lycurgus) are certainly not ordinary *patronomi*;<sup>10</sup> and twelve come from two inscriptions where, if the term *synarchontes* is given no more weight than it deserves, may not be *patronomi* either,<sup>11</sup> but even if they are, still we would be sure of the names of only thirty-three ordinary *patronomi*. We know the names of more *agoranomi*, *bideoi*, *bouagoi*, ephors, *gerontes*, *nomophylakes*, priests (and priestesses), *sphaireis*, and *proxeni*.

The few *patronomi* known form too small a sample to permit conclusions to be drawn about the *patronomia* on the basis of Spartan prosopography. One inscription (twelve *patronomi*) comes (probably) from the Augustan period,<sup>12</sup> two others from the early third century A. D.;<sup>13</sup> there is not enough evidence from either of these periods to be able to judge the status of these individuals. The fourth inscription is likely to come from the middle of the second century A. D.; two of the individuals have Roman *nomina* and can be considered prominent; another appears to have been *bouagos* (a distinction) and to have held the office of *bideos*;<sup>14</sup> the others are unknown. Certainly the members of this particular board appear to be respectable men; the Roman citizens and the *bouagos*, at least, might be expected to have decent or even distinguished careers in Sparta. Tentatively, we might say, if the

<sup>6</sup> IG V 1, 48; SEG XI 503, 499, 500.

<sup>7</sup> IG V 1, 115 (SEG XI 592).

<sup>8</sup> IG V 1, 534, as he probably is the eponymous *patronomos* of IG V 1, 46.

<sup>9</sup> IG V 1, 535, 539.

<sup>10</sup> IG V 1, 295 – 275 – 312 – 280 – 311, 541, 542 – 158 restored by A. M. WOODWARD, ABSA 43, 1948, 243–4 = SEG XI 631; SEG XI 542.

<sup>11</sup> IG V 1, 541, 544. The first offices named are *hipparch* and *agoranomos*. There could be a board of *agoranomi* honoring the *epimeletes* of the *patronomia* of Lycurgus. There is no evidence for a board of *hipparchs*, but the *hipparchs* were closely associated with the games in Sparta (IG V 1, 479) and the other inscriptions honoring the *epimeletes* were erected by persons involved in the games (IG V 1, 542 and 543). If the twelve *synarchontes* are *patronomi*, either there was a second election in this year or the assumption based on IG V 1, 48 (where there are twelve *patronomi* listed) that the *patronomia* had twelve members is wrong, because here we have twelve *synarchontes* (= *patronomi*) and the *epimeletes* of the eponymous *patronomos* and the eponymous *patronomos* himself, in this case, Lycurgus.

<sup>12</sup> IG V 1, 48.

<sup>13</sup> IG V 1, 541, 544.

<sup>14</sup> SEG XI 503; Nikandridas, SEG XI 605.

*patronomia* was not so important as the *ephoria* and the other major offices, nevertheless the one board for which we have evidence appears to have been filled, in part at least, by men who could hold the major offices.

There are forty-five careers of officeholders extant;<sup>15</sup> of the forty-five men, only four state that they were *patronomi*, and of these four, one certainly refers to his eponymous *patronomia*,<sup>16</sup> another refers to his tenure of office with «Lycurgus the god»,<sup>17</sup> (in itself sufficient reason to mention the post), and a third appears in a fragmentary inscription in which [*synar*]chos patro[nomias] has been restored.<sup>18</sup> In contrast, of four offices known to have been of some importance – *gerousias*, *ephor*, *nomophylax*, and, to a lesser extent, *bideos* – *gerousias* is mentioned in thirty-seven of the careers, *ephor* in twenty-six, *nomophylax* in twenty-two, and *bideos* in twelve.

The men who had their careers inscribed either held the office of *patronomos* or they did not. If they did hold the office of *patronomos* and yet did not mention that fact in their careers, they could not have considered the *patronomia* very important. If, on the other hand, they did not hold the office, either they were not important enough to hold it, which is absurd on the face of it – if they weren't important enough, who was? – or the office was not important enough for them to want to hold it.

The second difficulty in accepting the reconstruction of ATKINSON involves the definition of the words *synarchoi* and *synarchontes* and the use of them as evidence for an inferior board of *patronomi*. *Synarchoi* and *synarchontes* are never used to indicate a specific office. The terms mean (and are used in the meaning) «fellow-officials». An *agoranomos*,<sup>19</sup> a *gynaikonomos*,<sup>20</sup> *epimeletes*,<sup>21</sup> *bideos*,<sup>22</sup> *ephor*,<sup>23</sup> and perhaps even a *grammateus boulas*,<sup>24</sup> as well as a *patronomos*,<sup>25</sup> have *synarchoi*, usually expressed by the formula<sup>26</sup> «Agesinikos Sokleida, *epimel[e]tas* in the year of Damares; *synarchoi*: Polykles Gorgippou, etc.»

<sup>15</sup> IG V 1, 31–47, 65, 71; SEG XI 488–501.

<sup>16</sup> Theophrastos, SEG XI 492, cf. SEG XI 494, 496.

<sup>17</sup> SEG XI 500.

<sup>18</sup> IG V 1, 44. ATKINSON, op. cit. 152–4, points to other evidence that suggests the *patronomia* was not so very important – that it does not appear in cult lists, which she explains by saying that the cults were established before there was a *patronomia*.

<sup>19</sup> IG V 1, 124, 126–130.

<sup>20</sup> IG V 1, 170; SEG XI 626, 627.

<sup>21</sup> IG V 1, 133–135.

<sup>22</sup> IG V 1, 556.

<sup>23</sup> IG V 1, 54, cf. 53.

<sup>24</sup> IG V 1, 479: «The city (honors) Sex Pom(pei)us Epiktas, the *grammateus* of the *boule*, a good and pious man, hipparch and *agonothetes* of the second Olympiad – his *synarchoi* paid for the memorial.» The question here is who are these *synarchoi*: *gerontes*, hipparchs, or *agonothetai*?

<sup>25</sup> IG V 1, 48, 505; SEG XI 503.

<sup>26</sup> IG V 1, 135.

Sometimes one individual is the subject of an honorary decree and his *synarchoi* are listed.<sup>27</sup> Once, the ephors of one inscription are rearranged in another inscription so that some of them, for no discernable reason, become *synarchoi*.<sup>28</sup> We cannot, therefore, assume that the members of a board who are listed as *synarchoi* are inferior to the rest; when we encounter the phrase *hoi synarchontes tes patronomias* we must conclude that the phrase means 'the fellow-officials of the *patronomia*', not an inferior board of *patronomi*.<sup>29</sup>

The third difficulty in accepting the reconstruction of ATKINSON involves the usage of the prefix *syn*. In Spartan inscriptions certain individuals are described as *synephebos tou deinos*.<sup>30</sup> The force of the prefix cannot be that several different elements compose one *synephebe* (or even a 'synephebate'), but rather the *synephebe* is in a relationship to someone other than himself. Similarly, with *syngynaikonomos*,<sup>31</sup> *synpatronomos*,<sup>32</sup> and *synagoranomos*,<sup>33</sup> the *syn* indicates an individual in relation to another individual. And so also with *synarchoi*, as the examples cited earlier show (in the formula 'so-and-so and the *synarchoi*'), somebody and the *synarchoi* compose the *archontes*. Thus, if the *syn* of *synarchia* has the same force as the *syn* of *synarchoi*, then, as someone and the *synarchoi* compose the *archontes*, so something and the *synarchia* compose the *archeia*.

This is not to say that Spartan usage of the *syn*-prefix must have been consistent, but only that the burden of proof must rest on those who would maintain that *syn* shows the *synarchia* to have been a composite body.

Whether the *synarchia* was a composite body or not, it was a specific political entity. We find that a foreigner, coming to Sparta, approached the *synarchia* and the *damos*;<sup>34</sup> that Caracalla was honored through the *synarchia*;<sup>35</sup> that a private citizen was honored by the city through the *synarchia*;<sup>36</sup> that an altar was dedicated to Hadrian by the *synarchia*;<sup>37</sup> and that individuals were *presbys* of the *synarchia*.<sup>38</sup>

And yet we have no individual who states that he was a member of the *synarchia*, no inscription headed 'the *synarchia*', and no mixed list of offices which could legitimately be considered the *synarchia*, except, perhaps, for IG V 1, 20B, which is a list of [*gerontes*] with a *grammateus boulas*, ephors, and four *nomophylakes*.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. IG V 1, 505, 556.

<sup>28</sup> IG V 1, 53, 54.

<sup>29</sup> IG V 1, 505.

<sup>30</sup> E.g. IG V 1, 45, 47.

<sup>31</sup> SEG XI 500.

<sup>32</sup> SEG XI 499, 500.

<sup>33</sup> SEG XI 499.

<sup>34</sup> IG V 1, 4, lines 3-5.

<sup>35</sup> IG V 1, 448.

<sup>36</sup> IG V 1, 480.

<sup>37</sup> SEG XIII 256.

<sup>38</sup> IG V 1, 37 B, 480, 504, 1505; SEG XI 492, 495.

IG V 1, 18, 19, and 20 are concerned with Spartan contests, IG V 1, 18 and 19 with the Leonidean games, IG V 1, 20 either with these or with the Nervanidean Uranian games.<sup>39</sup> All three inscriptions may come from the same year, when the contests were established or renewed. IG V 1, 18A is headed «the *gerontes*». IG V 1, 19 ends ἀπογράψον[ται --- | --- τοῦ]ς νομοφύλακας. IG V 1, 20A ends ὁ λαχὼν τῶν ἀρχόντων. Since there is a reference to the *synarchia* «passing judgement» (but otherwise undefined) in the text of IG V 1, 20A, the list of officials in IG V 1, 20B could appear to be the *synarchia*, but the list seems rather to correspond to the archontes «from whom one will be chosen.» *Nomophylakes* come last in the list of IG V 1, 20B. The last *archontes* named in IG V 1, 19 are *nomophylakes*. The space in IG V 1, 19 fits ἀπογράψον[ται δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς] | [τοὺς γέροντας καὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους καὶ τοῦ]ς νομοφύλακας, precisely the offices found in IG V 1, 20B. There is, then, no reason to consider this list proof that the *synarchia* was a composite body.

We know from IG V 1, 448 that the *gerontes* were in the *synarchia* (leaving aside for the moment the question whether they constituted the whole of that body).

- 1 Μᾶρκον Αὐρήλιον Ἀντω-
- 2 νεῖνον
- 7 διὰ συναρχίας τῆς περὶ Μᾶρ-
- 8 κον Τάδιον Φιλοξενίδην.
- γέροντες ἐπὶ Ἰουλ(ίου) Δαμ(--)
- ᾧν πρέσβυς Μᾶρκος Τάδιος Φιλοξενίδης
- κτλ.

There are several parallels. IG V 1, 78 (+ 75A = SEG XI 555):

- [νο]μοφύλακες οἱ περὶ Γ[όργιππον]  
 [Γορ]γίππου οἱ ἐπὶ πατρωνό(μου) Με--  
 ᾧν πρέσβυς  
 [Γόρ]γιππος Γοργίππου  
 κτλ.

IG V 1, 140 (= SEG XI 616a):

- βίδειοι οἱ περὶ τὸν ἀξιολογώτατον Μ Αὐ  
 Ἔλενον < τὸ δεύτερον ἐπὶ πατρων(ό)μου  
 Μ Αὐρ Τειμοκλέους τοῦ < τοῦ καὶ Κλεο[ίτ]ου  
 ᾧν πρέσβυς Μ Αὐρ Ἐλενος κτλ.  
 (See also IG V 1, 137)

The parallels would have suggested, had there been no previous assumption, that what we call the *gerousia* the Spartans of imperial times called the *synarchia*.

As stated earlier, we do not find the word *gerousia* (without restoration) in a Spartan inscription of Roman times, though a single member of the board is a

*gerousias*.<sup>40</sup> Two or more members are *gerontes*;<sup>41</sup> which member was *presbys* is usually stated in the formula «*gerontes* in the year of so-and-so, of whom *presbys* (was) so-and-so»,<sup>42</sup> but also as «*presbys* of *gerontes*»<sup>43</sup> or «*gerousias* four times, *presbys* twice»<sup>44</sup> in career-inscriptions. The last formula is similar to one found in another career-inscription, «*bideos* twice, *presbys* once»,<sup>45</sup> and therefore the statement at the end of a third career-inscription, «held the office of *gerousias* four times, twice *presbys* of the *synarchia*»,<sup>46</sup> suggests that «*presbys* of the *synarchia*» is «*presbys* of *gerontes*».

Spartan inscriptions do not say much about the processes of the government, but the sheer volume of lists of *gerontes*, ephors, and *nomophylakes* demands that they be considered the three most important offices in Sparta, although, of the three, the *nomophylakia* appears to be the least important. It is an office that is held before the *ephoria* in every career we have<sup>47</sup> and the number of inscriptions which list ephors and *nomophylakes* together, thereby implying a close association of *nomophylax* and ephor, always list the ephors first.<sup>48</sup>

The two most important boards of officials are the *gerontes* and the ephors. If the *synarchia* is a composite body and one as important as its name would imply, it should comprise the *gerousia* and the *ephoria*. Its *presbys* would be either the *presbys* of *gerontes* or the *presbys* of ephors; in the two cases where the careers of *presbeis* of the *synarchia* can be traced, neither man was *presbys* of ephors, each was *presbys* of the *synarchia* twice, and one was *gerousias* four times, the other five.<sup>49</sup>

Nor must we be surprised that the board of *gerontes* was called by a name other than *gerousia*, since it appears in two frozen expressions as *boule*: *grammateus boulas*<sup>50</sup> and ΦΣΒ = φσ(ήφισμα) β(ουλᾶς).<sup>51</sup> And *boule* is found, without restoration, once, when it and the *demos* have chosen an individual to be *epimeletes* to the god Lycurgus in his fourth year as eponymous *patronomos*<sup>52</sup> and once through

<sup>39</sup> Cf. IG V 1, 667. The reference in the second column on page nine of IG V 1, under 19, is wrong. N. 668 should read n. 667.

<sup>40</sup> SEG XI 488, 489.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. SEG XI 564.

<sup>42</sup> IG V 1, 97 (SEG XI 564), 98, 100, 108, 109, 111, 117; SEG XI 559, 569, 585.

<sup>43</sup> SEG XI 489.

<sup>44</sup> IG V 1, 101.

<sup>45</sup> SEG XI 495.

<sup>46</sup> SEG XI 492.

<sup>47</sup> IG V 1, 31, 32 A, 32 B, 34, 36 A, 39 (*bis*), 71 b (lines 14–19); SEG XI 488.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. IG V 1, 51, 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 71.

<sup>49</sup> SEG XI 492, 495. Chares was *presbys* of the *synarchia* «for the second time.» He might have been *presbys* more often than that. And IG V 1, 448, where we know that the *presbys* of the *synarchia* and the *presbys* of *gerontes* were the same individual.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. SEG XI 585.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. SEG XI 564, 578, cf. L. H. JEFFERY, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961, 183: φσ = ψ.

<sup>52</sup> IG V 1, 541.

restoration as τᾱς α' βου(λᾱς).<sup>53</sup> This suggests to me that *boule* is the council in session (as the *bouleuterion* is its meeting hall, see below), while the *synarchia* is the council in its theoretical position in the state.<sup>54</sup>

There is a piece of evidence, however, which seems to prove that the *synarchia* could not have been just the board of *gerontes*: Chares was *presbys* of the *synarchia* for the second time in the year of Kallikrates Rufi,<sup>55</sup> *presbys* of *gerontes* and *gerousias* for the third time in the year of Biadas,<sup>56</sup> and *presbys* of *gerontes* in the year of Sejanus.<sup>57</sup>

SEG XI 585	IG V 1, 111 (per SEG XI 584)
γέροντες ἐπὶ Βιάδα, ὦν πρέσβυς	[γέροντες] οἱ ἐπ[ὶ Κ]λα[υ-]
Χάρης < γεροντεύων τὸ τρίτον	[δίο]υ Σεῖανοῦ, ὃ[ν πρέσβυς]
Φιλουμενὸς Σωτηρίδα τὸ δεύτερον	[Χ]άρης < γερο[ντεύων τὸ β']
4 Φιλωνίδας Εὐκρίνους, Σωσικρά-	4 Φιλουμενὸς Σ[ωτηρίδα]
της Ἐπαφροδείτου, Ἰούλιος Νέασμος,	Φιλωνίδας Εὐκρίνους
Νεικιπίδας Μενεμάχου, Ἰούλιος Λύκος,	Σωσικράτης Σώτο[υ]
Καλλικράτης Σωσικράτους, Σπαρτιάτης	Ἰού(λιος) Νέας [Σ]ωσικράτους
8 Σωσιδάμου, Εὐδαιμάκων Εὐκτήμονος	8 Καλλικράτης {Σ[ωκ]ράτ[ους]}
κτλ.	Σπαρτιάτης Σωσιδ(ά)μου
	Εὐδαιμάκων Εὐκτή(μονος)
	κτλ.

< is the abbreviation for the patronymic when the father and the son have the same name.

IG V 1, 111, line 8: *Sokratous* seems to have been wrongly inscribed (cf. SEG XI 585, line 7), then erased and the correct name, *Sosikratous*, added to line 7. *Soton* (line 6) seems to be an error arising from the same circumstances.

If the restoration of IG V 1, 111 is correct, Chares was *presbys* of *gerontes* for either the first or the second time in the year of Sejanus, and either the second or the third time, respectively, in the year of Biadas, but, if the board of *gerontes* is the *synarchia*, not for the second time in either year, because he was *presbys* of the *synarchia* for the second time in the year of Kallikrates, but he must have been *presbys* for the second time in either the year of Sejanus or the year of Biadas; therefore, if the restoration is correct and the information contained in the three inscriptions is not in error, the *synarchia* is not the board of *gerontes*.

<sup>53</sup> IG V 1, 11.

<sup>54</sup> A parallel case, though not exactly the same, is found in the Achaean League, A. GIOVANNINI, Polybe et les assemblées achéennes, MH 26, 1969, 14–15, where the author differentiates the terms *boule*, *ekklesia*, and *synodos*; the first two are assemblies, the last a term meaning session.

<sup>55</sup> SEG XI 495.

<sup>56</sup> SEG XI 585.

<sup>57</sup> IG V 1, 111.



When, however, we examine the restoration we find that it depends upon the assumption that Sejanus preceded Biadas, which depends, in turn, upon the restoration of IG V 1, 111.<sup>58</sup> The portion of the inscription which would record the number of times Chares and Philoumenos (who was *gerousias* for the second time in the year of Biadas) had served as *gerontes* is lost. The two inscriptions of themselves do not furnish the evidence to determine the order of the *patronomi*.

Ti. Claudius Sejanus and C. Avidius Biadas are known, as *patronomi*, from other inscriptions<sup>59</sup> and both appear as *patronomi* in IG V 1, 71 (careers of ephors and *nomophylakes* from the year of the *patronomos* Cascellius Aristoteles), where, unfortunately, Biadas and Sejanus do not appear in the same man's career. There is no direct evidence for the order of Biadas and Sejanus, though they do seem to fall in consecutive years.

Two dedications are made to Artemis Orthia, one (in Biadas' year) by «*Ga(ius) Juli(u)r Philochareinor, bouagor mikkichiddomenon*» (that is, a leader of a group of boys of a certain age) and one (in Sejanus' year) by «*Philochareinor Lysippo, boagor mikichiddomenon*» (sic).<sup>60</sup> The Philochareinos of the one inscription is the Philochareinos of the other, so, unless we are entirely mistaken about the nature of the office of *bouagos* – that is, a position held by a young man of around twenty – the years of Sejanus and Biadas must fall close together and, in fact, because of the coincidence of the individual *gerontes* of the two years, be consecutive.<sup>61</sup>

Three of the *gerontes*, Spartiates Sosidamou, Eudaimakon Euktemonos, and Philoumenos Soterida, appear in another list (IG V 1, 112).<sup>62</sup> Philoumenos must have been *gerousias* for the first time in the year of Sejanus, if Sejanus does precede Biadas, because Philoumenos was *gerousias* for the second time in the year of Biadas; he must have been *gerousias* for the third time (or more) in IG V 1, 112. Spartiates and Eudaimakon, likewise, would have been *gerontes* for the third time (at least) in IG V 1, 112, but the three men are eighth-, fourth-, and third-to-last in the list. Although it is not unknown for an individual to appear towards the end

<sup>58</sup> A. M. WOODWARD, ABSA 43, 1948, 236–7: «As his name [Nervinius Noetos] does not appear in the list of the Gerosia of the year of Biadas, he had presumably ceased to be a member at the end of Sejanus' year, and in his place and that of another retiring member Nikippidas and Julius Lykos were elected, though it is somewhat puzzling to find their names entered as sixth and seventh on the roll» implies the restoration of SEG XI 584, as does ATKINSON (cf. n. 4) 469, note D, «Philoumenos Σωτηρίδα is recorded as holding office τὸ δευτερον under Biadas, but no number is given to him under Sejanus.»

<sup>59</sup> Sejanus: IG V 1, 292, 293, 1586; Biadas: IG V 1, 294, SEG XI 493, 528, and perhaps to be restored in IG V 1, 88 by A. M. WOODWARD, ABSA 43, 1948, 230 = SEG XI 553.

<sup>60</sup> IG V 1, 294, 292.

<sup>61</sup> ATKINSON (cf. n. 4) 95–99, re *bouagos*; A. M. WOODWARD, ABSA 26, 1924–5, 193. Philochareinos is a rare name. A Philochareinos is father of Lysippos (I), IG V 1, 32 B, 65, 114, SEG XI 546; another Philochareinos is father of Lysippos (II), IG V 1, 85, 128, 292.

<sup>62</sup> Although the list is not wholly preserved, the appearance of a *gr(ammateus) boulas* confirms that it is a list of *gerontes*.

of such a list without recording the number of times he has held the office, it is quite unusual; it is more likely that the three men were *gerontes* in IG V 1, 112 for the first time and that Biadas preceded Sejanus as eponymous *patronomos*.

The *grammateus boulas* mentioned in IG V 1, 112, M. Ulpius Aphthonetos (the only Aphthonetos known in this period), appears to be the man who was eponymous *patronomos* in the latter part of the reign of Hadrian; since a Spartan attained the eponymous *patronomia* late in his career, he could hardly be expected to become *grammateus boulas* much later than (if, in fact, he hadn't held the post before) he had been eponym, but there are at least fifteen *patronomi* between Aphthonetos and Biadas-Sejanus, perhaps more.<sup>63</sup> The year of IG V 1, 112, then, should be earlier than the years of Biadas-Sejanus (and earlier, too, perhaps, than the year of Aphthonetos).

Philoumenos would have been *gerousias* for the first time in IG V 1, 112, for the second time, as recorded, in the year of Biadas, and for the third time in the year of Sejanus. Chares, the *presbys*, would have been *gerousias* for the fourth time in

<sup>63</sup> IG V 1, 32 A (in part): Seiteimos (eponymous *patronomos* during Hadrian's second visit to Sparta, A.D. 128/9, W. WEBER, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus*, Leipzig 1907, 188–9, 278–9) – Seiteimos – Aristoboulos – Aphthonetos – Atticus – Aristonikidas – Alkastos

Alkastos is roughly contemporary with Spartiatikos, but perhaps earlier, because two individuals who are *agoranomi* in his year (IG V 1, 128) are *nomophylakes* in the year of Spartiatikos (IG V 1, 85). Spartiatikos precedes Eudamidas, Eudamidas Sejanus (IG V 1, 71 b, lines 1–4), so

Alkastos // Spartiatikos – Eudamidas – Sejanus

Damokles follows Aphthonetos because the subject of a career-inscription which ends with the year of Aphthonetos, IG V 1, 34, held another office in the year of Damokles, IG V 1, 105 + 106 (= SEG XI 582). Damokles precedes Meniskos because a man who was *nomophylax* in his year (IG V 1, 65, SEG XI 549) was ephor in the year of Meniskos (IG V 1, 59, SEG XI 521) and *nomophylax* precedes ephor (cf. page 418 and note 47). Through SEG XI 494, 496, and 497 we can list in order

(Aphthonetos – Damokles) – Meniskos – Theophrastos – Onasikleidas – <Deximachos, who follows Onasikleidas but does not necessarily precede> – Lycurgus – Neikias – Damares – Eudamidas

Given the rapid succession of offices held in SEG XI 494 Deximachos is probably a few years or less after Onasikleidas.

Eudamos follows Onasikleidas (SEG XI 490) but precedes Damares, because Damares was ephor in the year of Eudamos (IG V 1, 63) and he is likely to have been ephor before *patronomos*.

Onasikleidas – Eudamos – Damares

Neikephoros is after Seiteimos and before Meniskos (SEG XI 494); whether he is before or after Aphthonetos is not known, but with him we have seventeen *patronomi* known between Seiteimos (A.D. 128/9) and Biadas/Sejanus. In other words the latter two *patronomi* can fall no earlier than 146/7, 147/8. We know, however, that [Kle]on falls in A.D. 147/8 (IG V 1, 87, 446). Therefore he precedes Biadas/Sejanus. Thus we have at least fifteen *patronomi* between Aphthonetos and Biadas/Sejanus. There are others who may precede the two but can not be proven to do so.

the year of Sejanus (which is not impossible, since Chares held that office five times during his career).<sup>64</sup>

It is idle to speculate about the reason for the coincidence of the two lists of *gerontes* in IG V 1, 111 and SEG XI 585, because these are the only two extant lists of *gerontes* which we have the right to assume come from successive years. It had been a modern assumption, and only an assumption, that the board of *gerontes* changed its membership completely, or almost completely, every year.

All that can be said safely is that some members of the board of *gerontes* were replaced,<sup>65</sup> and since there were so few, perhaps it is not unreasonable to suppose that their careers ended in that year, while the new members' careers extended beyond the time of Sejanus and Biadas. Neikippidas and Julius Lykos appear in the list of Biadas and not in the list of Sejanus (though this list is incomplete). Lykos is otherwise unknown; Neikippidas had been a *nomophylax* in the year of that Aphthonetos already discussed.<sup>66</sup> C. Nervinius Noetos was *gerousias* in the year of Sejanus<sup>67</sup> and Epaphras<sup>68</sup> may have been. Neither appears in the list of Biadas. Epaphras is otherwise unknown. Noetos was ephor in the year of Cascellius Aristoteles, a *patronomos* following Biadas and Sejanus.<sup>69</sup> These facts suggest that Noetos was the new member, Neikippidas the member replaced.

The *gerontes* are inscribed in the same order in the two lists,<sup>70</sup> except that Neikippidas Menemachou and Julius Lykos (line 6) of the year of Biadas do not appear in the year of Sejanus. They are either new members added to the list of Biadas or old members deleted from the list of Sejanus. I would expect new members to be added to the end, both for convenience and because, presumably, they were junior to the others.<sup>71</sup> On these grounds, too, Sejanus seems to follow Biadas.

We might also compare the fragment from the end of a list of *gerontes*,<sup>72</sup>

Ἐπαφρᾶς — —

<sup>64</sup> SEG XI 495.

<sup>65</sup> Unfortunately we do not have complete lists of other offices for the two years, but we do have a list of ephors for the year of Biadas (SEG XI 528) and the heading of a list of ephors for the year of Sejanus (IG V 1, 1586). I have examined a squeeze of IG V 1, 1586 and there appears to be the top of an omicron or other rounded letter beneath the upsilon of *Seianou*, that is, about the seventh letter in the line. The editor shows traces of the tops of a lambda and omicron, or similar letters, at the beginning of the line, suggesting a name like ΑΘ[ΗΝΙ]Ω[Ν] or ΛΟ[ΥΚΙ]Ο[Σ]. The first name, in any case, is not Eubaberiskos, the *presbys* of the year of Biadas, so it is likely that the board of ephors did change.

<sup>66</sup> SEG XI 547.

<sup>67</sup> IG V 1, 71 b, lines 11–13.

<sup>68</sup> R. V. NICHOLLS, *ABSA* 45, 1950, 296 # 52 a.

<sup>69</sup> IG V 1, 71 b, lines 11–13; cf. IG V 1, 69–70.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. SEG XI 586.

<sup>71</sup> See note 58, quotation of A. M. WOODWARD.

<sup>72</sup> NICHOLLS, op. cit. 296, # 52 a.

Νερβίνιος --  
 γρα βουλᾶς --

Noetos is the only Nervinius known to us; the style of this fragment accords with IG V 1, 111 (for instance, *nomina* without *praenomina*). It seems reasonable to suppose that this is a fragment of the list of *gerontes* of the year of Sejanus and that Noetos has been added to the end.

IG V 1, 111, then, should be restored as

- [γέροντες] οἱ ἐπ[ὶ K]λα[υ]-  
 [δίο]υ Σεϊανού, ὦ[ν πρέσβ]υς  
 [X]άρης < γερο[ντεύων τὸ δ']  
 4 Φιλουμενὸς Σ[ωτηρίδα τὸ γ']  
 Φιλωνίδας Εὐκρίνους  
 Σωσικράτης Σώτο[υ]  
 Ἰού(λιος) Νέας [Σ]ωσικοράτους  
 8 Καλλικράτης {Σ[ωκ]ράτ[ους]}  
 Σπαρτιάτης Σωσιδ(ά)μου  
 Εὐδαμιάκων Εὐκτῆ(μονος)  
 Ἀντώνιος Ὀφελίων  
 12 Ἰούλιος <  
 Ζεύξιππος Τυνδάρο[υς]  
 Κλαύδιος Διονύσ[ιος]  
 Μᾶρκος Νεικη[φόρου]  
 16 Καλλικράτ[ης <]  
 Μνάσ[ων Λυσίππου]  
 Φιλ[ωνίδας Ἀγίωνος]  
 Φ[ιλωνίδας <]  
 20 [Φιλοκλῆς <]  
 [Εἰσιγένης Στρατονείκου]  
 [Γοργίων Κλεοβούλου]  
 [Ἰούλιος Πρόκλος]  
 24 Ἐπαφρᾶς ---  
 Νερβίνιος [Νόητος]  
 γρα(μπατεὺς) βουλᾶς [Καλλικράτης <]  
 σπ[ονδοφόροι·]  
 -----

Lines 18–23 assume there were no other changes in the list.

Lines 24–27: R. V. NICHOLLS, ABSA 45, 1950, 296 # 52 a.

As far as the evidence goes, then, Chares could have been *presbys* of the *synarchia* (*gerousia*) for the second time in the year of Kallikrates Rufi, for the third time in the year of Biadas, and for the fourth time in the year of Sejanus.

Although there is a strong implication that the *synarchia* is the *gerousia*, the evidence is not strong enough, perhaps, to lead to certainty, but nevertheless, we can (I hope) now approach the contemporary literary evidence for the government of imperial Sparta without preconceptions. The best account – one paragraph – comes from Pausanias:<sup>73</sup>

«The Lacedaemonians of Sparta have an *agora* worth seeing and there is a *bouleuterion* for the *gerousia* and *archeia* for the ephors and *nomophylakes* and those called *bidiaioi* in the *agora*. The *gerousia* is the sovereign<sup>74</sup> council of the Lacedaemonian *politeia*; the rest are *archontes*. The ephors and the *bidiaioi* number five each. The latter are responsible for organizing the contests in what is called the *Platanistas* and the other contests for the ephebes; the ephors run all the other important business and provide the eponym, just as at Athens one of what they call the nine archons is eponym.»

The facts (which seem to be correct) about the *bidiaioi* (but in inscriptions *bideoi* or *bidyoi*) would, of course, be of interest to the tourist.<sup>75</sup> The statement that the ephors provide the eponym is not true.<sup>76</sup> Nevertheless, there is no reason to doubt that Pausanias was right in thinking that the most important organs of the Spartan government were the *gerontes* and the ephors and that they had their own meeting places.

A second literary source, though its worth is difficult to assess, is the letter of the Lacedaemonians to Apollonius of Tyana (which contains a *psephisma*) and Apollonius' reply.<sup>77</sup> The letter is headed »Lacedaemonians to Apollonius« and the *psephisma* begins, «*Psephisma* of Lacedaemonians, as the *gerontes* decided, Tyndares being the proposer, it was decreed by the ruling powers and the *demos* that Apollo-

<sup>73</sup> 3, 11, 2: Λακεδαιμονίων τοῖς Σπάρτην ἔχουσιν ἐστὶν ἀγορὰ θέας ἀξία, καὶ τῆς τε γερουσίας βουλευτήριον, καὶ τῶν ἐφόρων καὶ νομοφυλάκων καὶ καλουμένων βιδιαίων ἀρχεῖα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς. ἡ μὲν δὴ γερουσία συνέδριον Λακεδαιμονίοις κυριώτατον τῆς πολιτείας, οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ εἰσὶν ἄρχοντες· τοῖς δὲ ἐφόροις καὶ βιδιαίοις πέντε ἀριθμὸν ἑκατέροις οὖσιν, τοῖς μὲν τοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ Πλατανιστῇ καλουμένῳ καὶ ἄλλους τῶν ἐφήβων ἀγῶνας τιθέναι καθέστηκεν, ἔφοροι δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλα διοικοῦσι τὰ σπουδῆς μάλιστα ἄξια καὶ παρέχονται τὸν ἐπώνυμον, καθὰ δὴ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις τῶν καλουμένων ἐννέα ἐπώνυμός ἐστιν εἰς ἄρχων.

<sup>74</sup> Κυριώτατον συνέδριον. The force of the adjective, even in Pausanias, is that the council is the more important part of the government.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. IG V 1, 676; usually the board was composed of six members, SEG XI 608–610, but five are recorded, SEG XI 611 (the foregoing with the spelling *bidyoi*, for *bideoi* see SEG XI 616 a).

<sup>76</sup> Though Pausanias could be saved here, if the ephors of his time played a role in selecting the eponymous *patronomos*, but this is not what Pausanias has understood, because he compares the ephors to the Athenian archons.

<sup>77</sup> Letter 62: Λακεδαιμόνιοι Ἀπολλωνίῳ. Ψήφισμα Λακεδαιμονίων, καθὼς οἱ γέροντες ἐπέκριναν Τυνδάρεω εἰσηγησαμένῳ ταῖν ἀρχαῖν ἔδοξε τέλεσι τε καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Ἀπολλωνίῳ Πυθαγόρειον ἦμεν πολίταν . . . 63: Ἀπολλώνιος ἐφόροις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις (Flavii Philostrati opera, ed. C. L. Kayser, Volume I).

nus the Pythagorean be a citizen . . . » and the heading of Apollonius' reply is «Apollonius to ephors and Lacedaemonians.» The name Tyndares is not common in Sparta. A Tyndares is found in the «quaestiones convivales» of Plutarch,<sup>78</sup> probably too late to be the proposer of the decree (assuming the letter to have been written some time between Nero and Nerva, but more likely earlier than later) and another Tyndares, who appears to be a member of a prominent Spartan family, in the late first century B. C.<sup>79</sup> The name, then, could easily appear in a document of the middle first century A. D.

The Apollonius letters, Pausanias, and the inscriptions present a uniform picture of Sparta's government. As in the past,<sup>80</sup> so in Roman times the *gerontes* and the ephors presided, but now the *gerontes* were elected annually, they were eligible for election at a relatively early age,<sup>81</sup> and they could be reelected (whereas no case of reelection to the *ephoría* is known). Thus prominent Spartans could influence the affairs of their state most effectively by reelection to the council. The real power of that council increased enough that it was legitimately called the *synarchia*, the body that, with the *demos* (perhaps through its representatives the ephors),<sup>82</sup> composed the *archeia* of Sparta.

<sup>78</sup> 8, 1; 717 B–720 C, pointed out and discussed by C. CICHORIUS in E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913 (reprinted 1923), 342.

<sup>79</sup> IG V 1, 209.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, V. ROSE, Leipzig 1886, 331, # 537 (Lex. Patm., p. 152 SAKK., *gerousia* = K. LATTE, *Lexica Graeca Minora*, Hildesheim 1965, 162).

<sup>81</sup> *Nomophylax* is a relatively junior office. Individuals are sometimes *gerousias* before they are *nomophylax*: IG V 1, 32 A, 33, 39, 71 b, lines 1–3.

Korinthas Neikephorou, synephebe of Atticus, was *gerousias* in the year of Julius Panthales (IG V 1, 45). This Atticus appears to be Ti. Claudius M. Appius Atilius Bradua Regillus Atticus (PIR<sup>2</sup> Claudius 785, *cos.* A.D. 185, born ca. 130?). Korinthas must be about the same age or younger, that is, he, too, must have been born about 130 (or later).

Julius Panthales precedes Claudius Brasidas as eponymous *patronomos* (IG V 1, 46). Claudius Brasidas was *patronomos* during the campaigns of L. Verus (IG V 1, 44; SEG XI 486; J. H. OLIVER, *Marcus Aurelius, Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East*, *Hesperia* supplement 13, Princeton 1970, 78–80. 83), no later than A.D. 166. Korinthas was *gerousias*, then, before A.D. 166, when he was in his mid-thirties.

<sup>82</sup> E.g. Xenophon, *Resp. Lac.* 15, 7, where the ephors swear on behalf of the *polis*.

