

(290, 735, and 1122); in 290 the repetition is in very close proximity: *cum Alcumena cubat*; in 1122 the third *cu-* is more distant, but the constant alliteration of *c-* maintains the effect until climaxed by *cubitibus*.⁵

It seems more than reasonable that the repeated harping on and close repetition of the syllable *cu-* was intended by Plautus to suggest aurally the sound *cucu*, and by association the bird cuckoo—and quite possibly the concept of marital infidelity, which is, indeed, the subject of each passage.

Although the circumstances are different, such a joke would not be unworthy of the writer with the *latranti nomine* (Cas. 34) who could make an inebriated swain deny his condition with the word *mammadere* (Most. 331) or suggest that a teeth-chattering sea-soaked *leno* hire himself out as a *manducus* (Rud. 535).

JOHN N. HOUGH

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

5. The evidence for the ethlipsis of *cum* before a vowel is so vague and contradictory that it would not be wise to assume the complete disappearance of the *u* sound in the *cum* of ll. 112, 290, 808, and 1122. Quintilian's discussion of the sound of final *-m* (Inst. 9. 4. 40) indicates, as does also Probus (ap. Gell. 13. 21. 60) that the final *-m* had some sort of a sound unlike either *m* or *n*. The difference of which

Probus speaks between *turrem* and *turrim* before a vowel clearly indicates that the vowel is not entirely lost, Marius Sacerdos (449. 6 K.) notwithstanding. Marius Victor (6. 16. 4 K.) supports the existence of an *m* sound, hence of the retention of a vowel. All that is needed for the present argument is that enough of the *u* be retained to suggest, with the other *u*'s the *cu-cu* imitation.

HERAKLEIDES' ARCHONSHIP AND ABASKANTOS' PAIDOTRIBIA

The year A.D. 171/2, in which James A. Notopoulos has dated the archonship of Klaudios Herakleides Meliteus,¹ is also the first year of the *παιδοτριβία* of Markos [Λεύκιος ὁ καὶ Μᾶρκος Μαραθώνιος], for in A.D. 173/4 Markos was *παιδοτρίβης* for the third year.² The date of the archonship of Herakleides, however, does not appear to be correct; or if correct, some adjustment presumably is warranted, because Herakleides was archon when Abaskantos Kephisius was *παιδοτρίβης*.³ This conclusion is reached from the appearance of the ephebes Πό(π)λιος)

Ἀΐλιος Λεύκιος Παλλ(νεύς) and Τελεσφόρος Μενεκρ[άτ(ους) Φιλ(άδης)]⁴ in yet another document where Abaskantos is attested as the *παιδοτρίβης*.⁵ Thus the archonship of Herakleides must be dated anew and a suitable year must be found. His archonship may not be dated before A.D. 165/6,⁶ since Menekrates, son of Telesphoros and father of the ephebes Onesimos and Telesphoros, was himself an ephebe in 145/6;⁷ but neither can it be dated after 168/9, because of the office of the διδάσκαλος.⁸

The archon Klaudios Herakleides Meliteus

1. "Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire," *Hesp.*, XVIII (1949), 53 = *IG*, II², 2104, lines 1–2. All dates in the present article are A.D.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 53 = *IG*, II², 2103, lines 9–11.

3. The new evidence toward a reconsideration of the date of Herakleides' archonship was made possible by M. T. Mitsos' merger of *IG*, II², 2069, 2138, 2162, 2166, 2045, 2093A = *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 37, No. 18. The *IG* II² documents had been dated by J. Kirchner in the *med. s. ii p.*, *s. ii p.*, *s. ii p.*, *post a. 136/7*, and *c. a. 165 p.* respectively. Kirchner was led to these dates by prosopographical considerations, and Mitsos' joining of the various fragments has facilitated matters.

4. *IG*, II², 2104, lines 7 and 11 ([φίλοι] / καὶ ἀναστάται [lines 4–5]).

5. *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 40, No. 18, line 170: [παιδο]-τρίβης Ἀβάσκαν[τος Εὐμόλπου Κηφισιεύς]. Lines 175–76: Ἀἰ Λεύκιος [Παλληνεύς] / Θαρρηλ[ῶν] Ἐκα[τομ] (the demotic

being restored by the writer). Lines 179–80: Τελεσφόρος Μενεκρά[τ] / τοὺς Φιλ[άδης] Π[ανεύς] (or Π[οσειδ]); both patronymic and month being supplied by this writer. The demotic should read Φιλ[άδης]. The two ephebes were γυμνασιαρχοί in the months recorded above. On Telesphoros, see below, n. 7; and on Leukios, see *AJP*, LXX (1949), 307, n. 15.

6. See Notopoulos, *Hesp.*, *loc. cit.* (n. 1 above), p. 29.

7. *IG*, II², 2052, line 41, and 2055, line 10. Sons: *IG*, II², 2104, lines 9, Ὀνήσιμος Μενεκράτ(ους) Φιλ(άδης), and 11, Τελεσφόρος Μενεκρ[άτ(ους) Φιλ(άδης)]. Τελεσφόρος Μενεκράτ(ους) Φιλ(άδης) is the well-known *παιδοτρίβης*, who was in office from 205/6 (*IG*, II², 2193, line 34 = *Hesp.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 53) to 223/4 (*IG*, II², 2224, line 4 = *Hesp.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 54). In 223/4 Telesphoros was apparently in his seventies.

8. The known διδάσκαλοι in the sixties are Στράτων Εὐνόμου Παιανιεύς (attested as διδάσκαλος in *IG*, II², 2086, line 31 [163/4], and in *IG*, II², 2099 [*latus dextrum*], line 38 +

could be identical with the ephebe Tiberios Klaudios Herakleides Meliteus of 112/3,⁹ or he could be a son of that ephebe. But should the ephebe and the archon be the same, this may perhaps suggest an earlier date for Herakleides' archonship. This may be implied also by the ephebic office of the *ὑποκοσμητής*,¹⁰ which title occurs at least twice in the first half of the second century after Christ.¹¹ Yet such an early date is not possible, for it ought to be remembered that the *κοσμητής* in Herakleides' archonship was Attikos, son of Chares, from the deme Gargettos.¹² Attikos' son, Chares, is attested as *ἐφηβος* in the document of the 'Αρχαιολογική Ἐφημερίς.¹³

Herakleides' archonship has been limited above to the years 165/6–168/9. Athenian chronology, however, as has been worked out

in the past,¹⁴ does not permit a date in the second half of the sixties. Therefore, the archonship of Herakleides must be dated in 164/5 (now an open year)¹⁵ and we are to assume that an early marriage had taken place¹⁶ and that Menekrates Philades may have had twins, or that his two sons were born in close succession.

The inception of Abaskantos' *παιδοτριβία* has been attributed variously, but the date that has become acceptable is that by W. Kolbe, ascribing its beginning to the year 136/7.¹⁷ This date corresponds with the tribal cycles, as demonstrated by Notopoulos.¹⁸ We know that Abaskantos served for at least thirty-four years as *παιδοτρίβης*¹⁹ and the year 169/70 is considered to be his last,²⁰ but it is the thesis of this brief discussion that his last year must have

2100B, line 35 [see below, n. 27], which I date in 162/3, because of the ephebic officials, and Notopoulos in 163/4–168/9 [*Hesp.*, loc. cit., p. 53] and 'Απελλής Φλυεύς (*IG*, II², 2097, line 197 [169/70]; 2144, line 6 + 2014 = *Hesp.*, loc. cit., pp. 28 and 53 [170/1], which Notopoulos dated in 171/2; and 2102, line 46 = *Hesp.*, loc. cit., p. 53 [171/2 (Notopoulos: 172/3)]).

The [διδάσ]καλος in the document in *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 40, No. 18, line 167, is Λεωνίδης, who must have succeeded Straton Paianieus in the office of the διδάσκαλος.

The *ὀπλομαχοί* in this period are [–]θεός Σ[– –] Πειραιεύς (*IG*, II², 2099 [*latus dextrum*], line 30 + 2100B, line 28 [162/3; see above, n. 8]); 'Ηλιόδωρος) Πιθεεύς (*IG*, II², 2086, lines 28–29 [163/4]); 'Ονήσιμος Διομήδους Παλλ(ηγεύς) (*IG*, II², 2090, line 32 [165/6]); and Κλαύδιος Κλει(ς)ος? Πτελέσιος (*IG*, II², 2094, line 125 [ca. 166/7]). For the year 169/70, the *ὀπλομαχος* is Εὐδράτης) 'Επικ(ίδης) (*IG*, II², 2097, line 195); for 170/71, [–]ος Βερνεκίδης (*IG*, II², 2144, line 3 + 2014 [see above, n. 8]); and for 171/2, Δάφνος (*IG*, II², 2102, line 45 [see above, n. 8]).

The *ὀπλομαχος* in the document of the *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 40, No. 18, line 164, is 'Αφροδίσιος Μελ(ιτεύς).

9. *IG*, II², 2024, line 26: Τιβ. Κλαύδιος 'Ηρακλείδης Μελιτεύς (γυμνασιάρχης); and line 125: Τιβ. Κλ. 'Ηρακλείδης Μελιτεύς (παιδευτής). The gymnasiarch and the παιδευτής may not be identical. Perhaps they should be identified as father and son.

10. *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 40, No. 18, lines 159–60: ὑποκοσμητής / 'Ερμίας) Φλυ(εύς).

11. *IG*, II², 2037, line 6: ὑποκοσμηται (125/6); and 2047, line 10: ὑποκοσμητήν (140/1–141/2 [see below, n. 12]).

12. *IG*, II², 2104, lines 2–4: κοσμητεῖ/οντος 'Αττικοῦ τοῦ [Χάρη] / τος Γαργητίω[υ]. The patronymic is supplied by the writer; R. Neubauer had restored it as 'Ερμείω[τος] and drew accordingly the family's stemma (*Hermes*, XI [1876], 388–89). Attikos, son of Chares, is known also from another document, a *catalogus generis incerti* (*IG*, II², 2474, line 6: 'Αττικός Χάρητος [Γαργήτιος], as the demotic should be restored). In the same inscription also appears Ζήνων) Κυρτ(εύς) (line 10) = *SEG*, XII, 1955, p. 47, No. 141, and he was prytanis in 168/9 (*IG*, II², 1775, line 56).

Thus *IG*, II², 2474, may be dated also in that period (dated previously as *med. s. ii p.*). For the *ἐφηβεία* of Attikos' son, Chares, see below, n. 13.

Attikos is to be identified as a son of Χάρης) (Γαργήτιος) who was prytanis in 138/9 (*IG*, II², 1765, line 16) and ὑποκοσμητής in 140/1 or 141/2 (*IG*, II², 2047, line 10; as noted in B. D. Meritt's *IG*, II², copy, this inscription is dated by Harrison 140/1). [Δημήτριος Χάρητος Γαργήτιος (*IG*, II², 3195 [s. ii p.]) is either Attikos' or Chares' brother (or a son of Chares). For the name Δημήτριος, J. Kirchner referred to Δημήτριος) (Γαργήτιος) who was prytanis at the same time as Chares, son of Chares (above, line 15). The ephebe 'Αττικός) Γαρ(γήτιος) of 165/6 (*IG*, II², 2090, line 63) is to be identified perhaps as a son of the κοσμητής. See also *SEG*, XII (1955), 44, No. 123 (= *IG*, II², 2160, 2159 and 2136), line 69: Λικ. 'Αττικός 'Ατ[τικου] (Αλεξίδης), as the patronymic should be completed (s. ii p.); *IG*, II², 2215, line 22: Αὐρ. 'Αττικός) Γα[ργ] (post a. 212/3 p.); and 2481, lines 6–7: 'Αττικός Γαρ (whom J. Kirchner identified with the ephebe of 165/6) / 'Αττικός Γαρ (ca. a. 200 p.).

13. *Arch. Eph.*, 1950–51, p. 40, No. 18, lines 187–89: 'Αντινολέων ἐν ὅσπερ ἱε[ρεὺς] 'Αντινίου Χάρητος / 'Αττικοῦ Γαργήτιος (ἀγωνοθέτης). And what would be more natural for a son, provided he was within the right age, than to serve as ephebe during the father's κοσμητεία? See above, n. 12.

14. Cf. W. Kolbe, "Studien zur attischen Chronologie der Kaiserzeit," *Ath. Mitt.*, XLVI (1921), 149; and *Hesp.*, XI (1942), 86, and *ibid.*, XVIII (1949), 50.

15. A study of the traceable names in the document of the *Arch. Eph.*, with reference to the indexes of the *IG* III, has admittedly not produced an entirely positive solution in dating Herakleides' archonship in the sixties. To save space, a comparative prosopographical table is not here reproduced.

16. Cf. P. Ailius Phaidros Sounieus who died at the age of twenty but had already contracted a marriage and had a daughter (*IG*, II², 7447, lines 15–17).

17. Cf. commentary under *IG*, II², 2086 = W. Kolbe, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLVI (1921), 137 ff.

18. See *Hesp.* XVIII, 1 ff. and 48 ff.

19. *IG*, II², 2097, line 191 (169/70).

20. See *Hesp.*, XVIII, 28.

been 170/1, in which year Notopoulos dated the archonship of Phlauios Harpalianos Steirius²¹ and A. E. Raubitschek that of Tiberios Klaudios Demonstratos Meliteus.²² Abaskantos' successor then would be Markos. Moreover, the new year proposed for the end of Abaskantos' *παιδοτριβία* would coincide with the end of the *ὑποπαιδοτριβία* of Τελεσφόρος Ἀβασκάντου Μειλήσιος (a son of the *παιδοτριβίης* Abaskantos?).²³ To be sure, Telesphoros is identified as a *Μειλήσιος*, but this may not be wholly against my suggestion.²⁴ That Telesphoros may have been a son of the *παιδοτριβίης* Abaskantos is suggested further, it appears, by the inscribed letter

kappa (K *vacat*, and not K – –) after his name,²⁵ which was presumably to complete the demotic *Κηφισαεύς*, also the demotic of the *παιδοτριβίης* Abaskantos. It is also possible that the inscribed kappa may be an error on the part of the stonemason. The kappa, however, does not mean that Telesphoros was given Athenian citizenship, if not already a citizen, during the last year of his office,²⁶ since IG, II², 2100B, dates from the earlier rather than from the later years of Telesphoros' *ὑποπαιδοτριβία*.²⁷

ELIAS KAPETANOPOULOS

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 28 and 52. Notopoulos dated Demonstratos' archonship in 172/73 (*ap.* Raubitschek; see below, n. 22).

22. Γέρας Ἀντωνίου Κεραμοπούλου (1953), p. 247, n. 2. Raubitschek identified the archon mentioned in IG, II², 1777, which J. Kirchner dated *ca.* 168/9 because its *adornatio* resembles that of IG, II², 1775 (168/9), with Tib. Klaudios Demonstratos Meliteus (see above n. 21). The archon's name is fragmentary (lines 1–2: ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου – – –) / – ἐως ἀρχοῦτος). For other names proposed in the past, see R. Neubauer, *Hermes*, XI (1876), 376–77, and P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* (1922), p. 279. When making his identification, Raubitschek suggested that the archon Klaudios Demonstratos (IG, II², 1777) may be the same as the archon of IG, II², 1775. However, this must be a typographical error, since the archon of IG, II², 1775 is Τινήσιος Πιπτικὸς Βησσεύς. What was meant probably was IG, II², 1795, but that archon Demonstratos belongs to the deme Marathon.

23. Telesphoros' *ὑποπαιδοτριβία* ends about this time, for the *ὑποπαιδοτριβίης* in 171/2 or 172/3 is Ἡρακλέων Ἑστ(ιαύθεν) (IG, II², 2102, line 42 = *Hesp.*, XVIII, 53 [see above, n. 8]). Cf. also *Hesp.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 28.

24. See O. W. Reinmuth, "The Ephebate and Citizenship in Attica," *TAPA*, LXXIX (1948), 224–25, esp. p. 224: "No satisfactory explanation of the term 'Milesians' has been given."

25. As the squeeze provided by Mitsos shows (IG, II², 2100B, line 39; see below, n. 27).

26. So Notopoulos, *Hesp.*, XVIII, 28; see also J. Kirchner's comment under IG, II², 2100, line 38.

27. Mlle Simone Follet has joined IG, II², 2100B and IG, II², 2099 (*latus dextrum* [2099 + 2100B]), as B. D. Meritt has informed me *per litteras* (see above, n. 8). Undoubtedly she will publish her discovery.

CICERO PHILIPPIC 14. 18: DE CONTENTIONE PRINCIPATUS

Hartvig Frisch, in *Cicero's Fight for the Republic* (Copenhagen, 1946), pages 248–49, has suggested that, prior to the delivery of *Philippic* 14, Cicero had been elevated, unofficially at any rate, to take the place of the recently deceased P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus as *princeps senatus*. It is usually believed that Cicero's reply to his detractors in §18 is merely an extension of his attack on certain ex-consuls, whose weakness and unreliability he had criticized earlier in that speech (§17) and on other previous occasions (e.g., *Phil.* 8. 5), and that the word *tu* refers to a purely fictitious interlocutor (see E. Remy, *Trois "Philippiques" de Cicéron* [Louvain, 1941], p. 293). But the language of 14.18, especially the words "nollem primum rei publicae causa, deinde etiam dignitatis tuae," make it more

probable that the attack is directed at one particular individual.

It is possible to deduce the identity of the object of Cicero's attack. At first sight, the most likely person would seem to be Fufius Calenus, whom Cicero criticizes strongly in *Phil.* 8. 11–19 and 10. 3–6, and is probably the person referred to in 7. 5. But the language used by Cicero in 14. 18, and especially the theme of *contentio* and *vincere*, indicates that his opponent was a disappointed rival for the honor of the *principatus senatus*, and Calenus, though of considerable political influence, was far too junior in status among the ex-consuls to have had any possible claim to this honor. The only ex-consul of comparable seniority to Cicero was L. Caesar, of whom Cicero invariably speaks with courtesy and