

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

ΤΟ ΜΗ ΔΙΣ ΑΡΧΕΙΝ

The possibility that an Athenian in the early fifth century might hold one of the nine archonships more than once has recently been broached.¹ Whether that was so is far from proved. What I wish to point out is that there is enough evidence from the late Hellenistic period virtually to establish that once a man had held one of the nine archonships, he could not constitutionally hold another. These offices, namely, the archon, the βασιλεύς, the πολέμαρχος, and the six θεσμοθέται, therefore, constituted in this period a single ἀρχή. This practice reflects both what we read at *Athenaion Politeia* 62. 3 ἄρχειν δὲ τὰς μὲν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀρχὰς ἔξεστι πλεονάκις, τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐδεμίαν πλὴν βουλευῶσαι δις,² and what Aristotle says more generally of democracies at *Politics* 1317b23 τὸ μὴ δις τὸν αὐτὸν ἄρχειν μηδεμίαν ἢ ὀλιγάκις ἢ ὀλίγας ἔξω τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον. The evidence, however, is by necessity the evidence of silence, that is, the lack of attested examples.

We possess for the period 229 to 86 B.C. an abundance of prosopographical material, beginning with the great archon list, *IG* II² 1706,³ and ending with the list of contributors for the Pythais, *IG* II² 2336.⁴ The evidence is copious, often overlapping, and includes many types of inscriptions, particularly prytany decrees, ephebic decrees, and various lists of donors and victors.⁵ For the period after 166 there are also a large number of inscriptions from Delos that include the names of

1. See W. G. Forrest and D. L. Stockton, "The Athenian Archons: A Note," *Historia* 36 (1987): 235–40.

2. See also P. J. Rhodes' comment on this passage, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian "Athenaion Politeia"* (Oxford, 1981), p. 696.

3. Reedited by S. Dow, "The List of *Archontes*, *IG* II² 1706," *Hesperia* 2 (1933): 418–46. A new fragment was added by B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 23 (1954): 244, no. 17. For the important contributions to our understanding of this text of Sauppe, Beloch, Schebelew, and Kirchner, see Dow's account on pp. 430–32.

One correction needs to be made to this text. Line 37 has been read by all editors as [. . .]κοιφρέων. The correct reading is clearly (I am embarrassed to admit, for I ought to have seen it long ago) [N]υκοκρέων. The area where OK is inscribed is somewhat gouged and scratched, but the characteristically wide kappa of this cutter is unmistakably the letter after omicron. This name I now find was restored in *Hesperia* Index I–X (Baltimore, 1946), p. 114; it is apparently unique in Attic prosopography.

Indeed the name is a very uncommon one. The only other person known to me of this name is Nikokreon, son of Pnytagoras, king of Salamis on Cyprus in the late fourth century: see P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (Oxford, 1987), p. 335. He is also known in an inscription from Nemea: see S. G. Miller, "The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games," *Hesperia* 57 (1988): 148, line 4, and 153–54. In view of the rarity of the name, it is perhaps not farfetched to suggest that one of the Athenian Nikokreon's ancestors, perhaps his grandfather, was named after the Cypriot king.

4. See the recent edition by S. Tracy, *IG* II² 2336: *Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais* (Meisenheim, 1982).

5. For a list of the inscriptions belonging to this period, see S. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.* (Berkeley, 1990), pp. 9–38. There is also a large, as yet unpublished, inscription of the first half of the second century which preserves the lists of victors from three greater Panathenaias; it has been prepared for publication by S. Tracy and C. Habicht and is forthcoming in *Hesperia* for 1991.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

a great many Athenians. In addition, we possess for the years 138 to 97 the inscriptions of the Athenian Pythaiads to Delphi which record more than twelve hundred names.⁶ There is, in short, scarcely another period in Athenian history with so much prosopographical information. While our evidence is still slim compared with, say, that of our brethren in modern historical studies, it is by the standards of our study unusually abundant.

IG II² 1706 provides in itself an excellent test case. Dow's reconstruction of the stele, particularly his placement of fragment D (see n. 3 above), has withstood the test of time and is followed here. The stele preserved originally a complete listing of the boards of the nine archons for the years 230/29 to 213/12. Although it is in fragments, the lists of 229/28 to 224/23, 220/19, and 216/15 to 213/12 are either completely or mostly preserved. If Athenians active in politics normally held more than one of these offices, this list should reveal it. That is to say, the preserved portions are extensive enough and cover a long enough interval, seventeen years, that we would expect to see some duplication, for example, a θεσμοθέτης from one of the earlier years serving in a later one as eponymous archon, βασιλεύς, or πολέμαρχος. But this is not the case; there are no actual or probable repetitions of names on *IG II² 1706*.

Furthermore, from *IG II² 1706* and *IG II² 2336* alone we have the names of 136 archons well enough preserved to permit study. By this I mean that we know the name and demotic, and sometimes the patronymic as well, of these individuals. In addition the names of virtually all the eponymous archons of the period are known.⁷ Not one is attested as having held another one of the nine traditional archonships or as having repeated his archonship. There are no exceptions until one, at the end of the period. The single exception indeed marks the constitutional crisis which brought this era of Athenian history to a close. It involves the well-known Athenian statesman Medeios of the Piraeus (*PA* 10098). He held the eponymous archonship in 101/100 (*IG II² 2336*, line 92)⁸ and is again listed as eponymous archon for three consecutive years, from 91/90 to 89/88, in *IG II² 1713*, lines 9–11. The next year, 88/87, on that inscription is labeled ἀναρχία. With the support of the Romans Medeios held the archonship three times in succession at a troubled period in an attempt to keep Athens loyal to Rome.⁹ The year of "anarchy," 88/87, was one in which pro-Mithridatic forces controlled Athens. Indeed, C. Habicht has made the very attractive suggestion that no archon is listed on *IG II² 1714*, the archon list of this year,¹⁰ because King Mithridates himself filled the position.¹¹ It was at this time of Mithridatic control that Medeios' name, in an act of *damnatio memoriae*, was deliberately erased from *IG II² 2336*.¹² Thus the only known ex-

6. *FdD* III 2, nos. 3–56. On the number of participants, see S. Tracy, "Notes on the Pythais Inscriptions," *BCH* 99 (1975): 215–18.

7. For a convenient list of names and references, see B. D. Meritt, "Athenian Archons 347/6–48/7 B.C.," *Historia* 26 (1977): 177–88.

8. Line number according to the edition of Tracy, *Contributors of First Fruits*.

9. E. Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," *AJAH* 1 (1976): 108–10; Tracy, *Contributors of First Fruits*, pp. 66, 164, 180.

10. S. Dow, "The Lists of Athenian Archontes," *Hesperia* 3 (1934): 146, first established this.

11. "Zur Geschichte Athens in der Zeit Mithridates VI.," *Chiron* 6 (1976): 127–35. For a contrary opinion, see Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," pp. 111–14 and n. 41.

12. A. Wilhelm, "Attische Urkunden III.," *SAWW* 202. 5 (1925): 59–61; see also Tracy, *Contributors of First Fruits*, pp. 65–66.

ception in this entire period comes at a time of war and constitutional crisis.¹³ It is, indeed, "the exception that proves the rule."

The other certain exception, which does not fall within the period under primary discussion here, also fits this pattern. It involves the successive archonships of Olympiodoros in 294/93 and 293/92.¹⁴ They come at the beginning of a three-year period when King Demetrios regained control of Athens. Olympiodoros was almost certainly appointed by the king.¹⁵ The period is marked also by a break in the secretary cycle and the reappearance for the last time of the ἀναγραφεύς, an office clearly associated with oligarchic rule.¹⁶

With these two exceptions, not only is no archon known to have served twice or to have held another (different) one of these nine offices, but in no year do two archons come from the same tribe.¹⁷ The system of sortition saw to this distribution.¹⁸ Exactly how it worked in detail in the second century must remain conjectural. It may have been arranged somewhat as follows. The sortition was not open, but was drawn from candidates who had agreed to stand and had (perhaps) passed a means test, for these archonships entailed real expense. Each tribe ideally put forth a slate of ten suitable candidates, one for each office. Clearly, moreover, candidates could stand for a particular office; Medeios' first term as eponymous archon when he was in his late thirties points to this.¹⁹ Perhaps in some years only a small number of candidates presented themselves, or a candidate for a particular office went unopposed. That is to say, it seems highly likely that the tribes either did not always, or could not always, present a full slate. Presumably, moreover, a candidate for a particular office could present himself more than once if he was not selected the first time. When in the process of sortition one of the offices was allotted to a certain tribe, then clearly the other nine candidates from that tribe were excused from further participation in the allotment of that year.

The system did demand choices from potential officeholders. The politically ambitious clearly sought an archonship, probably one of the major ones, at a relatively early age as a means of entrance into the Areopagos. The real arena of political power in the second century lay in the elective offices, primarily the hoplite generalship and, in the second half of the century, the herald of the Areopagos and the governorship of Delos.²⁰ To stand for these, one apparently had to belong to the Areopagos. There existed, moreover, a middle tier of elected offices which did

13. The multiple tenure of Argeios as archon, still in the literature, was based on a faulty reconstruction of *IG II² 2336* and never existed. See on this point, Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," p. 106 and n. 5.

14. See the seminal discussion of W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), pp. 7–8, 18–21.

15. On the events of these years, see C. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich, 1979), pp. 26–30.

16. R. M. Errington, "Diodorus Siculus and the Chronology of the Early Diadochoi, 320–311 B.C." *Hermes* 105 (1977): 488–91; but see also S. Dow, "The Athenian *Anagrapheis*," *HSCP* 67 (1963): 40–41.

17. Dow, "Lists," pp. 175–82; S. Tracy, "Athens in 100 B.C.," *HSCP* 83 (1979): 220–21; and S. Aleshire, "The Athenian Archon Hoplon," *Hesperia* 57 (1988): 254.

18. On this system in the late fourth century, see *Athenaion Politeia*, esp. 55. 1, and the discussion of M. Lang, "Allotment by Tokens," *Historia* 8 (1959): 87–89. Lang's enunciation on p. 88 of "the requirement that no tribe receive any one of the chief archonships more than once in ten years" is manifestly incorrect for the later period (as study of the tribal affiliations of the archons of *IG II² 1706* reveals) and is probably in general unwarranted.

19. Tracy, *Contributors of First Fruits*, pp. 115, 161, n. 5.

20. On these and other elected offices, see *ibid.*, pp. 112–21.

not require membership in the Areopagos.²¹ These provided administrative and political experience for aspiring public figures.²² Others, those who craved merely the prestige associated with holding one of the archonships and could bear the financial burden, probably held them later in life.²³

In conclusion, there is abundant evidence from the late third to early first centuries, and it strongly suggests that no individual could ordinarily be archon more than once. The Athenians of the late Hellenistic period were clearly following in this a traditional practice which goes back at least to the late fourth century, the time of the *Athenaion Politeia*. For the time before Aristotle, there exists no convincing argument that matters were different.²⁴

STEPHEN V. TRACY
Ohio State University

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 121–28, esp. 126.

22. There was also a vast array of offices at the deme and phyle level, all of which provided valuable experience to those who stood for archonships. On the activities of the deme and deme officials, see D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 86–148.

23. Tracy, *Contributors of First Fruits*, pp. 144–45, 177–79. The ages of most archons cannot be determined accurately, though, in the cases where we possess some evidence, they appear to have been in their late 30s and 40s. We know the year of ephebic service for three of the archons on *IG* II² 1706 and 2336; they were all 40 or older at the time of their tenure as archons: Ainesidemus of Sypalettos was an ephebe in 244/43 or 243/42 (*IG* II² 766 = *Hesperia* 17 (1948): 4–5, line 41 [II]) and, therefore, 41 or 42 years of age when he was βασιλεύς in 220/19 (*IG* II² 1706, line 92); Aristion of Melite was an ephebe in 128/27 (*Hesperia* 24 (1955): 232, line 217) and thus was 48 years old when he served as πολέμαρχος in 98/97 (*IG* II² 2336, line 194); Eunikos of Sphetos served as ephebe in 244/43 or 243/42 (*IG* II² 766, line 35 [III]) and was 48 or 49 when he was θεσμοθέτης in 213/12 (*IG* II² 1706, line 168).

24. This paper was written in the congenial atmosphere of The Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. I am indebted to the faculty, particularly of the School of Historical Studies, who extended me the courtesy of a summer visitorship. I also owe particular thanks to C. Habicht, S. Dow, and G. Bowersock for helpful advice during the preparation of this paper.

ASINIUS POLLIO IN VERGIL *ECLOGUE* 8

In 1971, G. W. Bowersock reopened the question of Vergil's addressee in *Eclogue* 8, contending that the unnamed honorand is not Asinius Pollio, as most modern scholars have always assumed, but Octavian.¹ His contention has inspired or provoked a good deal of further discussion in favor of one or the other candidate.² It has also given rise to a down-dating, not only of *Eclogue* 8, but of the entire collection.³ The questions of identification and date may never be finally resolved. Nevertheless, some important arguments in favor of the traditional view have been overlooked, and a few of the weaker ones advanced by the revisionists

1. "A Date in the Eighth Eclogue," *HSCP* 75 (1971): 73–80; see also "The Addressee of the Eighth Eclogue: A Response," *HSCP* 82 (1978): 201–2.

2. For the history of the question before Bowersock, see J. Van Sickle, "Commentaria in Maronem Commenticia: A Case History of 'Bucolics' Misread," *Arethusa* 14 (1981): 17–34. For a very complete and detailed guide to the recent debate, see also D. Mankin, "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue: A Reconsideration," *Hermes* 116 (1988): 63–76.

3. See W. Clausen, "On the Date of the *First Eclogue*," *HSCP* 76 (1972): 201–5; E. A. Schmidt, *Zur Chronologie der "Eklogen" Vergils*, Sitz. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss. (Heidelberg, 1974), p. 6.