

The *Hiereus* of the *Soteres*: Plut. *Dem.* 10.4, 46.2

Boris Dreyer

IN THE SPRING OF 294 B.C. Demetrios Poliorketes, the son of Antigonos Monophthalmos, set about the reconquest of Athens. He began by subduing the Piraeus and the strongholds of Attica and subjecting the city to a long siege. As soon as he entered the *asty* he interfered with the inner workings of the state in order to strengthen his position. His adherent Olympiodoros was appointed *eponymous archon*, a position in which he remained for two years, in contravention of the constitution. Like him several other magistrates installed by Demetrios (so probably the *basileus*)¹ were nevertheless popular. For the summer of 294 and for the following three years *anagrapheis* are on record—in a similar position as in the years 321 to 318. Presumably not immediately upon entering the city, but only after his opponents on the Greek mainland had submitted, Demetrios occupied the hill of the Museion and brought back the oligarchs.²

One piece of evidence for the regime of Demetrios Poliorketes

¹Philippides of Paiania: W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931: hereafter DINSMOOR) 7–8.

²Plut. *Dem.* 34; Paus. 1.25.8; for this date and interpretation of the sources against the position of Habicht, see *GGA* 250 (1998) 216–222; B. Dreyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätclassischen Athen* (Stuttgart 1999) 135–142. The year 292/1 (in which these activities probably took place) marks a turning point in the supremacy of Demetrios at Athens. The *anagrapheis* also ceased to function as *eponymoi*.

in Athens tends to be left out of consideration or should not—in the opinion of the majority of scholars³—be used for its characterization. In chapter 46.2 of the *Life of Demetrios* Plutarch recounts how Athens rebelled against Demetrios in 287 B.C.; among the measures to re-establish the former constitution the following action is recorded:

καὶ τὸν τε Δίφιλον, ὃς ἦν ἱερεὺς τῶν Σωτήρων ἀναγεγραμμένος, ἐκ τῶν ἐπωνύμων ἀνεῖλον ἄρχοντας αἰρεῖσθαι πάλιν, ὥσπερ ἦν πάτριον, ψηφισάμενοι . . .

These priests of the *Soteres* (Saviour-gods) began to function as *eponymoi* in 307, if we can trust Plutarch (10.4):

μόνοι δὲ σωτήρας ἀνέγραψαν θεούς, καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πάτριον ἄρχοντα καταπαύσαντες ἱερέα σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνου καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν· καὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῶν ψηφισμάτων καὶ συμβολαίων προέγραφον.

Kirchhoff supposed that Plutarch misunderstood his source by mixing up the priests of the Saviour-gods with the statues of the two tribes of Athens named after Demetrios and Antigonos.⁴

We can follow Kirchhoff in supposing that Plutarch's account is not in every respect correct. The priests of the Saviour-gods did not replace the archons as *eponymoi* from 307/6 to 288/7. Kirchhoff collected the relevant inscriptions (none of which belongs to the second period of Antigonid

³A. Kirchhoff, "Ist in Athen jemals nach Priestern der Sotere datirt worden?" *Hermes* 2 (1867) 161–173 (hereafter KIRCHHOFF); K. Scott, "The Deification of Demetrios Poliorcetes," *AJP* 49 (1928) 137–166; Elena Cappellano, *Il fattore politico negli onori divini a Demetrio Poliorcete* (Turin 1957), esp. 12.

⁴Kirchhoff 168. In accordance with this conclusion the cult of the Saviour-gods would be wrongly equated with the cult of the tribe-eponyms (for the separation see Chr. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*² [Munich 1970] 44–45). However, it would not be plausible to suppose that the source or even Plutarch himself was unable to distinguish between the cult of the Saviour-gods and the heroes of the tribes of the Antigonids.

control after 294).⁵ The lack of evidence for the service of the priests of the Saviour-gods as *eponymoi* in this period is not to be attributed to a late erasure of their names, after the event, as Kirchhoff saw (166–167). But by stressing the erasure on some of the stones Kirchhoff opened himself to criticism.

The erasure was made in 201 B.C.;⁶ up to this time the tribes of the Antigonids and their *eponymoi* existed without rupture. The persistence of the cult of the tribes (and the statues as objects of the cult) is confirmed as long as the tribes existed. The statues of the tribe-heroes of the Antigonid tribes therefore presumably remained in their place from 307 until 201.⁷ The military and political circumstances of the city in 287 in particular did not allow an action of this kind, because only the *asty* was liberated, whereas the Piraeus and the fortifications of Attica remained occupied by Macedonian forces. Thus the statues of the tribe-heroes were not overthrown or removed when Athens dissociated itself from Demetrios in 287.⁸ Plutarch could not have found the non-event in his well-informed contemporary source.

But also the further errors that Kirchhoff attributes to Plutarch are not credible. In this case Plutarch would not only have confounded the eponymous priests of the Saviour-gods with the statues of the eponymous heroes of the tribes, which later on were not replaced as *eponymoi* but were overthrown as statues.

⁵Evidence for this period would exist if we date the beginning of the regime in 295 with Habicht: against that, *GGA* 250 (1998) 216–219. The argument in this paper would corroborate the later date of 294; cf. P. J. Rhodes with D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford 1997) 46–47.

⁶Liv. 31.44.2–9, 41.23.1; Polyb. 16.25.9 (tribe for Attalos); Liv. 31.15.5–7, cf. 31.44.2–9 (tribe for Attalos, cancellation of the honours for the Antigonids).

⁷Pausanias (10.10.2) even saw all the tribe-heroes consecrated in Delphi in their original places in spite of the numerous occasions on which Athens or Aitolia opposed the Antigonids in the third century B.C.

⁸Evidence for existence of the tribes shortly after 287: *IG* II² 653.1 (archon Diotimos: 285/4). A repartition of the *demos* into ten tribes in 287 was advisable neither from a political nor from an economic point of view.

At the same time Plutarch would have stated positively but nevertheless wrongly that the priest of the Saviour-gods as *eponymos* in place of the normal eponymous archon (Kirchhoff 168–169) headed all private and public documents.⁹

This distortion would be unique in the *Life of Demetrios*. Exaggerations deriving from a source (especially comedy) are possible¹⁰ and uncertainties in the tradition are explicitly mentioned (27.2), but Plutarch never presented in this *Life* an account which is to be wholly rejected or even one which should be rejected as unproved. Plutarch did sometimes fail in dating events, and it is the merit of Habicht to have demonstrated this by examining the honours conferred on the Antigonids.¹¹

Plutarch mentioned the change in the eponymous status of the priests of the Saviour-gods in the context of the honours that were dated to the year 307/6.¹² Kirchhoff thought that Plutarch was wrong about that change, because he believed that Plutarch's dates were correct. Surprisingly Kirchhoff did not doubt the chronology of Plutarch, although he criticized him in every other respect in this context. But Kirchhoff could not know that there was in fact a change in the prescripts of documents between 307 and 287: not one whereby the priests of the Saviour-gods were promoted to the status of eponymous

⁹Through his source(s) Plutarch had access to contemporary documents, for example *Dem.* 34 and perhaps 13.

¹⁰Scott (*supra* n.3) 149 on the "replacing" of the Dionysia by the Demetria (in Plutarch), a statement which in his view is based on comedy. In reality the Demetria were only "associated" with the Dionysia, see Dinsmoor 8, at line 42 (= *IG* II² 649); Duris *FGrHist* 76 F 14; the supplemented ceremony surely only existed after 294: see Habicht (*supra* n.4) 51–54, who is right to oppose Ferguson's thesis connecting the cult of the Saviour-gods with the cult of Dionysos before 294, *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 128.

¹¹Habicht (*supra* n.4) 44–57, especially concerning all the honours which Plutarch related for the year 307 (*Dem.* 10–13). Habicht supplied the corrected dates partly here, partly in *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v.Chr.* (Munich 1979) 34–44 (307 or 304 or 294).

¹²10.4. At 10.5 he begins to recount the honours which do not belong with certainty to the year 307: see Habicht (*supra* n.4) 48–49 concerning the honours for Demetrios as Kataibates (304).

magistrates, but one whereby the *anagrapheis* were elevated to co-eponymous magistrates. Since Dinsmoor's pioneering analysis of the Attic archon-list it has become clear¹³ that there was a second period of co-eponymous *anagrapheis* early in the third century B.C., in addition to the period following the Phocion regime from 321/0 to 319/8.¹⁴

The thesis to be argued here, which connects the two passages of Plutarch¹⁵ with the epigraphical evidence for the *anagrapheis* and which assumes that Plutarch in principle understood his source, has to cope with the following problems: (1) the problem of the time-limits in Plutarch; (2) the problem

¹³*The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931) 17, 30; corrections in *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York 1939) 20. Since then also: W. K. Pritchett and B. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1940) xvi; Meritt, *Hesperia* 13 (1944) 235; Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1947) 61–64; Dinsmoor, *Hesperia* 23 (1954) 312–313; Meritt, *The Athenian Year* (Berkeley 1961) 231–232; Meritt, *Hesperia* 30 (1961) 289–292; S. Dow, *HSCP* 67 (1963) 44–54 and his synopsis at 42 (hereafter DOW).

¹⁴First period: 321/0: SEG XXI 303 = *Agora* XVI 97; SEG 304 = IG II² 546; 320/319: IG 380, 381, 382; SEG 306 = *Agora* XVI 100; IG 383b (add. 660) = SEG 305; *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 174–175 no. 25; IG 383, 384 (= SEG 309); 319/8: SEG 310 = Moretti, *ISE* I 3 = Osborne, *Naturalization* D 29 = *Agora* XVI 101; IG 386 (add. 660) = SEG 311; SEG 312 = Moretti, *ISE* I 4 = *Agora* XVI 102; IG 388 (cf. SEG 313); IG 387 (add. 660) = SEG 314 = Osborne, *Nat.* D 35; IG 390 (Meritt, *Athenian Year* 123; cf. SEG 315); SEG 316 = *Agora* XVI 103. Second period: 294/3: IG 378 = SEG 353 = Osborne, *Nat.* D 70; 293/2: IG 389 = SEG 354; IG 649 = Dinsmoor 7; *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 97–100 no. 17 = *Agora* XVI 167 (all three decrees on the same day); 292/1: IG 385 = SEG 355). See also epigraphical commentaries in S. V. Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition* (Berkeley 1995). On the "strong" and "weak" *anagrapheis* and the estimate of the weak position of the *anagrapheis* in the second phase of the Phocion regime, inferred from their position in the prescript (before or behind the eponymous archon; in genitive or nominative case; before or behind the secretary; extent of citation), see A. Henry, *Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 49 [1977]) 50–57, esp. synopsis at 52–53; cf. M. Errington, *Hermes* 105 (1977) 488–491 (who combines the weakening of the *anagrapheis* with the weakening of the regime after the decree of Polyperchon). On the *anagrapheis*: Dinsmoor 7 ff.; Dow 37–54; Meritt, *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 425–439; H.-J. Gehrke, *Phokion. Studien zur Erfassung einer historischen Gestalt* (Munich 1974) 93–97.

¹⁵It may not be by chance that Plutarch in both passages used the verb ἀναγράφειν.

that the offices are designated differently by Plutarch and in the inscriptions; (3) the problem of the description Plutarch gives of the change in the *eponymos*-status; (4) the problem of integrating the last "eponymous *hiereus*" Diphilos (Plut. *Dem.* 46.1).

(1) It has already been stated that Plutarch has wrongly dated several honours in the year 307. A chronological error by Plutarch would hardly occasion surprise. But Plutarch also dated the undoing of this change in the *eponymos*-status to the year 287, that is to say when Athens defected from Demetrios. The evidence for the *anagrapheis* certainly ends sooner, even if the order of the archons after Philippos (292/1) is uncertain,¹⁶ because the regular secretary (Theotimos of Trikorynthos XI) is attested in the year of Charinos (291/0?).

There are two possibilities: (a) Plutarch misunderstood his source, which reported all the honours—the change in the *eponymos*-status included—under the year 307, and referred to the previous state of affairs when narrating Athens' defection from Demetrios in 287, so that Plutarch connected the restoration of the previous state of affairs with the defection. (b) Plutarch deliberately attached the restoration of the normal state to the defection in 288/7 in order to dramatize the fall of Demetrios from the honoured god to the maniacal drunkard, when the king also lost Macedonia and much of his mainland possessions in consequence of his arrogant character and ambitious plans.

(2) Plutarch unmistakably mentioned a *hiereus* of the *Soteres* who was given *eponymos*-status.¹⁷ In the inscriptions of the

¹⁶See literature and discussion above. Charinos 291/0?; Telokles 290/89?; Aristonymos 289/8?; Kimon and Xenophon are certain in their relative order in *IG II²* 682; for the date of the last two archons see M. J. Osborne, "The Archonship of Nikias Hysteros and the Secretary Cycles in the Third Century B.C.," *ZPE* 58 (1985) 275–295; Rhodes (*supra* n.5) 46–47. J. D. Morgan informs me that he will date Aristion (normally attributed to the 230s B.C.) to the year of Aristonymos; therefore Aristonymos will have to give way (and to be moved to 277/6).

¹⁷By making the *hiereis* of the *Soteres* eponymous, Demetrios achieved the same aim as by establishing the priests of the founder-cult in Sicyon and

years 294/3 to 292/1 (archons Olympiodoros I/II and Philippos) the *anagrapheis* are surely to be regarded as co-eponymoi. Kirchhoff (162) at the outset of his analysis offered two different explanations of the eponymity of the *hiereus*: firstly, a fusing of the older (*i.e.* traditional) eponymous archon and the newer eponymous priest,¹⁸ secondly, their independent existence as separate *eponymoi*. The evidence discovered since 1867 has confirmed the second possibility. The position of the eponymous archon seems to have been left untouched and the possibility that the three *anagrapheis* after 294 were fused with contemporary eponymous archons can be rejected. Provided that Plutarch may be understood as referring to the second period of the *anagrapheis*, the equation of the eponymous priests of the Saviour-gods (who for Plutarch head all documents) and of the eponymous *anagrapheis* found in inscriptions is only plausible in a situation of co-eponymity (*i.e.* co-existence).

Here we can discern the purpose of such a measure: by amalgamating the *hiereis* and the *anagrapheis* and raising them to co-eponymous magistrates with the archons the city was able to honour Demetrios Poliorketes and the king was able to confirm his rule in the city at the same time. As with the other restrictive regimes between 322 and 229, the highest goal was to stabilize the regime without a definite and coherent constitutional concept (apart from the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron).

Perhaps we can go further: if the account of Plutarch is accurate, then the priest of the Saviour-gods gained in addition to his "traditional" duty (the cult of the Saviour-gods) new

Demetrias (Habicht [*supra* n.4] 74–75), who likewise were eponymous: all citizens were, so to speak, confronted with the ruler and had to discharge their obligations in relation to him each day.

¹⁸The possibility of replacement has to be considered, as Plutarch presumably understood. This possibility is attested immediately after the "Mithridatic adventure," see Habicht, *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich 1995) 315 = *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1997) 316–317. The evidence does not favor replacement in 294.

duties, indicated by the word *anagrapheus*. The increase in powers may have come about in this way: the *hiereus* of the *Soteres*, since he was annually elected, began to exercise the further and more important functions of co-eponymous *anagrapheus*. So he may have been responsible for official and private contracts. It would be less plausible to suppose the reverse development, because of the wording of Plutarch and because in this case the holder of a state-office would administer the cult of the ruler, which would reverse the real conditions of power. Thus the Athenians were aware of the origin (which Plutarch elucidated for his readers), without having explicitly formulated it.¹⁹ Moreover, Demetrios gained the possibility of controlling the constitutional machinery and the decision-making process (as already through Olympiodoros in personal respects).

No analogy exists for this supposition, but the role of the *anagrapheis* of 321/18 and 294/1 was unique in the constitutional history of Athens. The oligarchic *anagrapheis* of the year 411, to whom reference is made in the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*,²⁰ may or may not actually have borne this title. It is not yet clear whether they coincide with one of the other oligarchic 100-man groups, *i.e.* the hundred *katalogeis* (*Ath. Pol.* 29.5) and the "nucleus" of the 400, who appear only in Thukydides (8.67.3).²¹

¹⁹For a degree of considerateness for the Attic democracy, which may be Demetrios' attitude after 294 B.C., see *Dem.* 34 (Demetrios installing popular magistrates). *Ergon* (1993) 7 probably also is to be dated in this context: the Athenian Adeimantos was installed as *strategos* for two years by Demetrios; the alternative would be to date *Ergon* (1993) 7 shortly after 304.

²⁰30.1: κυρωθέντων δὲ τούτων εἴλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι τοὺς ἀναγράφοντας τὴν πολιτείαν ἑκατὸν ἄνδρας; 32.1: οἱ μὲν οὖν ἑκατὸν οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν πεντακισχιλίων αἰρεθέντες ταύτην ἀνέγραψαν τὴν πολιτείαν.

²¹P. Rhodes, *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981, 1994²) 384–389, 50, 406; in favour of the identity of the nucleus of the 400 and the *katalogeis*: Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen II* (Berlin 1893) 357; in favour of the identity of all the three groups: Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte II* (Halle 1899) 428, 433; G. Busolt, *Griechische Ge-*

The nature of the “democratic” *anagrapheis* of the fifth century is even more difficult to describe.²² They were established one year thereafter (*i.e.* 410) with the title ἀναγραφεῖς τῶν νόμων.²³ This secretarial office cannot be compared in any respect with the co-eponymous *anagrapheus*: the latter acted in isolation and as an individual, not in a collegial capacity. He participated actively in the decision-making process and appeared not only when merely collecting and copying skills were required. The function of the *anagrapheus* after 322 was entirely new in competence and inner structure.

About the responsibilities of the *anagrapheis* of the democratic periods 399–322, 307/4, and after 301 B.C. nothing

schichte III.2 (Gotha 1904) 1481 n.1, 1486; Rhodes, however, argues (385) in favour of the separation of the three groups, but concedes an individual and therefore partial identity. Concerning the time of activity of the *anagrapheis* see Rhodes 386 and 406 (right after the *Colonos* meeting), against the opinion that the *anagrapheis* were active before the *Colonos* meeting, and that their proposals were ratified at that meeting.

²²Evidence: Lys. 30.2–5, 17, 21, and other passages; Andoc. 1.83–85 (decree of Teisamenos); *IG* I³ 104, 105, 236–241; Rhodes, *JHS* 111 (1991) 87–100, against N. Robertson, *JHS* 110 (1990) 43–75, on the instructions, competence, and operation of the *anagrapheis* after 410: from Lysias’ speech against Nicomachos it can be concluded that the initial phase of the work of the *anagrapheis* lasted from 410 to 404 (limited instructions) and the second phase from 403 to 399; in the beginning they were empowered to collect only the laws of Solon, then all the existing laws of the community; in the first period they were active not for four months, but for six years, and in the second period not for four weeks, but for four years. Against M. H. Hansen (*The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* [Oxford 1991] 162; “Diokles’ Law (24,42) and the Revision of the Athenian Corpus of Laws in the Archonship of Eukleides,” *CIMed* 41 [1990] 68–69) Rhodes states that the clerical work of the *anagrapheis* from the years 410 to 404 and the tasks of the first group of *nomothetai* in 403/2 were not identical, as is to be seen from the decree of Teisamenos, Andoc. 1.83: the first group of *nomothetai* had to revise the corpus of laws and to propose (in the context of the events up to the amnesty) new laws, which the second group of *nomothetai*—the first appointed out of the *boule*, the second out of the *demes*—had to ratify.

²³Lys. 30.2–3 (*cf.* 25): ἀναγραφεὺς (a) τῶν νόμων, (b) τῶν ὁσίων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν; see Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 195–196; *Comm. Ath. Pol.* 441–442; Hansen, *Athenian Democracy* 163; Robertson (*supra* n.22); Rhodes (*supra* n.22); J. Bleicken, *Die athenische Demokratie*⁴ (Paderborn 1995) 218.

substantial is known.²⁴ In the bouleutic list of 335/4 *Agora* XV 43.229 an *anagrapheus* is to be found among eight officials—underneath the secretary. A different bouleutic stele (*Agora* XV 53.13 of 324/3) shows the *anagrapheus* underneath the *demos*-secretary as in *Agora* XV 43. In one place in *Agora* XV 58 (305/4) ἀ[- -]φεύς (l. 84) can be read, in the another ἀντ[(80). In the first instance ἀντιγραφεύς, who each month had to report on the income of the state (Aeschin. 3.25), was restored and in the second ἀναγραφεύς, in reverse order compared with *Agora* XV 43.229–231.²⁵ The honour conferred in *IG* II² 415 is not dated with certainty, but may belong to the years around 330, *i.e.* in the democratic period (Dow 39–40). At 12–13 one of the tasks of an *anagrapheus* is described ἀναγραφή τῶν γραμμάτων (the rest of his activities remain nebulous, line 16).²⁶

The fourth-century *anagrapheus* (before 322) therefore seems to be a magistrate, who probably ranked below the secretary. Even though much remains uncertain, one thing is clear: the

²⁴For the evidence of the democratic period after 399 see Dow 39: *IG* II² 1700.215 = *Agora* XV 43.229; *Prytaneis* no. 1; *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 42 = *Agora* XV 53.13; *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 1–24 = *Agora* XV 62.231; *IG* 415, 487; Rhodes, *Comm.Ath.Pol.* 111–112, 387, 441–442; Rhodes, *Boule* 128; see also *IG* 1685 B5.6 = S. Aleshire, *Asklepios at Athens* (Amsterdam 1991) 13–34 (beginning of III B.C.; Aleshire's date is year 300/299, see below).

²⁵For the ἀντιγραφεύς see H. Leppin, "Die Verwaltung öffentlicher Gelder im Athen des 4. Jahrhunderts," in W. Eder, ed., *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Stuttgart 1995) 559–560; G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* II (Munich 1926) 1042–1043; Rhodes, *Boule* 138–140, 238–239; U. Bultrighini, "Gli antigrafeis ateniesi e il loro significato nel II sec. a.C.," *QUCC* 36 (1981) 85–105; R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge 1989) 11.

²⁶In *IG* II² 487 (304/3) the post of the person honoured is not certain. In *IG* 1685.B5.6 (beginning of III B.C.) Aleshire (*supra* n.24: new edition; dated to the year of Hegemachos 300/299), supplemented in Aleshire line 111; *anagrapheus* in B5.6 = Aleshire lines 10 and 31. Aleshire translates ἀναγραφέα/ἀναγραφέας with "plan(s)" (24–26, lines 31 and 106). Line 31: ἀναγραφ[έ]α ὃν ἂν [- - - Aleshire: "according to the p]lan which [*the architect] may [provide" (completed from *IG* 1666.A.34). L. 106: ἀναγραφέας, κα[ὶ] ... Aleshire: "p]lans. An[d]"; cf. *IG* 1666.A.34 (and other passages) with commentary. Again Aleshire p.30 "concept," if it is the correct supplement; see for the secondary meaning of *anagrapheus* LSJ *s.v.* III "plan, pattern, design"; see also J. J. Coulton, *AJA* 80 (1976) 302–304.

anagrapheus of 321/18 and 294/1 B.C., in his entirely new and certainly more extensive competence, differs from all the *anagrapheis* attested up to that time. As a result one must distinguish the *anagrapheus* before 322 from the *anagrapheus* of 321/18 and 294/1 and refrain from filling the gaps in our knowledge of one period with the evidence from the other.

Moreover, even if we can connect the “new” *anagrapheus* of the period 294/1 with Plutarch’s statement, so that the now more important priest of the Saviour-gods acted in the position of a co-eponymous *anagrapheus*, we have to confess that an identical explication for the *anagrapheis* of 321/18 cannot, in spite of their parallel position, be offered on the basis of the existing sources. On the one hand we have no evidence for a ruler-cult in Athens after 323,²⁷ because its establishment seems to be quite impossible in view of Antipatros’ attitude, which was most important after the defeat of Athens in 322.²⁸ On the other hand there is no sign of another magistrate who might have been transmogrified into a new co-eponymous *anagrapheus*

²⁷ Because of the proposal to establish an Alexander-cult Demades was fined 100 talents (Athenaios 10 talents) and therefore became an *atimos* (Ael. VH 5.12; Ath. 251B); rehabilitation in 322 after the defeat in autumn: Plut. Phoc. 26; Diod. 18.18.1; see also Habicht, *Athen* (*supra* n.18) 77 n.3; J. M. Williams, “Demades’ Last Years,” *AncW* 19 (1989) 23 n.23. Pytheas, later a member of the government of Phocion, resisted the deification of Alexander in Athens: Plut. *Mor.* 804B and 187E, cf. Gehrke (*supra* n.14) 100 n.69. Demosthenes at first was vehemently against a deification during the investigation (six months, Dinarch. 1.45) because of his role in the Harpalos affair, then he changed camps and recommended the deification (Dinarch. 1.94; Hyperid. 1.31). In the funeral speech of Hyperides in 323/2 the actually existing cult-honours were addressed more clearly than elsewhere (6.21): φανερόν δ’ ἐξ ὧν ἀναγκαζόμεθα καὶ νῦν ἐπί· θυσίας μὲν ἀνθρώποις γ[ιγνο]μένας ἐφορᾶν, ἀγάλμ[ατα δὲ] καὶ βωμοὺς καὶ ναοὺς τοῖς μὲν θεοῖς ἀμελῶς, τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρώ[ποις] ἐπιμελῶς συντελούμενα, καὶ τοὺς <τοῦ>των οἰκέτας ὡσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν ἡμᾶς ἀναγκαζόμενους.

²⁸ Antipatros is believed to have advocated the opinions of Philip II and therefore the traditional presentation of the Macedonian kingdom. Accordingly he was deeply rooted in the Macedonian tradition (note also Cassandros’ activities, which followed those of his father, R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens* [Munich 1986] 127ff. = *A History of Macedonia* [Berkeley/Los Angeles 1990] 130ff.).

as presumably happened in 294. Accordingly we cannot posit restrictions, in addition the ones known, for the time after 322 as we did for 294 (the promotion of the *hierēus* of the *Soterēs* to a co-eponymous *anagrapheus*).²⁹

It may be possible however that in 322 the reduction of the citizen-roll, which required a concentration in offices and tasks beyond that found in the extant evidence (*IG II² 380 = Syll.³ 313*), had an effect on the *anagrapheus* in his new position, so that he could become a model for the period 294/1.

It cannot be denied that the *anagrapheus* of 321/18 and 294/1 (compared with the history of the office to that point) occupied a unique position, partly because he appears as a single official in contradistinction to the *anagrapheis* of 411 and 410/4. In addition, he gained with his eponymity a position of eminence far beyond the degree normal in the democracy in the years after 399. The duties of his office themselves lay at the centre of daily administration.³⁰

(3) It remains to be discussed how Plutarch described the change in the *eponymos*-status. At *Dem.* 10.4 Plutarch has regularly been interpreted as stating that the Athenians “ceased to install the traditional eponymous archon and began to elect the priest of the Saviour-gods instead.” I think two explanations can be offered in the light of our thesis: one possibility would be that Plutarch misunderstood his source (probably

²⁹The honours and the wreaths for Antipatros in 322 surely cannot be compared with those for the Antigonids, *Diod.* 18.18.8 (in general on all regimes established by Antipatros, that is to say also on the regime in Athens).

³⁰See Williams (*supra* n.27) 26–27. It would not be correct to judge the tasks of the co-eponymous *anagrapheus* as merely representative; the new position rather is supposed to have been connected with extraordinary duties. So the hated but important magistrate could not be removed immediately when the Phocion regime was cancelled in March 318: the *anagrapheus* of 319/8 held his office until the “regular” end of his term.

Philochoros)³¹ and thought that the Athenians stopped installing the traditional eponymous archon.

But perhaps it is possible to save Plutarch's reference to archons and priests as *eponymoi*, if my conclusions have a purchase on the truth. In that case the Athenians in the year 294 "having stopped the traditional designation of the year by the archon [only], elected the priest of the Saviour-gods annually and [also] wrote him at the head of the public edicts and private contracts."³²

Likewise we have to conclude that at the end of this period of installing two eponymous magistrates, which we have to date in the present state of the evidence to the year of Philippos (292/1), the Athenians "removed also Diphilos, who had been appointed priest of the Saviour-gods, from the ranks of the eponymous magistrates and they voted in the *ekklesia* to install archons in the traditional manner again."³³

Therefore we can criticize Plutarch for not being clear and definite in his formulation³⁴—but probably not for having falsified or misunderstood his source—and for being indifferent

³¹Against P. Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus. Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque* (Paris 1989) 330ff., esp. 348–349, who pleads for Duris. I think Plutarch's source is very well informed about Athenian conditions in the passages cited and Plutarch would search for the best source possible: as in the patriotic passage of Pausanias 1.25–26 (history of Athens from 323 to the 270s), I suspect the source is the *Atthis* of Philochoros. But this question need not be discussed in this context.

³²Bernadotte Perrin's (Loeb) translation allows a broader interpretation: "They put a stop to the ancient custom of designating the year with the name of the annual archon, and elected every year a priest of the Saviour-Gods, whose name they prefixed to their public edicts and private contracts."

³³*Dem.* 46.2; cf. also transl. of Perrin: "They voted to elect archons, as had been their custom of old, and took away from Diphilos, who had been appointed priest of the Saviour-gods, the privilege of giving his name to the current year." The *ekklesia* would have agreed with Demetrios in my view, if in fact he did not initiate the vote.

³⁴See also Plutarch's statement that the Demetria replaced the Dionysia. In fact the Demetria were only associated with the Dionysia: see above and Habicht (*supra* n.4) 52–53; *IG* II² 649 = Dinsmoor 7–8.

to chronology. Both criticisms may also be conditioned by Plutarch's source and justified by Plutarch's aims as a biographer.

(4) There remains Diphilos,³⁵ the appointed priest of the Saviour-gods, and the last one holding the position of an eponymous *anagrapheus*. The last attested eponymous *anagrapheus* is dated to the year of Philippos (292/1).

IG II² 385.a³⁶ is the only Athenian decision which can be dated to this year.³⁷ The original join with IG II² 385.b, which was proposed by Wilhelm because of the similarity in script, has been disproved,³⁸ and the dating of fragment a to the year of Apollodoros (319/8) rejected.³⁹ Dow discussed the possibility of inserting the fragment in the years of Olympiodoros or Philippos⁴⁰ and decided rightly for the more probable dating, Philippos. Concerning the name of the *anagrapheus* he read Θ and for the deme like Meritt ἐ]ξ Οἴου. Meritt however still in 1977 did not mention Θ.⁴¹

Assuming that Meritt was right to disregard Dow's reading, and provided that the *anagrapheus* was eponymous for the last time in the year of Philippos and that the identification of the tribe is correct, the completion of lines 2 and 3 can be as follows (*ca* 35 *stoich.*):

³⁵ Athenians with this personal name were relatively numerous, see Kirchner, *PA* 4462–4488, and J. Sundwall, *Nachträge zur Prosopographie Attica* (Helsinki 1910) 66. Our Diphilos *PA* 4470, *LGPN* II s.v. no. 21.

³⁶ One further fragment by M. B. Walbank, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 94 no. 22.

³⁷ In any case in one of the periods of the eponymous *anagrapheis* because of the magistrate preserved in line 1.

³⁸ Dinsmoor 24–25; Meritt, *Hesperia* 30 (1961) 290, *cf.* *Athenian Year* 232; see also *SEG* XXI 341 and 355; especially Dow, below.

³⁹ Dow 52–53, and 78–92 for IG 385.b; see also Henry (*supra* n.14) 53–54, especially for the formula in IG 385.a.

⁴⁰ Dow 52. [Aristo]nikos in line 1 is the probable object of both decrees (IG 385.a and b), although they now have to be separated chronologically.

⁴¹ *Historia* 26 (1977) 172; see also Osborne, *ZPE* 58 (1985) 282–287, esp. table on 282, but with no further discussion of the *anagrapheus* of Philippos. Suggestions (of Wilhelm, Leonardos, Kirchner, and earlier) in Dinsmoor 24–25; Dow 42.

[ἐπὶ Φιλίππου ἄρχοντος ἀ]ναγραφέως δὲ [Διφί]-
[λου τοῦ.^{ca 13}]ξ Οἴου [.^{ca 9}]⁴²

If it is permissible to sum up on the basis of these provisional reflections, we can state that the institution of the eponymous *anagrapheus* of the years 294 to 291—with the loyal personnel of the ruler-cult—is to be interpreted as a precaution of the ruler. Similar actions may be presumed for each regime after 322: these actions were without any constitutional ambition, neither by the ruler nor by an Attic “regent” (except Demetrios of Phaleron). The *anagrapheus* of 294/1 therefore was one element among the safety measures of which the citizens were conscious in the daily administration and work. Another was the garrison, which presumably was not to be found in the central part of the city before 292.

Therefore the turning point of 292/1 was rather abrupt. It was marked by refusing to show reverence to the master of the city and adopting instead a regime based strictly on the garrison stationed in the Museion (see date in n.2). These elements of the regime before and after this turning point Antigonos Gonatas copied from the very outset of his rule over Athens (260–255). But he refused to elevate the *hierous* of the *Soteres* to an eponymous status with the function of an *anagrapheus*; this measure presumably seemed to have failed in 291.

It remains open, how far the *anagrapheis* of 321/18 influenced the character and structure of the office after 294,⁴³

⁴²If the first *omicron* of the demotic lies directly underneath the *gamma* of the *anagrapheus* in the upper line (Dow 52), then there is after the deme in line 3 space for 9 letters. On the reconstruction in *IG* (commentary: Wilhelm) there exists only a space of *ca* 3 letters: ἐ]ξ Οἴου [ἐπ]ι [τῆς . . .].

⁴³It is probable that the *anagrapheis* of the period 321/18 were elected at least before the decree of Polyperchon, because persons attested elsewhere also held this office: Archedikos (320/19): Habicht, *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 253–256 (also *Athen* 251–255); Thrasykles (321/0): Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen 1982) 205. But we have to refrain from jumping to conclusions on the basis of analogy. In fact the position of the *anagrapheis* in the prescripts demonstrates the following differences

although it seems possible that the magistrates concerned had similar tasks. In any case it is permissible to accept what Plutarch (*Dem.* 10.4) says about the installation of the eponymous position, as a *cheirotomia* of the *hiereus* (that is to say, appointment by election, not by lot). Presumably the archons, who were at least equal in rank, were also (formally) elected,⁴⁴ after the attested appointment in 294 (*Dem.* 34), as was the case in 317 (*Diod.* 18.74). This kind of appointment is also attested in the period after 260, when the king installed the magistrate and the people were reduced to ratifying his choice.⁴⁵

October, 1999

Althistorisches Seminar
Georg-August-Universität
37073 Göttingen, Germany
bdreyer@gwdg.de

between the first and the second period of this office: (a) The *anagrapheus* of the second period after 294 stands as far as is known always in the second position, with patronymic and deme, behind the eponymous archon, while the *anagrapheis* of the period 321/18 stood in a flexible position: in nominative or genitive case before or after the eponymous archon, regularly with patronymic and deme (Henry [*supra* n.14] 54–55); Henry (57) and Errington, *Hermes* 105 (1977) 490, state that the *anagrapheus* was weakened in consequence of the decree of Polyperchon; Henry concludes that the position of the *anagrapheus* after 294 was not as strong as in 321; (b) in the second period the secretary is missing (Henry 55 n.19); (c) in the second period the eponymous archon (Olympiodoros) was given extraordinary powers; (d) in the second period the *anagrapheis* were removed by the king Demetrios, while in the first period a power from outside took the initiative and the *anagrapheus* of 319/8 remained in office until the end of the Attic year, although the regime was already abolished in March.

⁴⁴ An election with at least a formal character is possible in the case of the popular Olympiodoros.

⁴⁵ For advice and corrections I am grateful to Prof. P. J. Rhodes, Prof. G. A. Lehmann, and Dr F. X. Ryan.