

Thrasymphon Hierokleidou Xypetaion

Sterling Dow

THRASYPHON was a notable Athenian of the 240's to 220's B.C. His name is preserved in two decrees proposed by him and is restorable in a third. Various errors have obscured knowledge of Thrasymphon, and a full treatment, despite—or because of?—the numerous corrections may have some interest.

MEANING OF *Θρασυφῶν*. *Θρασυφῶν* is from *θρασύς* and *φάων*,¹ but there is much uncertainty about just how Greek names were understood. Pape translated it 'Hartbert als Starker od. kühn glänzend'.² Thrasymphon is uncommon, but the large number of names in *θρασυ-* (Bechtel 211–13) and of Athenians bearing such names (114 in *Prosopographia Attica*) proves that the first meaning given in LSJ, 'bold', was the accepted meaning for the nomen, and not the pejorative '(2.) more freq. in bad sense, over-bold, rash. . . audacious, arrogant, insolent'.

OTHER ATHENIANS NAMED THRASYPHON. The following, mostly in J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, are all there are:

(*PA* 7371. Not Thrasymphon: the reading was corrected in *IG II*² 478 ii 37 to [P]asiphontos.)

PA 7372. Not from Alopeke: the Arkhon of 221/0 B.C. *IG II*² 1706.81 was restored [ἄρχ Θρασυφ]ῶν Ἀλωπε. Subsequently the fragment bearing line 81 was shown to belong, not to 221/0 B.C., but lower in the stele.³ The restoration had to be abandoned and the connection of Thrasymphon with Alopeke dissolved. In view of the rarity of the name and the fact that most Arkhons were aristocrats, the suggestion seemed natural that the Arkhon Thrasymphon was *PA* 7373, Thrasymphon Hierokleidou Xypetaion, who was a member of the Genos of the Kerykes; one of his decrees, *IG II*² 1235, dates from after 230 B.C.⁴ This identification too was mistaken.

¹ F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle 1917) 211–12, 460–61.

² W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³, ed. G. F. Benseler (Braunschweig 1863–1870, repr. 1959) *s.v.*

³ S. Dow, *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 418–46 and plates XII–XIV.

⁴ Dow, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 433–36, 444; and *idem*, *AJA* 40 (1936) 60–62.

A small new fragment of *IG II*² 1706 showed that the Arkhon of 221/0 B.C. was [ἄρχ Θρασυφῶν Εὐ]ωνυ(μεύς).⁵ The restoration fits the space, as determined by the next full line, 87, exactly. These prominent families were few but often persistent. Merely as a suggestion to be kept in mind, note that in Euonymon—a large Deme, to be sure—there was earlier (398/7 B.C.) a Thrasyllus, one of a known family.⁶

(*PA* 7387.) Erroneously omitted from *PA* as a separate entry, the father in *PA* 7387, Θράσων Θρασυφῶντος Κικυννεύς, should have been entered after *PA* 7372, and again, with the Demotai, on page 557. The son, *PA* 7387, was a Pythaist *ca* 100 B.C., and the fairly pretentious grave monuments of each of *his* two sons, *IG II*² 6460 and 6465, formerly dated under the Empire, have been moved back to *med. s.I a.* (No Thrasyphon is now left in *IG III*, but there are still many persons in Θρασυ-, so that the pejorative meaning had not prevailed. The Deme being very small, Kirchner was right in calling attention to *PA* 7385, Thrason Kikynneus, who was a Thesmothetes in 225/4 B.C.,⁷ and to *PA* 7386, Thrason Euarkhidou Kikynneus, an Ephebos of 111/0 B.C.

PA 7373. The subject of the present article.

PA 7374. Father of an Ephebos, Ἀλκέτης Θρασυφῶντος Πειραιεύς, of 107/6 B.C. (*IG II*² 1011 iv 91).

Thus at present the name Thrasyphon occurs in four Demes: Euonymon, Kikynna, Xypete and Peiraiеus. There is evidence, not all positive but suggestive, that in two of the Demes the families were 'propertied'. The fourth family is that of the Ephebos of Peiraiеus (*PA* 7374), who necessarily had a father with some property.

THRASYPHON HIEROKLEIDOU XYPETAION AND HIS FAMILY. Of the third propertied family, that of *PA* 7373, one ancestor, three decrees and one descendant may be listed:

350/49 B.C. 'Ιεροκλείδης was Daidoukhos:⁸ *PA* 7460A. The name Hierokleides was not uncommon (14 others in *PA*), but the Daidoukhos had to belong to the Genos of the Kerykes.

⁵ B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 23 (1954) 244, no.17.

⁶ *PA* 7343; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) no. 11221.

⁷ *IG II*² 1706; Dow, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) pl. xiv line 47.

⁸ K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (*TAPS* n.s. 64.3 [1974]) 50A, 46A [hereafter, CLINTON with page number].

THRASYPHON HIEROKLEIDOU XYPETAION

248/7 B.C. Thrasyphon Hierokleidou Xypetaion is Rhetor of *IG II² 683*, a decree of the Boule and Demos passed in the year of the Arkhon Hieron, in honor of the Epimeletai of the Mysteries in the preceding year, the year of the Arkhon Polyeuktos. The names of the Epimeletai are not preserved.

Although it could be imagined that such a decree was proposed by a young man acting on behalf of his elders, as Perikles was said, later, to have let others do the actual talking, still that seems unlikely. A resolution to praise the great dignitaries was a solemn affair. All the more if it involved partisan feeling, it should not be proposed by an underling but by a personage of acknowledged prestige. So in the years of Polyeuktos and Hieron, probably Thrasyphon was already mature and fairly eminent.

IG II² 683, EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES; THE EPIMELETAI OF THE MYSTERIES. It was a modest Hymettian stele, set up at Eleusis. The stoikhedon order is never violated; there is no concession to syllabification. The lettering is excellent, the best style of *post med. s. III a.* In line 2 the chisel was held with the length of the blade at a slight angle so that only the bottom half of the letter got inscribed. This feature is seen in the work of the mason of *IG II² 1706*.⁹ In line 8 the *xi* of ΕΔΟ ΕΝ was never inscribed, nor the *lambda* of ΒΟΥ ΕΙ in line 8 (the *epsilon* is given in the Corrigenda). The mason did not like the letter *xi*; he made the *xi* of line 9 as an *epsilon* with no vertical. *Theta* always lacks a central dot (lines 1, 9, 11, 12, 12, 15). Part of the third *tau* in line 13 shows, and of the first *iota* in 14. Dot the *lambda* in line 16. Note that, here in Eleusis where the inscription was set up, Antigonos in line 16 escaped erasure.

The decree honors οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν μυστηρίων οἱ χειροτο|νηθέντες τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Πολυεύκτου ἄ|ρχοντος (lines 10–12). Reasons for the honors are given before the inscription breaks off: the Epimeletai have offered the ancestral Eleusinian sacrifices on behalf of the Athenaiοι and Basileus Antigonos; then, before any other details are given, and before the Epimeletai are named, the inscription breaks off. It is a pity. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57.2 states that the (Arkhon) Basileus πρῶτον μὲν μυστηρίων ἐπιμελεῖται μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν ὧν ὁ δῆμος

⁹ See e.g. S. V. Tracy, *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 267.

χειροτονεί, δύο μὲν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων, ἓνα δ' ἐξ Εὐμολπιδῶν ἓνα δ' ἐκ Κηρύκων. In the preserved decrees honoring Epimeletai of the Mysteria, the Eleusinian Gennetai are never once mentioned; it is the two citizens chosen by the Demos who get the honors. The common opinion is that Aristotle erred.

This is not the place to attempt a solution. It should merely be noted here that sacrifices of national importance would be more likely to be entrusted, not just to a pair of citizens but to a board of five. Moreover Thrasyphon, who later (at least: *IG II*² 1235, *infra*) was zealous for his fellow-Kerykes, would probably *not* propose a decree, to be set up at Eleusis, honoring a couple of non-Eleusinians.

236/5. *IG II*² 787 is a decree of the Boule and Demos passed in the year of the Arkhon [Ekphantos] to honor the Epheboi and their officials of the previous year, the year of the Arkhon [Ki]mon (line b8). The Rhetor is lost except for the end of his demotic, ΑΙΩΝ. Long since it was realized that only one demotic has this ending, and in *IG II* as well as *IG II*² the restoration is, correctly, [Ἐυπετ]αιῶν. Before it—the inscription being stoikhedon—19 spaces need to be filled by the nomen plus patronymic. I suggested [Θρακυφῶν Ἱεροκλείδου Ἐυπετ]αιῶν.¹⁰ Xypete was a fairly large deme, and two names totaling 19 letters are about average, but in that one generation there cannot have been many Demotai in 19 letters who were given to proposing public honors for officials. The restoration can perhaps be classed as a reasonable conjecture.

*IG II*² 787 REEDITED. The stele was surmounted by a pediment, and the peak of the gable is preserved. The peak is directly above the first preserved *pi* in line 1. With a (stoikhedon) line of 41 letters restored, as at present, and correctly, the *pi* in question is the middle letter (the 21st); though unnecessarily, this confirms the restoration. Here the mason showed the same neatness in the layout that he did in the lettering. But not always. The clause of passage, line 7, according to the 'Perfect Design',¹¹ which he was following, should

¹⁰ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 60, 62.

¹¹ Original description: *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 62–65. Fullest treatment: W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York 1939) 16–17.

have been centered: it contains 26 letters, and should have been preceded by a gap of 8 or 7 letters and followed by a gap of 7 or 8 letters. Actually it is preceded by a gap of 9 and followed by a gap of 6.

Like other registers of Ephēboi, such as the new one of 205/4 B.C.,¹² the present one includes important youths, but restoration of the text as given in *IG II²* is impossible because it gives no indication of the number of letters missing. The text which follows has a number of petty variations from *IG II²* which need no comment.

IG II² 787

236/5 B.C.

ΣΤΟΙΚΗ. 41

- 1 [Ἐπὶ Ἐκφάντου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄντιο[χί]δου[ς] τ[ρ]ίτης
 2 [πρυτανείας ἡμὶ Δημήτρ?]ιος Δημητρίου[υ] Ἱπποτ[ομά]δης
 3 [ἐγραμμάτευεν Βοηδρωμι]ῶνος ὀγδοεὶ ἐπὶ δέκ[α] τετά
 4 [ρτη καὶ δεκάτη τῆς πρυ]τανείας ἐκ[κ]λησί[α τῶν] προ
 5 [έδρων ἐπεισήφισεν . . .⁶ . . .] ὀδωρος Πυρριχ[ί]ωνος Φλυ
 6 [εὐς καὶ συμπρόεδροι]
 7 [vac. 9 ἔδοξεν τῆμὶ βουλ]ῆ καὶ τῶμὶ δήμωμ vac. 6
 8 [Θρακυφῶν Ἱεροκλείδου Ξυπετ?]αιῶν εἶπεν υ ἐπ[ε]ιδὴ ο
 9 [.¹⁸ τὸν κοσμητ?]ῆν τῶν ἐφήβων εὐ ᾤ
 10 [.²⁹] ≡ ᾤ[-

Uncertain number of lines missing

- 12 [-39-] *PO*
 13 [-32- εἰς δὲ] τῆν ἄ
 14 [ναγραφὴν τῆς στῆλης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῆμὶ διο]ικῆσει τ 41+1[+1]
 15 [ὁ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα]

[In a painted wreath:]	[In a painted wreath:]	In a [painted wreath:]
16 [ἡ βουλή]	19 [ὁ δῆμος τὸν]	24 ὁ δῆμος
17 [τοὺς ε]	20 [κοσμητῆν]	25 τοὺς ε
18 [φήβους]	21 [-----]	26 φήβους
	22 [-----]	
	23 [-----]	

¹² J. S. Traill, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) 302-03.

- 27 [Οἱ ἘΦΗΒΕΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ ἘΠὶ ΚΙ]ΜΩ(Ν)ΟΣ ἜΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ
- 28-40 [Missing in Col. i: rubrics and Erpheboi
[[*Ἀντιγονίδος*]]
[[*Δημητριάδος*]]
'*Ερεχθείδος*]]
- 50 [^{ca} 4] δ]ωρος *Νικοδώρου Φρεάρι*
Ἀκαμαντίδος
[^{ca} 4½] ατος *Σωστράτου Κεφαλ*
κράτης Θεοφίλου Ἑρμει
Οἰνείδος
- 55 [^{ca} 5] ημος Ἵονήτορος *Λουκ*
Κεκροπίδος
[*Λέων*] *Κιχηςίου Αἰξωνεύς*
[^{ca} 4½] ἰων *Φαλάνθου Ἄθμονε*
[^{ca} 3] β]ουλος *Κτηρικλέους Αἰξ*
- 60 [^{ca} 6½] ης *Μένωνος Πιθεύς*
[*Ἴπ*] *ποθωντίδος*
[^{ca} 10-11] ε[^{ca} 3] *Πε]* *ιραει*
[Missing: 2 lines, including
Αἰαντίδος]
- 41 [*Αἰγειίδος*]
[*Δρομέας Δρο*] *μέου Ἑρχ[ιεύς]*
[^{ca} 8½] ος *Ἀριστομένου Κ[-* 65 [] ≡ [-
[*Π*] *ανδιονίδος* *Χαρίας Φρ?υ?[-*
- 45 [^{ca} 8] ἰδης Ἑλιοδώρου *Παιαν* Ἄντι[οχίδος]
[^{ca} 6] ἰδης Ἑλιοδώρου *Παιανι* *Παντακλῆς Κρ[-*
Λεωντίδος *Λεπτίνης Εὐρ[-*
[^{ca} 4½] κος *Νικοβούλου Κρωπίδ* 70 *Καλλίστρατος [-*
- 49 [^{ca} 5½] ς *Εὐβούλου Λευκονοε* *vac.*
- [In a painted wreath:
the Paidotribes?] 76 [In a painted wreath:]
[*ἡ βουλή*
[*ὁ δ*] *ἦμος*
[*τὸν ἄ*] *κοντις*
[*τῆν* -----]
80 [-----]
- [In a painted wreath:
the Toxotes?] [In a painted wreath:
the Katapel-
taphetes?] [In a painted wreath:
the Grammateus?]

COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

LINE 1. The restoration of the Arkhon as Ekphantos, originally by Ferguson¹³ (year 236/5), appears to be unquestionable.¹⁴ But about the precise form [ἐπι Ἐκφάντου ἄρχοντο]c there is a very real question. An inscription from Eleusis¹⁵ was found by P. Traywick to contain a variant form, ἐπι [Ἐκχφάντου], and in publishing it we noted that in *IG II*² 788, which had the only other preserved mention of this Arkhon, the reading is ἐπι Ἐκφάντου.¹⁶ Hence the restoration of Ekphantos in the present line 1 *might* call for one letter fewer or one letter more than the stoikhedon order permits.¹⁷ In any case, the man Ekphantos continues to be unidentifiable.

LINE 2. So much stone is preserved in the area of the letter before ΟΣ that a slight nick there helps to make *iota* plausible. The nomen of the Grammateus was [.]ιός, and I suggest that he was named for his father. The *mu* in the demotic, read undotted hitherto, is illusory.

LINE 5. In his majuscule copy, Koehler recorded the bottoms of the last three letters, but in his transcription he replaced them with four dots instead of (the correct) three, and Kirchner printed nothing but three dots. The first two traces Koehler recorded were however correct. First is a vertical stroke, centered in the stoikhos: it can only be *iota*, *tau*, *upsilon*, *phi* or *psi*. Next is a slant which can only be *alpha* or *lambda*. In the third place (the last stoikhos of line 5) Koehler had a dot, centered, again as if for the vertical stroke of *iota*, *tau*, *upsilon*, *phi*, *psi*. The dot is still there. There are other marks, accidents. The only demotic which will fit the traces is ΦΛΥ|[εύς. Names inόδωρος are Διονυς-, Ἡφαιστ-, Θεμιστ- and Ὀλυμπι-. The name Πυρριχίων occurs nowhere else.¹⁸ Πύρριχος is familiar, but the diminutive should be treated with respect.

LINE 9. Hitherto this line has been left unrestored. The first preserved letter, next before the first *nu*, may be an *eta*. The *beta* can be read, dotted, and the last letter seems to be represented by the end of a top horizontal stroke, ㄥ. I have not found any passage to help with the restoration.

LINE 14. Koehler and Kirchner thought that ΣΕΙΤ occupied three stoikhoi, but the *tau* is properly centered in its stoikhos, and for some

¹³ W. S. Ferguson, *The Priests of Asclepius* (CPCP 1.5, Berkeley 1907) 133, 140.

¹⁴ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931) 103–05.

¹⁵ J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamonte* (Paris 1954) 129–32.

¹⁶ S. Dow / P. Traywick, *Glotta* 45 (1967) 195–98.

¹⁷ It does not strengthen confidence in the successive lists of Arkhons (*Historia* 26 [1977] 161–91 *et ante*) to find that this possibility and the would-be full treatment in *Glotta* (*supra* n.16) are not mentioned.

¹⁸ The present instance is in *PA*, but, alarmingly, not in F. Dornseiff/B. Hansen, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Berlin 1957), nor in Bechtel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 393.

reason not apparent, ΗΞΕΙ are crowded into three stoikhoi. In order to restore the regular words earlier in the line, they put ΤΗΣΤΗΛΗΣ, but it is preferable to assume another crowding and to restore τῆς κτήλης.

THE FIRST ROW OF CROWNS. A. Wilhelm, addendum on page 667 to *IG II² 787*, pointed out that the crown of the Demos, at the right, lines 24–26, should be balanced by one of the Boule, restored, at the left. Pelekidis studied the various systematic aspects (index, page 315).¹⁹ The text is affected by page 173 note 4, where he restores a crown, between Wilhelm's two, with honors by the Demos to the Kosmetes. The position of the Demos' crown for the Epheboi, lines 24–26, is so far to the right that a central crown would indeed be demanded by the spacing alone. This gives support, though unnecessary, to the restoration *supra* of the Kosmetes in line 9. For honors, Thrasyphon would put the Kosmetes first, and not any of the trainers.

LINE 27. The first *omikron* must be dotted because in isolation it could be *theta*. For the first *nu*, Koehler's majuscule copy has IV but the (end of the) oblique stroke is imaginary. Enough of the surface is preserved to show it if it were there. The Arkhon's name reads ΜΩΙΩΣ. The oblique stroke, apparently, was never inscribed. But the two verticals, so far as they are preserved, are different: the left-hand vertical is thin and unornamented; the right-hand vertical is thicker and at the bottom has a small serif. Both these strokes are precisely like those of the (preserved) second *nu*. The Arkhon Kimon of this period, as distinct from an Arkhon Kimon of *init. s. III a.* (now dated 288/7 B.C.), is vouched for by *IG II² 1299* line 60 and also *IG II² 1297* line 2.²⁰ In the present line, the Arkhon's name should be read Κί]μω{ν}ος.

Number of Epheboi. In previous tabulations of numbers of Epheboi, Day gave this inscription "c. 31" and Pelekidis gave "31"; the same figure had been given by me.²¹ In all three instances, doubtless, it was based on Kirchner's version, in which there are 43 lines in all, including the 12 Phylai, so that by subtraction the Epheboi were 31. Everything depends on the size of the gap between fragments *bc* and *de*; for this purpose I have not examined the fragments in the Epigraphical Museum. In Kirchner's version, two lines are missing between line 62 and the newly read line 65, so that Hippothontis and Aiantis together had a total of 4 (if Aiantis was presented). This might be reduced by 1, leaving Hippo-

¹⁹ C. Pelekidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Ecole française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires 13 [Paris 1962]).

²⁰ Add to W. K. Pritchett / B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1940) xxiii.

²¹ John Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (New York 1942) 275; Pelekidis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.19) 165; S. Dow, *HSCP* 48 (1937) 109.

thontis with 1; or increased to 5 for Hippothontis (if Aiantis had none). Thus the whole number was *ca* 29–33; probably not fewer nor more.

REGISTER OF EPHEBOI. After line 15, as *IG II*² should have said, the arrangement is non-stoikhedon. The spacing varies considerably even within lines, and estimates of letters missing have to be based on what is preserved; an unusual margin of error has to be allowed for.

COL. I. LINE 41. An Ephebos who like [Dromeas] in line 42 was a member of one of the most prominent families would almost certainly be placed first in the list for his Phyle, like Leon Aixoneus in line 57.—Restore [*Αἰγείδο*] in line 41. Earlier, *IG II*² has [*Ἐρεχθηίδο*], and here, with no accent, *IG II*² has [*Αἰγηίδο*], despite the clear reading *Οἰνείδο* in line 54. Later, at least, *epsilon* was used consistently: see, conveniently, *IG II*² 1006, 1008, 1009, 1028.

LINES 42–49. Estimates of the number of letters missing at the beginnings of lines depend on the restoration of line 42.

LINE 42. As subscribers in 247/6 B.C., next after the leaders of the state, who were Eurykleides and Mikion Kephisieis, were listed Dromeas Erkhieus, in line 36, and after him Diokles Erkhieus, in line 37 (*IG II*² 791). They were brothers, and their position shows that they were the second family of Athens. According to what was probably a general practice, Dromeas, listed first, was the elder. The present line, which evidently contains a son of his, has long been restored, to give an alternation of names, [Diokles]. Pritchett published a fragmentary list of Epheboi in which line 8 was read [*Διοκλῆ*][*ε*][*Δρομέου Ἐρχι[εύε]*].²² The restoration fits the space exactly. This name and one other suggested a date *ca* 235 B.C. for the new list. The poor squeeze poorly reproduced (plate 38—all that was possible in 1947) gives an inadequate basis for readings and style of letters, but it seems clear that, as Pritchett says, except in one spot the list is inscribed stoikhedon—a most unusual feature; no other list of Epheboi, and no list of Prytaneis in *s. III a.*, is stoikhedon. These reservations, however, are merely cautionary. It is all but positive that the present Ephebos had a brother Diokles who was an Ephebos *post med. s. III a.*, and Pritchett (p.187 n.11) was right in suggesting that the present line should be restored [*Δρομέας Δρομέου*]. There is another, somewhat faint, possibility. In 216/5 B.C. the Arkhon was Hagnias Erkhieus, who was somehow related. The nomen of his father is unknown. If Hagnias were a son of a Dromeas, his name could be restored in the present line. He would be Arkhon, however, when only 39 or 40 years of age.

²² W. K. Pritchett, *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 185–87, no.92.

Revising Kirchner's stemma in *PA* 4023, Davies gave a stemma of the entire family, which is known in every generation from *ante med. s. IV a.* down to *fin. s. II a.*²³ Part of this stemma, excellent though it is as a whole, will need to be modified, but a proper treatment would be too lengthy here.

LINE 43. The first *omikron* is very uncertain.

LINES 45–46. The Deme Paiania was one of the largest, and the nomen Heliodoros was not uncommon. A Grammateus of Prytaneis in 220/19 B.C., Heliodoros Dionysiou Paianieus, has been taken to be the father of the two brothers in lines 45–46.²⁴ The patronymic is different, but this may very well be correct. Other possible relatives, later, may be some of the following.

Heliodoros Simonos Paianieus, an *ἐγγυητής* of 157/6 B.C.²⁵

Heliodoros Paian[ieus], honored in a decree for Prytaneis, 135/4 B.C., as *ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπόρρητον*.²⁶

Heliodoros Diodotou [Paianieus], Arkhon Basileus in 128/7 B.C.²⁷

His son, [D]iodotos Heliodorou Paianieus, Ephebos in 119/8 B.C.²⁸

(Various mint magistrates whose demotics are unknown.)

A new inscription²⁹ has brought to light a new Arkhon, Diodotos, as usual without patronymic or demotic. Reinmuth mentions various bearers of the name, none of them Paianieis, as possible relatives of the new Arkhon.³⁰ It would seem that a relative of the Epheboi brothers of 236/5, and/or of the above, would be a better conjecture.

LINE 50. [*Νικόδ*]ωρος might fit.

LINE 52. [*Σώστρ*]ατος might fit. In *PA* Kirchner suggested that a brother might be Philis[ti]des Sos[tr]atou Kephalethen, whose name occurs only on a grave monument, *IG* II² 6371. When Kirchner came to examine it for *IG* II², the lettering of the grave monument proved to be much too late: Kirchner dated it '*s. II a.*', and the shapes of the letters as he gives them could be later still.

LINES 53–62. Thus far the only nomen restored is one from the well-known family of Leon/Kikhesias Aixoneus, line 57. The restoration can be considered positive. The estimates of space in the other lines are based

²³ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 2–3, no.126.

²⁴ J. S. Traill, *Hesperia* 38 (1969) 426, no.2 lines 31–37, 49, 63; 427, 429.

²⁵ J. Sundwall, *Nachträge zur Prosopographia Attica* (Helsingfors 1910) *s.v.*

²⁶ B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 359–67, no.7 lines 56–57 with commentary; B. D. Meritt / J. S. Traill, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors* (*Athenian Agora* XV, Princeton 1974) no.243.

²⁷ Sundwall, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.25) *s.v.*

²⁸ *IG*² II 1008 i 113; *PA* 3905.

²⁹ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 296–303.

³⁰ O. W. Reinmuth, *Hesperia* 43 (1974) 252.

on line 57. The spacing for so short a name would be wide, but the letters preserved in the other nomina are also widely spaced. Patronymics and demotics are more crowded.

LINE 53. The deme was small, so that a connection with Euangelos Theophilou Hermeios, whose sculptured grave monument *IG II² 6077* attests prosperity *post med. s. IV a.*, is plausible. The grave monument of the wife of a descendant named Theophilos may be *IG II² 6078*, formerly dated *s. III a.*, but now *s. II a.* With serif'd letters, it must be *med. s. II a.* at the earliest.

LINE 55. Koehler and Kirchner printed [— — δ]ημος, but *delta* is merely the commonest possibility; of the others, *phi* is commonest.

LINE 57. Leon Aixoneus was a famous Athenian. Drawing up the only stemma of the family, Kirchner, *PA 8445*, based the dates of the five generations known to him on *ca 232* as being the *floruit* of the present Leon and of his brother the Thesmothetes of 214/3 B.C. This is in need of change. Others of the family are now known, but a new stemma would be out of place here.

LINE 58. A certain Σμικυθίων Φαλάνθου Ἀθμονεύς was one of six *μεράρχαι* honored by the Deme for their services in 324/3 B.C. (*IG II² 1203.12–13, 21–22*). Kirchner restored the name in the present line, perhaps rightly; but the preserved letters in line 58, ΙΩΝ, are widely spaced, and the restoration calls for 6 (full) letters in the space where line 57 had 5.

LINE 62. Read a new letter, *epsilon*, in the patronymic. Koehler and Kirchner read three letters of the demotic and restored it. Add two more. Taken separately, each letter is doubtful, but taken together, the demotic is positive.

LINE 65. In the second letter space, the bottom shows of a (new) vertical: the letter was *tau*, *upsilon*, *phi* or *psi*. Hence Aiantis probably had at least two Epheboi. Unless the rubric for Aiantis was never inscribed, the two Epheboi did not belong to Hippothontis.

LINE 66. The first letters of the patronymic should be legible, but the squeeze, good elsewhere, fails here.

LAST TWO ROWS OF CROWNS. The inscription in the crown for the Akontistes is preserved in lines 76–78. In line 78 the surface is blank after ἈΚΟΝΤΙΣ. A (new) line contained [THN]. This was the middle crown of the upper row, and the six crowns may well have been arranged like those of an Ephebic inscription found in 1931 in the Agora.³¹

³¹ B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 159 fig. 6, reprinted by Pelekidis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.19) 173 n.5; on the instructors, see Pelekidis 178–80.

229/8–208/7 B.C.; probably the early 220's. The Gene of the Eumolpidai and Kerykes often acted as one unit. Jointly they passed and inscribed a decree, *IG II*² 1235, which honors the Hierophantes of the previous year, *scil.* one of their own number. He was an Eleusinian. The decree was set up at Eleusis. Being, so to speak, their own business and mainly of local interest, the decree was not felt to need Athenian dating, so that no Arkhon is mentioned. It has to be dated by the lettering, which is distinctive, and by its Rhetor, Thrasyphon Hierokleidou Xypetaion. When he was putting in order the entire series of the various Eleusinian officials, it was natural for Clinton (p.23, no.10) to date the arkhon-less Eleusinian decree by reference to *IG II*² 683, which preserved the Arkhon and was proposed, as Kirchner states in the commentary, by the same Thrasyphon. So Clinton dated *IG II*² 1235, and the Hierophantes preserved therein, "around 248/7."

*IG II*² 1235 is inscribed by a mason, him of *IG II*² 1706, whose lettering is highly distinctive. Collecting no fewer than 49 inscriptions by this mason, S. V. Tracy did not get to see, or at least to cite, Clinton's work, and he gave *IG*² *II*² 1235 the date which he (Tracy) gave to all the undated works of the *IG II*² 1706 mason, *viz.* "ca 215."³² This precise year is of course arbitrary, a middle year given for brevity. The mason's first known inscription is of 229/8 B.C.—probably he began getting commissions in that year of new beginnings—and his last known inscription, *IG II*² 849 (article forthcoming), is of 207/6 B.C. Of course he may have continued on for some years.

*IG II*² 1235, EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

PHOTOGRAPH OF SQUEEZE: see *AJA* 40 (1936) 61, fig. 2.

LETTERING. The mason did not like to inscribe *xi*: the one in line 1 is lightly and poorly inscribed; in line 11 is another poor one; a third in line 20. In line 12 he did a little better. *Phi* is often inept, as in lines 7, 10, 17, 21, although there are passable *phis* in 1, 2, 6, 13. *Omega* in line 18 is unrecognizable as *omega* or any other letter. All of these flaws can be found in other inscriptions by this mason, who is Tracy's Mason of *IG II*² 1706.³³

³² Tracy, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 247–50.

³³ *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.32).

VACATS. At the ends of lines, in order to begin the next line with a word or syllable, he left blank spaces, notably, so as to begin the decree in line 2, he left blanks at the end of line 1. Internally there is no blank except—not noted earlier—before ἀγαθῆι, *i.e.* the clause of passage in line 11. There are also, as regularly with this mason, occasional wide inter-letters.

LETTERS PER LINE. Observation of the *vacats* at the ends of lines yields an interesting result. Counting them, and plotting the letters on squared paper with allowance of half a space for each *iota*, the regularity of the lettering is surprising. Line 20 is exceptional: in order to inscribe the end of the text on that line, rather than leave a few letters for a new line, the mason crowded the letters so that line 20 has 38 (full) letters. But the other lines vary only from 32 (one line only, line 3) to 35½ (one line only, line 12). All the remaining 17 lines vary only from 32½ to 35. There is a definite tendency to inscribe more letters per line: lines 1–8 are all 32–33 letters, lines 9–19 are all 33½–35½.

The wreath below is large (the maximum diameter is the horizontal, 0.206 m.), accurately centered between the sides, and very well cut. The branches intersect at the top (as always, until in Roman times they meet at the bottom), where they make a convincing knot, and flare out at the sides with decoratively enlarged ends. The leaves, presumably myrtle (line 14), are abundant. At the top, for the outside leaves and some on the inside, both edges are inscribed and the leaves stand out independently; in the bottom half, most of the leaves overlap each other.

PROSOPOGRAPHY. The Hierophantes honored by the decree is Khairétios Prophetou Eleusínios. He is no.10 in Clinton's list (p.23). To that notice a relative should be added. In his excellent publication of the decree, important both for the Mysteries and for the Aitolian League in 367/6 B.C., Schweigert did not fail to note that the Spondophoros Πρ[οφήτην] in lines 12–13, who as a Spondophoros was necessarily a Eumolpides or Keryx, could well be an ancestor of the present Khairétios Prophetou.³⁴ The other Spondophoros of 367/6 was a certain Ἐπιγένης (no patronymic or demotic given), and Schweigert suggested (p.11) that he was related to Epigenes Lysaniou Eleusínios, known from a grave monument IG II² 6031, apparently now lost. The reason for this suggestion was doubtless the demotic Eleusínios, but at present no Eleusínian Gennetes is known to have belonged to the Deme Eleusis—with one exception, the present Khairétios.³⁵

³⁴ E. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 5–12, esp. 10–11.

³⁵ Clinton p.8 n.4.

A more interesting connection can be suggested. A Priestess of Demeter, name unknown, set up a dedication in Athens, doubtless in the Eleusinion, near which it was found:³⁶

ἡ ἱέρεια Δήμητρ[ρος -----]
 Ἐπιγένος μήτηρ Ἀχαρν[έως ἀνέθηκεν]
 [-----]ος Ἀριστείδο ἐπ[οίησεν]

It was a substantial base, bearing a statue (of Demeter?) by a sculptor, unknown to us, who signed it. The lettering and orthography suggest a date *ante med. s. IV a.* Since the mother mentioned this one son, it is likely enough that he was well known. The reason why he was well known may have been that he was the Spondophoros with Prophetes when the Trikhonieis seized the two of them. The Priestess is no.3 in Clinton's list (p.70B). Note that the Priestess could come from the Genos of the Kerykes (Clinton p.76A; clarify 76B?), so that her son would be eligible to be a Spondophoros.

Fin. s. III a. HIEROKLEIDES, ALTAR PRIEST AND DAIDOUKHOS. Since each of these officials had to be a Keryx, it seems a conjecture worth keeping in mind that the Altar Priest Hierokleides of *ante fin. s. III a.* (Clinton p.82B no.2) and the Daidoukhos Hierokleides of *fin. s. III a.* (Clinton p.53B no.6) were the same man, and that he was a son of the present Thrasyphon. This was first suggested by Threpsiades,³⁷ and it is the basis—such as it is, the sole basis apart from *IG II² 1235*—for believing that Thrasyphon belonged to the Kerykes.

THE KERYX THRASYPHON. His was evidently a conservative, stable family, in which was transmitted, over the centuries, the (doubtless significant) name Hierokleides. (Various Hierophantai also bore this name.)

Unknown to us, Thrasyphon may have held one or more of the 'sacred' offices at Eleusis reserved for Kerykes. In his earlier years at least, he was free to propose decrees in the Ekklesia, and doubtless he was not legally prohibited at any time from holding 'political' office. Whether it would have been usual for him to do so is another question. We do not know that he did.

³⁶ B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 26 (1957) 79–80, no.25 and pl. 15; published without comment.

³⁷ I. Threpsiades, in K. Kourouniotes, *Ἐλευσινιακά* I (Athens 1932) 235.

The decrees by which the present Thrasyphon is known to us all praise dignitaries, in two instances Eleusinian dignitaries; the Kosmetes of the Epheboi (*IG II² 787*) is lost, but it would not be surprising if he too were an Eleusinian.

Of the two Gene which between them were responsible for the cult of Demeter and the associated deities, and especially for the ancient Mysteries, the Eumolpidai were clearly superior. It was they who provided the Hierophantes and the Exegetai. The Kerykes provided other officials; the Kerykes were not greatly inferior; once Aristotle could even name them first (*Ath.Pol.* 39.2). But the very name of the Kerykes implies functions which though vital and dignified were inferior. It is therefore notable that Thrasyphon speaks of the (one) Genos, and that in *IG II² 1235* he puts the Kerykes first: τῶι γένει τῶν τε Κηρύκων καὶ Εὐμολπίδων (lines 3/4). In line 12 it is δεδόχθαι Κήρυξι καὶ Εὐμολπίδαις. In the wreath (lines 25–26) again the Kerykes are first. Members of the senior Genos may have smiled; they let it stand. But in lines 9–10 it is ὅπως --- τὰ γένη φαίνεται τιμῶντες, and in lines 19–20 the action is to be by τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς ἀεὶ καθισταμένους ἐξ ἑκατέρου τοῦ γένους, and finally (22–24) the arrangements for the stele are to be made by the Arkhontes τῶν γενῶν. And after all, in this decree by Thrasyphon, it is a Eumolpides who is honored.

Nothing can be learned about Thrasyphon's mind from *IG II² 787*, because nearly all is lost. *IG II² 683* dwells on sacrifices (by the Epimeletai), then breaks off. Sacrifices, if mentioned at all, should of course come first, as here, but the statement is full and seems emphatic. It is therefore notable that the other decree, *IG II² 1235*, though honoring a Hierophantes, makes no mention whatever of piety toward the Gods but only of practical helpfulness toward fellow-Gennetai. The decree gives particulars interesting for the announcements abroad of the Mysteries: Clinton (p.23) is good on this.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

June, 1979