A significant question concerning Athens of the second half of the third century is whether the στρατηγία, or the office of the στρατηγός ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα, survived into this period and hence into the fourth century and beyond. The full testimonia for an unequivocal answer are lacking, but a conclusion can be drawn from what evidence there exists. Already Daniel J. Geagan has observed that the ephetic ἀρχαί are not listed in the last two known ephetic texts of 254/5 and 274/5, to wit, I.G. II² 2245 (which records only the ἄρχον ἐφήβων) and Hesperia XI (1942) 71-74, No. 37 (below)¹. However, for a clearer picture of the problem, the ephetic ἀρχαί are listed below chronologically, beginning with the year 212/3.

1. About 212/3: I.G. II² 2208. This particular text records two στρατηγοί (line 169), two κροκες (line 171), the βασιλεὺς (line 174), and the π[ολεμαρχός] (line 176) [the ἄρχοντας (line 180) and ἀστυνόμοι (line 182) are omitted from this survey]². For some reason no ἄρχον ἐφήβων is recorded, but James H. Oliver has identified Φλάρ(ί)ς Δραστάνων (line 8) as the missing ἄρχον ἐφήβων, because of his prominence there³. However, the identification is not assured, since in I.G. II² 3763 (Flavius) Dryantianos, honoring his κοσμητής Αυρ(ελίους) Dositheos ὁ καὶ Θales Pambotades, calls himself simply ὁ ἐφήβος. Thus, someone else must have been the ἄρχον ἐφήβων, and it appears that it was the kosmētes' son Aur(elius) Dositheos who is evidently honored in I.G. II² 3755: [......... Αὐρ. Δω/σίτου [Θάλητος / ἄρχοντα ἐφήβων, κτλ. (from an apogra-
phum from the squeeze at The Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, 18-VIII-70). The restored name was also noted on the margin of Benjamin D. Meritt's I.G. II* copy there, and O(scar) W. R(einmuth) had written: Verse?*. However, Aur. Dositheos is not identified as being also ἀχιλλός ἐφήβων in I.G. II* 2208, lines 77-78, 100-101 and 103*.

A unique feature of I.G. II* 2208 is that it records two strategoi and two kerykes (above), indicating that these two offices had been shared. The strategoi were brothers, but not the kerykes. The sharing of the ephetic strategia parallels in some way No. 40, lines 3-6, of Hesperia XLVII (1978) 325, of about 210-220. In this document the strategia had been assumed by οἱ περὶ τῶν πολίτων ἐξηγητήν, and John S. Traili has commented on its significance (ibid., p. 326, under Lines 3-8)*.

2. About 222 S[imone] Folket, Athènes [au II* et au III* siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques, Paris 1976], p. 526: 221/2-231/2): I.G. II* 2219 = 'Apx. ΄Εφεμ. 1973, pp. 91-92, No. 4, lines 1-5. This text lists the ἀρχιττέτον (line 31), the στρατηγεύον (line 33), the κυριοὶ (line 35), the βασιλεῖσ (line 37), and the θεομοθέται (line 39). The polemarchos, it appears, had been omitted. See No. 10 below.

3. 218/9 (S. Folket, Athènes, pp. 271-272 and 525: 216/7): I.G. II* 3764. The ἀχιλλός ἐφήβων is (Ἀθηναῖος Ἀπολλώνιος), honoring his homonymous father Aelius Apollonios, kōsmeter at the time. They are probably Antinoeis (cf. I.G. II* 3688) and date from the beginning of the third century. The archon ephèbōn has been identified with the ephetic Aelius Apollonios of I.G. II* 2222 = 'Apx. ΄Εφεμ. 1971, p. 57, No. 1, lines 3 and 7-8, but he is apparently a Palleneus, since he is not listed under the tribe Hadrianis in I.G. II* 2224 = 2222*, etc. (see also p. 236 in S. Folket, Athènes).

4. 219/20 (writer): I.G. II* 2223. This text preserves only the ἀρχιττέτον and the στρατηγεύον in line 16, inscribed horizontally.

5. 221/2 (writer): S. Folket, Athènes, p. 409, No. 8 (Pl. VII, No. 8). The ephetic archai are listed parallel to each other: [ἀχιλλός] (line 9), στρατηγεύον (line 66), [κυριοὶ] (line 108). This ephetic text dates from the archonship of Aur. Meletemenos, and it is a separate text from the one illustrated in S. Folket, Athènes, Pl. VIII, No. 8, as already indicated in A.A.A XVI (1983 = 1985), p. 56. See also Phίλια Ἐπεική εἰς Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάζ, III (Athens 1989), p. 269, note 6;

4. This text has been also restored by W. Peck, SEG 30 (1980 = 1983), No. 153.

5. 'Apx. ΄Εφεμ. 1968, 206 (si., Αἰγ. Δωσιθέους VI).


6. 221/2-230/1 (S. Follet): I.G. II² 2151 + 2141 + 2140 + 2139 + 2198 + 2039 + 2076 = S. Follet, Athènes, p. 417, No. 9. The [δρίχων (line 12), the [στρατηγώς?)] (line 47), and the [ξηράς (line 104) are listed parallel to each other, while the [βασιλεύς (line 14) is recorded under the archon (ἐφύσιον).

7. Third decade of the third century (S. Follet): I.G. II² 2289f, c + EM 13449 = Markellos Th. Mitsos, ΦΟΡΟΣ (Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt, Locust Valley, New York 1974) = S. Follet, Athènes, p. 428, No. 11. Only the πολέμῳ [ξυρακ] (line 54) and the θεῷ [θέσι] (line 56) have survived. Their listing is vertical.

8. 230/1: I.G. II² 2241. Line 6 mentions the [δρίχων ἐφύσιον].


10. Shortly before 235/6 (S. Follet): I.G. II² 2231 = 2251 + 2487 + 2231 + 2161 = S. Follet, Athènes, p. 440, No. 14. The ἄρχοι (line 17) are listed vertically: ἄρχοι (line 18), στρατηγώς (line 20), κρίμβος (line 22), βασιλεύς (line 24), and the θεῷ [θέσι] (line 26). Again the polemarchos has been omitted (under No. 2 above).

In AAA XVI (1983 = 1985), p. 52, note 12, it was proposed to date this ephoric text in the 270's, but the listing of the archai, in contrast to the lack of archai in Hesperia XI, No. 37 (above), does not favor apparently the retribution. Note: Two of the οἱ σωματικοὶ in S. Follet, No. 14, lines 12 and 16 (above), disappear, as the names indicate, in I.G. II² 2235 = Φιλία Ἐπτι III (under No. 12 below), lines 30 (Κλ. Ξενοφόρων) and 33 (Ἀρ. ΝεκρῆΡος). Xenophon and Neikrophoros should have become σωματικοί. C.f. I.G. II² 3768.

11. 232/3-233/4 (S. Follet, Athènes, p. 486): I.G. II² 2237 (Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ. 1968, p. 220, index). Listed vertically, only the [πολέμῳ] (line 1) and the [θεῷ] (line 3) have survived.

12. 234/5: I.G. II² 2235 = Φίλια Ἐπτι III (under No. 5 above), text after p. 264. Kasanos Philippus has been identified as the [ἐφύσιον] (line 9). The other archai are listed vertically: [στρατηγώς] (line 10), κρίμβος (line 12), βασιλεύς (line 14), πολέμῳ (line 16); and only one θεῷ in line 19. Kasanos Philippus, cf. John M. Camp, The Athenian Agora (London 1986), p. 196 (note 14 below).

13. 237/8-243/4: I.G. II² 2239 + Ἐφημ. 1950/1, p. 43, No. 21 = lines 133-142 = 136-145. In this text the στρατηγώς is listed first and then the ἰκραυν and the κρίμβος (line 10 = 11), in a parallel order. Below the strategoi and the archon are recorded the βασιλεύς (line 12 = 13) and the πολέμῳ (line 78 = 80) respectively and parallel to each other. The κερυκος Ὀλίγων Ἕδη ἔχει.
been recovered from a photograph; he is undoubtedly the brother of the archon Valerius Kecharismenos Hybaides (below). The interesting feature of this text is that it lists the strategos M. Aur. Dionysis Lampreus first, suggesting perhaps that the strategos (ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα) had surpassed in prominence the archon (ἐπώνυμος). However, the strategos M. Aur. Dionysis was the son of the κοσμητὴς M. Aur. Kallippos Lampreus of lines 2-3 (cf. S. Follet, Athênes, pp. 96 and 242). The ἄντωνος κοσμητὴς M. Aur. Theoxenos Lampreus of lines 3-4 is the kosmetes’ son or some other relation. The kosmetes and antikosmetes testify to the family’s preeminence, and this would explain why the strategos precedes the archon in this ephebic text. The strategos’ social preeminence is also shown by the fact that he headed the gymiasiarch (gymnasiarch for two months, lines 81-83 = 83-85), as well as the agonothetes (line 178 = 181), the sysremmatarchs (line 192 = 195), and the ephes of his tribe in line 31 = 32 (his brother in line 32 = 33). Later the strategos served as archon eponymos (S. Follet, Athênes, p. 542 = I.G. II² 1817 = Benjamin D. Meritt and John S. Traill, The Athenian Agora, vol. XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors [Princeton 1974], No. 466 = Epigraphica XLIII (1981), pp. 124-125, No. 10.

The archon Valerius Kecharismenos hailed from a prominent family, too, but apparently the strategos’ enjoyed a greater influence. At any rate, the archon and his brothers Valerius Herakleon and Kecharismenos πρ. (or is the latter a cousin?) head their tribe’s ephes, with the πρ.περιτερος) being first and the archon second in lines 121-123 = 124-126. The three also served as gymnasiarchs (lines 97 = 99, 99 = 101, 105 = 107), agonothetes (lines 186 = 189, 188 = 191, 190 = 193) and sysremmatarchs (lines 193-195 = 196-198).

Although the strategos’ relation to the kosmetes and the antikosmetes, coupled with his prominent position in the text, probably explains why he displaced the archon in the hierarchic order, nevertheless the archon’s second position may imply some irregularity in this period. A somewhat similar irregularity is also observed in I.G. II² 2243 which is dated by the agonothete of the Great Panhellenia, and the eponymous archon’s name follows in the genitive (absolute) in line 7 = 8. This ephebic text dates from 243/4-251/2 (under No. 14 below). In any event, the irregularity in I.G. II² 2239 may suggest that the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλα had gained in prominence over the archon eponymos. However, this is not borne out, for example, by Agora XV, No. 466 (above), which dates from this period. Moreover, this is also true of I.G. II² 2239 (under review herein), 2242 (240/1) and 2245 (254/5) which are dated by the archon eponymos. As the

*Ἐνυμ. 1968, 188, No. 14. He is the brother of Κλ. ο. Ὀσῆμος, the βασιλεὺς (line 13 = 14), and Κλ. ο. ᾿Αθήνας (lines 232-234 = 235-237). Another relation is Κλ. ο. ἀττικ[ε]ς in line 238 = 241.
evidence has survived, no other ephebic text shows the displacement of the ephebic archon, except where the archai are appended with the ephebes' gymnasiarchy. This is seen in I.G. II² 2059, lines 6-7, 13-14, 17, and 19-20, of shortly before 147/8; 2068, lines 186-188 (the keryx is the kosmetes' son), 189-193, and 196-198, of 155/6; and 2111/2, which lists only the strategos in lines 18-21 (he is apparently the kosmetes' son), of 155/6, as dated by others.

Lastly, I.G. II² 2239 displays a fancy abbreviation between lines 195-198 = 198-201, that is, extending from KEXAPIEMENOC ΥΒΑ (line 195 = 198) to CEMOC (line 198 = 201). The abbreviation can be read as Φων(ήσας, -οι) or Φων(ήσας, -οι) of the tribe Antiochis, but it is not clear why this fancy abbreviation there, for the ephebes therein are not of Antiochis. On the other hand, the abbreviation may be stretched to read B(ωνή) (τῶν) ΨΝ. However, the phi reading is clear, and the comments are made from a guide supplied by Madame Kon/na Peppa-Delmouzo.

14. From 243/4, 247/8 or 251/2, according to the Panhellenia: I.G. II² 2243. This text lists the στρατηγώς (line 10) and the κηρυκές (line 49) in a parallel fashion, and their gentilicium Mestrus indicates that they are related, undoubtedly brothers. I.G. II² 2243 is the last known ephebic text which lists the (ephebic) strategos, suggesting possibly that after this the στρατηγία may have declined. NOTE: The left (right) side of the στρατηγία (line 120: Ἀφ. [---]) is missing, but perhaps [βασιλεύς] / Αφ. [---] should be read there. Below these two lines, the text should read: νας (missing title) / Δωμ. Π[ρομηθεύς] / Εναγ[- 'Αρσενθέου?] (or 'Εγνάζ[τιος 'Αρσενθέου?]) / Μέστρος Σωκράτης vel Κυστίων. Enag[-], whose deme and tribe have been lost, is also mentioned in line 135: Εναγ[γ- 'Αρ?]στεδεσ(ιω) aut [Γ-'Αρ]στεδεσ(ιω). The lines about line 135 should be redistributed to include the names of the games, but it is not clear what ephebic festivals are involved. The observations are made from a photograph.

15. 254/5: I.G. II² 2245. As observed above, this text lists only the ἄρχων ἐφήβων in line 14, three lines below the heading. Although this is a complete text, its peculiarity is that it does not list the other ephebic archai. NOTE: In AAA XVI (1983 = 1985), p. 55 and note 28, the writer commented on the phyli in I.G. II² 2245, and it was noted that the last Skambonides under the tribe Hadrianis is to be found in I.G. II² 2128, line 62, of 184/5, as dated. This statement is not entirely

---

8. Extant ephebic texts listing the (ephebic) archon first: I.G. II² 2085 (161/2), 2119 (S. Follet: 191/2), 2130 (192/3; see Epigr. 52, 1990, 32, under 1), 2125 (ca. 195/6). 2203 (S. Follet: ca. 200/1), 2193 (S. Follet: 201/2), and 2201 (S. Follet: 206/7 or 210/1), before 212. The dates in the parentheses are given as a guide.

9. S. Follet, Athenes, 242, note 6, suggests: 119 bis [ἄρχων] / 120 Ἀφ. [Σωκράτης], 120 bis [ἐφήβων]. Note also her other comments therein.
correct, though the original argument concerning Aur. Eukarpides Aphr. Skamb. and Aur. Eukarpides Aphr. (tribe of Leonis) of I.G. II² 2245, lines 16 and 122, is not altered in any way. In Agora XV, No. 419, line 27, of 188/9, the deme Skambonidai appears under Hadrianis. One of the prytaneis is Smaragos (son of Smaragdos) (Skambonides) in line 28; and if the name is any indication, the deme Skambonidai still belonged to Hadrianis in 230/1, as indicated by Agora XV, No. 491, line 18: Σμάραγδος, if a Skambonides (the prytaneis are listed here by tribe alone).

16. 274/5 (writer): Hesperia X1 (1942), pp. 71-74, No. 37 = SEG XXXII (1983 = 1986), No. 158; AAA XVI (1983 = 1985), pp. 53-54. As noted above, this document which is the last known ephetic text to have survived does not record the ephetic archai. They cannot be restored in lines 12 (new)-24 (23), where a title (line 12) and five names (lines 13-17) are to be restored. This then produces a total of twelve names (5 lost + 7 preserved). The archai add up to eleven names (archon, strategos, keryx, basileus, polemarchos + 6 thesmothetai). On the other hand, the restoration [σωφρονιστής] / twelve names may have greater validity. This would imply that the σωφρονιστής and ὑποσωφρονιστής have been combined and are listed together under one rubric (cf. AAA, herein, p. 54). It should be also noted that the seven surviving names cannot be traced to the surviving ephebes’ names, and this may strengthen the σωφρονιστής = ὑποσωφρονιστής suggestion.

Although a significant gap exists in the ephetic texts of 250-275 (only two documents have been preserved from this period: I.G. II² 2245 and Hesperia X1, No. 37, above), it appears that some change may have taken place at this time, with an effect on the στρατηγία. This reasoning seems to have the support of the evidence concerning (Herennius) Dexippus I (Hermeios), and this is especially true of I.G. II² 3669 which lists his offices some time after 270, when the Boule numbered 750 (instead of 500). I.G. II² 3669 expressly shows that Dexippus I never served as hoplite general, which suggests that the στρατηγία may have been eliminated at his time. Naturally, one may choose to argue that Dexippus I simply did not serve as hoplite general or that he may have served after I.G. II² 3669 was set up. These would be valid arguments, but it’s probably unlikely that this is the case with Dexippus I. In I.G. II² 3671 he is called a κοσμητόρ, but this is probably not a military title.16

In the past, because of Historia Augusta which calls Dexippus I a dux, it was assumed that he was a hoplite general when he delivered a victory against the

16. The κοσμητόρ factor is commented by the writer in Αρχ. Εφημ. 1972, 155, under Η241. There is an unpublished fragment in the E.M., which may shed new light on Dexippus I.
Herulians\textsuperscript{11}. However, the word \textit{dux}, if it's not to be emended to \textit{indice/docente}\textsuperscript{12}, carries probably the general connotation of leader or military leader without implying that Dexippos I was hoplite general at the time\textsuperscript{13}. In any case, Dexippos I should not be identified as one of the hoplite generals, as the evidence stands.

And there is another good reason why this should be so. The surviving evidence which attests a hoplite general cannot be dated beyond the middle of the third century. A list of the hoplite generals may be consulted in S. Follet, \textit{Athènes}, p. 520, and in Theodore Sarakakis, \textit{The Hoplite General} (1951), p. 35. However, of the hoplite generals there only two require singling out for some comment. They are Kasianos Philippes Steiricus of \textit{Agora XV}, No. 466, lines 12-14, and P. Aelius Ergocharis Prosopatios of \textit{I.G. XII}(8), No. 27, who have been dated «second tiers du III\textsuperscript{e} siècle» (S. Follet) and «after the middle of the third century A.D.» (Th. Sarakakis) respectively (S. Follet's date for Aelius Ergocharis: «second quart du III\textsuperscript{e} siècle?»). Kasianos Philippes\textsuperscript{14}, because of \textit{Agora XV}, No. 466, falls just before the 250's, as does undoubtedly Aelius Ergocharis, and especially if the prytanis Aelios M(ε)trophanes of \textit{Agora XV}, No. 443, line 22 (tribe of Ptolemais), is his father; and if the prytanis' name is not to be emended to \textit{Αλιςος (᾿)εροφαίν(τ)γός} (from Hagnous)\textsuperscript{15}. This prytany catalogue dates from about 200(-210), and consequently Aelius Ergocharis cannot be later than the 250's, the hoplite general's chronological limit in this study\textsuperscript{16}. That the \textit{στρατηγικα} may not have survived beyond the 250's it is also indicated, it seems, by \textit{I.G. II\textsuperscript{2}} 3692, where Hegeias son of


\textsuperscript{12} G. Fowden, \textit{JHS} 108 (1988) 54, note 13 (note 41 below).

\textsuperscript{13} 'Apr. 'Eph. 1972, 135; AAA 16 (note 11 above).

\textsuperscript{14} The name Philippes appears to have come into the family of Steiria through a marriage alliance with the family of Claudius Dadouchos (Philippes) of Melite. This would call for chronological adjustments, if the name Philippes did not pre-exist in the family of Steiria. Cf. \textit{BCH} 92 (1968) 512-513, No. 105 (delete \textit{I.G. II\textsuperscript{2}} 1806, as also observed by S. Follet, \textit{Athènes}, 279, note 7); J. M. Camp, \textit{The Athenian Agora} (London 1986) 196; and Φίλια Ἐγινέα ες Γ. Ε. Μακρονέων, III (Athens 1989) 263, Line 38, and 266, Line 102.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. K. Clinton, \textit{The Sacred Officialis of the Eleusinian Mysteries}, \textit{TAPhS} n.s. 64(3) (Philadelphia 1974) 32, No. 23, and 34. Fig. 3 (relief depicting the hierophant); and S. Follet, \textit{Athènes}, 259 and 315. The hierophant's name in \textit{Agora XV}, No. 350, line 10(9), should read [Αδ. Εὐρυφάκης (᾿Αγγελόσκος), of 200-208 (see restoration in S. Follet herein, 259). Apparently there were two hierophants from Hagnous one being named Logismos, the prytanis of No. 350 (above), line 11(10): [Αδ. Λόγισμος (᾿Αγγελόσκος) (cf. Clinton and Follet herein, 42, No. 31, and 259 respectively). In \textit{Agora XV}, No. 377, line 9, the name should read [\textit{Ιεροχώρας} (᾿Αγγελόσκος) (169/70)]. It is interesting that an hierophant and hierokeryx served as prytaneis from Hagnous. 'Apr. 'Eph. 1968, 191, note 4 (Ael. Logismos).

\textsuperscript{16} A hoplite general's name may be restorable in \textit{Agora XV}, No. 383, attributed by the writer to 254/5 in \textit{Epigr.} 43 (1981) 125, under No. 10; note 22 below.
Timokrates is honored by ἡ πόλις. Hegeisias had served only as eponymous archon and panegyricarch some time after 250. This is the best chronological assignment for this particular archon. However, the above chronological limitation for the στρατηγὸς may be upset by an entry in Hesychios, which implies that a στρατηγὸς (ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπλαὶ;) was still elected at the lexicographer’s time, that is, probably fifth century (Πυὸς ὁ τόπος Ἄθηναν, ἐν ὧν ἦ γέγοντα στρατηγὸς πόλις, μὲν πάσι, νυνὶ δὲ ἄσπος, ὅταν στρατηγὸς χειροτονῶσαν).  

There is still another piece of evidence which has been associated with the hoplite general, and it is found in Julian who informs us that Constantine styled himself στρατηγὸς of Athens. The whole passage of Ora1. I, 8c is reproduced here: καλὸν ἦν ὅτι καὶ τὰν ξενᾶμον Ἀθηνῶν μην θύηναι, ἢ ἐκεῖνος ἐργοι καὶ λόγοι τιμών τὸν πάντα κράτον διετέλει: βασιλεὺς γὰρ ἄν καὶ κύριος πάντων, στρατηγὸς ἐκεῖων ἑξίοις καὶ κατείρθη, καὶ τεκτὼν εὐθὺς τιμῶν καὶ τευχῆς τοῖς τιμῶν μετ’ ἐπιγράφων ἐγάννι πλεόν ἡ τῶν μεγίστων τιμῶν ἀξίωθαι. As indicated above, Julian’s στρατηγὸς has been identified with the hoplite general, and especially since Constantine also gave grain to the Athenians, a function of the hoplite general, at least at the time of Philoctates (230–238). Ora1. I, 8d reads: ἀμειβόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς πόλεως, πυρῶν μεσίων καὶ ναὸς, καὶ τοῦ ἐκείνου ἔτος διουρών καὶ παραστάσεως, ἢν ὑπήρχε τῇ πόλει ἡ ἑκάθον ἐν νομίμοις εἶναι εκεῖνος δὲ ἐπαινοῦ ταῖς παρατηρήσεως. However, the distribution of grain by Constantine may not identify him at all as a hoplite general. For example, M. Ulpium Eubiotos Leucrius Gargiottius distributed grain in Athens sometime between 230 and 250, it seems, but he was not hoplite general. He had only served as archon eponymos. On the other hand, the absence of a hoplite generalship here appears to support the thesis of this study that this office may have been eliminated by the 250’s, but changes occurred as indicated by the phrase

---


18. If this is a reference to the lexicographer’s time, it may be that the στρατηγὸς had been revived after its eclipse, or possibly Hesychios’ στρατηγὸς may be the archon eponymos whose office is attested to the 5th century (see vol. of I.G. IP, Nos. 1370–2788, 796).

19. Of Athens rather than of the Athenians, the antecedent of ἐκείνων being Ἀθηνῶν. Th. Sarikakis (note 11 above) 35 and 47 (Con/nex). Julian, Ora1. I, 46a: ἡξίον (= Ἀλέξανδρος) γάρ ὕπος Ἀμινονος, ἀλλ’ ὡς Φιλιπποῦ νυξεῖναν (cf. also ibid. 14b and d. 31d, and 45a (on usage of ἡξίον), and Plut., Cicero, xxxiv. 5 and xxxiv. 1 (ἡξίον). Note 33 below.


συνάρτησις τῷ πατρὶ ἐν θεσμοθετίας in I.G. II² 3702, which suggests a grouping of the eight archons, below the eponymous archon²².

In any event, as Daniel J. Geagan has noted, no Roman emperor is known to have served as hoplite general²³, and it appears doubtful that Constantine assumed now the στρατηγία, especially if it was no longer in existence at his time (above). Conversely, if the στρατηγία existed at his time and Constantine assumed it, it would imply that it had passed in preeminence the eponymous archonship²⁴. James H. Oliver also has rejected the argument that Constantine had served as hoplite general and has gone one step further. He interpreted Julian’s στρατηγία to mean that Constantine had served instead as eponymous archon at Athens. In other words, Julian’s στρατηγία, according to Oliver, refers to the highest official of a city, in this instance the eponymous archon²⁵. And some Roman emperors before Constantine had served as eponymous archons at Athens. However, Oliver also pointed out that Julian would have known the difference between the office of the eponymous archon and that of the hoplite general²⁶, and presumably Constantine, too. In any case, to support his thesis, Oliver cited Cicero who calls Polycharmos praetor in one of his letters to Atticus²⁷. Oliver took praetor to mean the eponymous archon²⁸. However, Polycharmos was archon after 51 B.C.²⁹, and Cicero’s Polycharmos the praetor of 51 B.C. (date of letter), or of just before 51 B.C., must be the hoplite general³⁰. Moreover there is no room for Polycharmos as archon in the 50’s B.C.³¹, and Elizabeth Rawson has correctly rejected the identification of Polycharmos as archon³².

²². Hesp., Suppl. 12 (1967) 10 and 12. However, Agora XV. No. 383, which the writer ascribed to 254/5 (note 18 above) is fragmentary; see the writer’s comment in RFIC 112 (1984) 187.


²⁴. However, see under note 18 above.


²⁶. Hesp., Suppl. 12 (note 23 above). For example, Julian is aware of correct terminology, Ora. III 107d: τὴν ἐποίησιν τῷ ἔτος ἔχοντο (if Constantine had assumed such an eponymous office in Athens).

²⁷. Letters to Atticus V. No. 11: ὑπομνηματισμὸν tollerent, quem Polycharmum praetore fecerant.

²⁸. Note 25 above.


At any rate, if Constantine had assumed an Athenian office, Julian would probably have expanded on his στρατηγός, unless he was using language of the classical period or even of his own times. Moreover, if Constantine had served as archon eponumus, or even as hoplite general, at Athens, surely Julian would have used some such verb as ἐλευθέργησε, προύστη or ἀνέλαβε to convey his intended meaning. However, this he does not do, and his language resembles in a way Dio Cassius’ about Mark Antony and Athens in Bk. XLVIII, 39, 2 (39 B.C.): καὶ ἄλλα τε ἔν τούτῳ πολλά ἔξω τῶν στρατίων ἔξωθέν, καὶ Διόνυσον κατόν νέον αὐτῶς τε ἐκάλες καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὅμοίμησας ἡμῖν. Ἐστειδή τε οἱ Ἑθναίαρχοι πρὸς τε τούτο καὶ πρὸς τά ἁλλα τὴν Ἑθναίαν αὐτῶν κατηγόρησαν, δέχονται τε τῶν γάμων ἄρη καὶ πρὸς ἀὐτών οἱ μισάδες ἐκατόν παρ’ αὐτῶν ἑξέπραξαν. However, there is an irony in all this. Whereas Constantine rewarded the Athenians for the honor of στρατηγός, Mark Antony is presented as having exacted a prize from the Athenians for his «marriage» to Athena.

But be that as it may, since Julian does not qualify his στρατηγός by some distinct word or phrase, it is probably safe to conclude that Constantine, the στρατηγός, was neither eponymous archon nor hoplite general of Athens, particularly if the hoplite generalship had gone out of existence by his time, as suggested above. There is also Proboairesios’ honorary title of στρατοπεδάρχης which has been connected with the hoplite general, but the very difference in the titles (στρατηγός-στρατοπεδάρχης) argues, it seems, that the two are not identical and that the στρατηγία was not in existence in Athens at the time. Moreover, the title στρατοπεδάρχης was given to Proboairesios by the emperor Constantius, and it is, therefore, a purely Roman honorary office, even though the title στρατοπεδάρχης was bestowed on Proboairesios in conjunction with his request that Athens be given certain islands for purposes of tribute and grain supply.

If the above arguments are sound, then Julian’s στρατηγός requires reinterpretation. Julian tells us in the passage cited above that it was Constantine himself who demanded (ἥξιον) to be called (καλείθω) στρατηγός (of Athens), because he was especially fond of that city. This is shown by his beneficences to Athens (ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις) and by the distribution of grain (above). One consequence of Constantine’s desire to be styled στρατηγός (of Athens) was that the Athenians


immediately honored him to that effect with a statue and epigram which unfortunately have perished, apparently. In other words, the statue and epigram followed Constantine's request. In any case, Constantine found this very flattering. He may have been depicted as an Athenian general (Perikles, the στρατηγός?) rather than in the usual imperial fashion of his times. Moreover, was he honored with a reinscribed herm after altering an earlier στρατηγός into Constantine? This was practiced by the Athenians.

Now, with the above in mind, what sort of στρατηγός (of Athens) did Constantine style himself? And there appears to be a simple explanation to the question. By styling himself στρατηγός (of Athens), Constantine was drawing a distinction between βασιλεύς (αὐτοκράτωρ) and στρατηγός of old, the leader of a city. To the Greeks, the Roman emperor was either αὐτοκράτωρ or βασιλεύς, and sometimes κοίρανος poetically. The titles αὐτοκράτωρ and βασιλεύς may not have sat well with the Athenians and for that matter with Constantine's admiration for that city. Consequently, Constantine, aware of the possible onus imposed on the Athenians by the titles αὐτοκράτωρ and βασιλεύς and perhaps wishing also to assume a lesser imperial stature toward the Athenians, flattered them by styling himself στρατηγός (of Athens). Of course, to all his other subjects he was still the βασιλεύς or αὐτοκράτωρ. And there is a precedent to this, namely, Alexander as βασιλεύς of the Makedones and ἡγεμόνας αὐτοκράτωρ of the Hellenes.

Julian seems to have misunderstood Constantine's intention and assumption of the title στρατηγός, when the former perceived a degradation in that assumption, as indicated by the comment that Constantine assumed that title (στρατηγός), even though he was βασιλεύς и κύριος πάντων. In any event, consciously or unconsciously Julian, it seems, draws a distinction between βασιλεύς and στρατηγός. This distinction is found also in Orat. II, 79b: οὖτε οὖν Σάββα έκείνος (= Σωκράτης) ἐπήχειν ποτέ οὖν ἄλλων τινὰ Περσῶν ἢ Λυδίων ἢ Μακεδόνων βασιλέα, ἄλλ' οὖτε 'Ελλήνων στρατηγόν, κτλ. On the other hand, cf. Orat. II, 50c: οἵμαι (= 'Τουλίανος) κρείττονα τοῦ τῶν 'Ελλήνων βασιλέως (= 'Αγαμέμνονος) εἶναι ἐθέλοντα (= τῶν Κωνστάντιον).

35. It does not seem such an epigram to have survived in the Anth. Graece. However, a question emerges as to how much epigraphical material is extant between 256 and 330. The inscriptions of this period have not been studied in a monograph (A. F. Ruždolzec. Hs. 33). 36. Cf. Paus. Aithka (Lviii.3): τὰς γὰρ Μυληνία καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους εἰκόνας ἐς 'Ρωμαίων τε ἅγία καὶ Θράκα μετάγραψα. Plut., Antony LX.3.
37. I.G. II 357, lines 10 (κοίρανον) and 12 (Ἄθρος), of 124/5.
38. For the coupling of στρατηγός-βασιλεύς, or variations of it, see Isocr., To Philip, 140; Diod. XVII.4.5 and 71.8; Plut., Mor. 401A and 417D; Arrian II.14.4 (ἡγεμόνας-βασιλεύς); and Lucian, The Ship or The Wishes, 22 (Lykinos). Note 39 below.
However, the 'Ελλήνων βασιλεύς in the second passage above refers to the Homeric times, and accordingly it does not color the study's thesis. Thus, very probably Constantine was also making the same distinction between βασιλεύς and στρατηγός, when he styled himself στρατηγός (of Athens). The assumption of such a title echoed Athens' glorious past and placed the Athenians in a special relationship vis-à-vis the emperor himself and the rest of the empire. In this way, the eternal city of learning enhanced her reputation and prosperity. And perhaps it was Nikagoras the δίκαιος who put all this into motion, or possibly Praxagoras who wrote a history of Constantine in two books.
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and 73a. Cf. also Pseudo-Kallisthenes (note 34 above), B.3.10 and 7.6; although an objection may be raised to this reference, the Bioς 'Αλεξάνδρου contains authentic terminology, with Alexander in some respect echoing Alexander I. Notes 38 and 40 above and below.

40. Again, for the coupling στρατηγός-βασιλεύς, see also Herod. VII.238 and IX.26 and 44; and Plut., Alexander IX.3, and Pyrrhus XIII.2, Note 39 above.


42. The author's name suggests that he may have hailed from the family of Adelius (Claudius) Praxagoras of Melite (BCH 92, 1968, 511-512, No. 96). Praxagoras' history has been summarized by Photos (FGH, No. 219). See T. D. Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, Cambridge, MA 1981, 72, and T. G. Elliott, TAPA 120 (1990) 351-352. For another connection of Constantine and Athens, see Zosimos, New History, i, Budé, Paris 1971, II.xvii.2 and 3, and xviii.2 (Piraeus-ships).