

THE STRATEGIA IN ATHENS AFTER A.D. 250*

Μαρκέλλω Θ. Μιτσῶ μνήμης χάριν

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 ὄπλα, 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 ephebic ἀρχαὶ are not listed in the last two known ephebic texts of 254/5 and 274/5, to wit, *I.G.* II² 2245 (which records only the ἄρχων ἐφήβων) and *Hesperia* XI (1942) 71-74, No. 37 (below)¹. However, for a clearer picture of the problem, the ephebic ἀρχαὶ are listed below chronologically, beginning with the year 212/3.

1. About 212/3: *I.G.* II² 2208. This particular text records two στρατηγοὶ (line 169), two κήρυκες (line 171), the βασιλεὺς (line 174), and the π[ολέμαρχος] (line 176) [the ἀγορανόμοι (line 180) and ἀστυνόμοι (line 182) are omitted from this survey]². For some reason no ἄρχων ἐφήβων is recorded, but James H. Oliver has identified Φλά(βιος) Δρυαντιανός (line 8) as the missing ἄρχων ἐφήβων, because of his prominence there³. However, the identification is not assured, since in *I.G.* II² 3763 (Flavius) Dryantianos, honoring his κοσμητῆς Aur(elius) Dositheos ὁ καὶ Thales Pambotades, calls himself simply ὁ ἔφηβος. Thus, someone else then must have been the ἄρχων ἐφήβων, and it appears that it was the *kosmetes'* son Aur(elius) Dositheos who is evidently honored in *I.G.* II² 3755: [..... Αὐρ. Δω/σ]ίθειον [Θαλῆτος / ἄ]ρχοντα ἐφήβων, κτλ. (from an *apogra-*

* All dates are A.D., except where stated differently. ABBREVIATIONS: *Agora* XV, No. ... = B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, under No. 13 below, and S. Follet, *Athènes*, under No. 2 below [main text].

1. *Hesp.*, Suppl. 12 (1967) 1. The *Hesp.* 11 ephebic text is reproduced in *SEG* 33 (1983 = 1986), No. 158, and the writer has discussed its date in *AAA* 16 (1983 = 1985) 52-54.

2. Ephebic *astynomoi* and *agoranomoi* are also found in *I.G.* II² 2266 = S. Follet, *Athènes*, 409, No. 8, line 110: ἀγορανόμοι (writer: 221/2 in *Epigr.* 52 [1990] 21-22), and 2243 [main text, under No. 14 below], lines 66: [ἀστυ]νόμοι, and 69: [ἀγορα]νόμοι (243/4, 247/8, or 251/2).

3. *Hist.* 26 (1977) 89-90. Fl. Dryantinos is attested as ἄρχων [τῶν Εὐμολιπιδῶν] in *I.G.* II² 1078, line 3 (about 220).

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.* II² copy there, and O(scar) W. R(einmuth) had written: Verse?⁴. However, Aur. Dositheos is not identified as being also ἄρχων ἐφήβων in *I.G.* II² 2208, lines 77-78, 100-101 and 103⁵.

A unique feature of *I.G.* II² 2208 is that it records two *strategoï* and two *kerykes* (above), indicating that these two offices had been shared. The *strategoï* were brothers, but not the *kerykes*. The sharing of the ephebic *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 τὸν πυθόχρηστον ἐξηγητήν, and John S. Traill has commented on its significance (*ibid.*, p. 326, under Lines 3-6)⁶.

2. About 222 (S[imone] Follet, *Athènes* [au II^e et au III^e siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques, Paris 1976], p. 526: 221/2-231/2):

I.G. II² 2219 = 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1973, pp. 91-92, No. 4, lines 1-5. This text lists the [ἄρ]χ[ων] (line 31), the [στ]ρατηγ[ός] (line 33), the [κῆ]ρυξ (line 35), the [βασ]ιλεύς (line 37), and the [θεσ]μοθέται (line 39). The *polemarchos*, it appears, had been omitted. See No. 10 below.

3. 218/9 (S. Follet, *Athènes*, pp. 271-272 and 525: 216/7): *I.G.* II² 3764. The ἄρχων ἐφήβων is (Ἄλιος Ἀπολλώνιος), honoring his homonymous father Aelius Apollonios, *kosmetes* at the time. They are probably Antinoeis (*cf.* *I.G.* II² 3688) and date from the beginning of the third century. The *archon ephebon* has been identified with the ephebe Aelius Apollonios of *I.G.* II² 2222 = 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 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.* II² 2221 = 2222+, etc. (see also p. 236 in S. Follet, *Athènes*).

4. 219/20 (writer): *I.G.* II² 2223. This text preserves only the ἄρχων and the στρα[τηγός] in line 16, inscribed horizontally.

5. 221/2 (writer): S. Follet, *Athènes*, p. 409, No. 8 (Pl. VII, No. 8). The ephebic *archai* are listed parallel to each other: [ἄρχων] (line 9), στρατη[γός] (line 66), [κῆ]ρυξ (line 108). This ephebic text dates from the archonship of Aur. Melpomenos, and it is a separate text from the one illustrated in S. Follet, *Athènes*, Pl. VIII, No. 8, as already indicated in *AAA* XVI (1983 = 1985), p. 56. See also Φίλια Ἔπη εἰς Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνᾶν, III (Athens 1989), p. 269, note 6;

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

5. 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1968, 208 (stemma): Αὐρ. Δωσίθεος (VI).

6. The archon in this text is Αἰρ. [-/---]ος Στεφ(ι)εύς (*nomen* read by writer), who must be related to Aerarius Sosipatros of *I.G.* II² 3715 (*s. III/IV p.*). *Cf.* also *Hesp.*, Suppl. 8 (1949) 216: ἄ(ρ)χοντα Α<I>ρ. / ['Α]δριανόν (?) = ΑΦΧΟΝΤΑ ΑΡ / ΑΡΙΑΝΟΝ; B. D. Meritt therein: ἄρχοντα ΑΡ / [-- 'Α]δριανόν.

Epigraphica LII (1990) 21-22.

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 [ἄρ]χων (line 12), the [στρατηγός?] (line 47), and the [κῆ]ρυξ (line 104) are listed parallel to each other, while the [β]ασιλεύς (line 14) is recorded under the *archon* (ἐφήβων).

7. Third decade of the third century (S. Follet): *I.G.* II² 2229e, f, 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 πολέμ[αρχος] (line 54) and the θεσμο[θέται] (line 56) have survived. Their listing is vertical.

8. 230/1: *I.G.* II² 2241. Line 6 mentions the [ἄρχων ἐφήβ]ων.

9. 231/2-241/2 (writer): 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1974, χρονικά, p. 3, line 4: [ὁ ἄρχων τ]ῶν ἐφήβων[ν].

10. Shortly before 235/6 (S. Follet): *I.G.* II² 2231 = 2251 + 2487 + 2231 + 2161 = S. Follet, *Athènes*, p. 440, No. 14. The ἀρχαί (line 17) are listed vertically: ἄρχων (line 18), στρατηγός (line 20), κῆρυξ (line 22), βασιλεύς (line 24), and the θεσμοθέται (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 ephobic 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 reattribution. NOTE: Two of the ὑποσωφρονισταί in S. Follet, No. 14, lines 12 and 16 (above), reappear, as the names indicate, in *I.G.* II² 2235 = Φίλια "Επη III (under No. 12 below), lines 30 (Κλ. Ξενοφῶν) and 33 (Αὐρ. Νεικηφόρος). Xenophon and Neikephoros should have become σωφρονισταί. Cf. *I.G.* II² 3768.

11. 232/3-233/4 (S. Follet, *Athènes*, p. 486): *I.G.* II² 2237 ('Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1968, p. 220, index). Listed vertically, only the [πολέμαρχ]ος (line 1) and the [θε]σμοθέται (line 3) have survived.

12. 234/5: *I.G.* II² 2235 = Φίλια "Επη III (under No. 5 above), text after p. 264. Kasianos Philippos has been identified as the [ἄρχων ἐφήβων] (line 9). The other *archai* are listed vertically: [στρατηγός] (line 10), κῆ[ρυξ] (line 12), βασιλε[ύς] (line 14), πολέμαρχ[ος] (line 16); and only one θεσμοθέτης in line 19. For Kasianos Philippos, cf. John M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London 1986), p. 196 (note 14 below).

13. 237/8-243/4: *I.G.* II² 2239 + 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1950/1, p. 43, No. 21 = lines 133-142 = 136-145. In this text the στρατηγός is listed first and then the ἄρχων and the κῆρυξ (line 10 = 11), in a parallel order. Below the *strategos* and the *archon* are recorded the βασιλεύς (line 12 = 13) and the πολέμαρχος (line 78 = 80) respectively and parallel to each other⁷. The *keryx* Οὐα. 'Ηρακλέων 'Υβᾶ. has

7. The *polemarchos'* name is Κλώδ. Ζήνων rather than Κλαύδ. Ζήνων, as given in 'Αρχ.

been recovered from a photograph; he is undoubtedly the brother of the *archon* Valerius Kecharismenos Hyba(des) (below). The interesting feature of this text is that it lists the *strategos* M. Aur. Dionysios Lamptreus first, suggesting perhaps that the *strategos* (ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα) had surpassed in prominence the *archon* (ἐπώνυμος). However, the *strategos* M. Aur. Dionysios was the son of the κοσμητής M. Aur. Kallippos Lamptreus of lines 2-3 (cf. S. Follet, *Athènes*, pp. 96 and 242). The ἀντικοσμητής M. Aur. Theoxenos Lamptreus 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 gymnasiarchs (gymnasiarch for two months, lines 81-83 = 83-85), as well as the agonothetes (line 178 = 181), the systemmatarchs (line 192 = 195), and the ephebes of his tribe in line 31 = 32 (his brother in line 32 = 33). Later the *strategos* served as archon eponymos (S. Follet, *Athènes*, p. 512 = *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 Valerii Herakleon and Kecharismenos πρ. (or is the latter a cousin?) head their tribe's ephebes, with the πρ(εσβύτερος) 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 systemmatarchs (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 στρατηγός ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα 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

¹*Εφημ.* 1968, 188, No. 14. He is the brother of Κλώδ. Ὀνήσιμος, the βασιλεύς (line 13 = 14), and Κλώ. Ἀθήναιος (lines 232-234 = 235-237). Another relation is Κλώ. Ἀττικ[ός] in line 238 = 241.

evidence has survived, no other ephebic text shows the displacement of the ephebic archon⁸, 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 185/6, as dated by others.

Lastly, *I.G.* II² 2239 displays a fancy abbreviation between lines 195-198 = 198-201, that is, extending from ΚΕΧΑΡΙΜΕΝΟΣ ΥΒΑ (line 195 = 198) to ΚΕΜΝΟΣ (line 198 = 201). The abbreviation can be read as Φυρν(ήσιος, -οι) or Φορν(ήσιος, -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 Β(ουλή) (των) ΨΝ. However, the phi reading is clear, and the comments are made from a squeeze supplied by Madame Kon/na Peppa-Delmouzou.

14. From 243/4, 247/8 or 251/2, according to the Panhellenia: *I.G.* II² 2243. This text lists the στρατηγός (line 10) and the κήρυξ (line 49) in a parallel fashion, and their *gentilicium* Mestrius 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 στήλη (line 120: Αύρ. [---]) is missing, but perhaps [βασιλεύς] / Αύρ. [---] should be read there⁹. Below these two lines, the text should read: *vac.* (missing title) / Δομ. Π[ρομηθεύς] / Εναγ[- 'Αριστείδου?] (or ('Εγνά)[τιος 'Αριστείδης?]) / Μέστ[ριος Σωκράτης *vel* Κυέστωρ]. Enag[-], whose deme and tribe have been lost, is also mentioned in line 135: Ενα[γ-'Αρ?]ιστείδ(ου) *aut* ['Αρ]ιστείδ(ης). 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 *phylai* 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 I), 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, *Athènes*, 242, note 6, suggests: 119 *bis* [ἄρχων] / 120 Αύρ. [Σωκράτης], 120 *bis* [θεσμοθέται]. Note also her other comments therein.

correct, though the original argument concerning Aur. Eukarpides Aphr. Skamb. and Aur. Eukarpides Aphr. (tribe of Leontis) 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 Smaragdōs (son of Smaragdōs) (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: Σμάρραγδος), if a Skambonides (the prytaneis are listed here by tribe alone).

16. 274/5 (writer): *Hesperia* XI (1942), pp. 71-74, No. 37 = *SEG* XXXIII (1983 = 1986), No. 158; *AAA* XVI (1983 = 1985), pp. 53-54. As noted above, this document which is the last known ephebic text to have survived does not record the ephebic *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 [σωφρονισταί] / twelve names may have greater validity. This would imply that the σωφρονισταί and ὑποσωφρονισταί 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 σωφρονισταί = ὑποσωφρονισταί suggestion.

Although a significant gap exists in the ephebic texts of 250-275 (only two documents have been preserved from this period: *I.G.* II² 2245 and *Hesperia* XI, 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) Dexippos 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 Dexippos 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 Dexippos 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 Dexippos I. In *I.G.* II² 3671 he is called a κοσμήτωρ, but this is probably not a military title¹⁰.

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

10. The κοσμήτωρ factor is commented by the writer in 'Αρχ. Έφημ. 1972, 155, under H21. There is an unpublished fragment in the E.M., which may shed new light on Dexippos I.

Herulians¹¹. However, the word *dux*, if it's not to be emended to *indice/docente*¹², carries probably the general connotation of leader or military leader without implying that Dexippos I was hoplite general at the time¹³. 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, *Athènes*, p. 520, and in Theodore Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General* (1951), p. 35. However, of the hoplite generals there only two require singling out for some comment. They are Kasianos Philippos Steiricus of *Agora* XV, No. 466, lines 12-14, and P. Aelius Ergochares Prospaltios of *I.G.* XII(8), No. 27, who have been dated «second tiers du III^e siècle» (S. Follet) and «after the middle of the third century A.D.» (Th. Sarikakis) respectively (S. Follet's date for Aelius Ergochares: «second quart du III^e siècle?»). Kasianos Philippos¹⁴, because of *Agora* XV, No. 466, falls just before the 250's, as does undoubtedly Aelius Ergochares, and especially if the prytanis Ailius M(e)trophanes of *Agora* XV, No. 443, line 22 (tribe of Ptolemais), is his father; and if the prytanis' name is not to be emended to Αἴλιος ('I)ε{τ}ροφάν(τ)ης (from Hagnous)¹⁵. This prytany catalogue dates from about 200(-210), and consequently Aelius Ergochares cannot be later than the 250's, the hoplite general's chronological limit in this study¹⁶. That the στρατηγία may not have survived beyond the 250's it is also indicated, it seems, by *I.G.* II² 3692, where Hegeias son of

11. Th. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General* (Athens 1951 = Chicago 1976) 35 and 49-50, and S. Follet, *Athènes*, 520; see also *BE* 1988, No. 590. *AAA* 16 (note 1 above) 51, note 4.

12. G. Fowden, *JHS* 108 (1988) 51, note 13 (note 41 below).

13. *Arch. Ephém.* 1972, 135; *AAA* 16 (note 11 above).

14. The name Philippos appears to have come into the family of Steiria through a marriage alliance with the family of Claudius Dadouchos (Philippos) of Melite. This would call for chronological adjustments, if the name Philippos did not pre-exist in the family of Steiria. Cf. *BCH* 92 (1968) 512-513, No. 105 (delete *I.G.* II² 1806, as also observed by S. Follet, *Athènes*, 279, note 7); J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London 1986) 196; and Φίλια "Επη εἰς Γ. Ε. Μυλωνᾶν, III (Athens 1989) 263, Line 38, and 266, Line 102.

15. Cf. K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, *TAPhS* n.s. 64(3) [Philadelphia 1974] 32, No. 23, and 34, Fig. 3 (relief depicting the hierophant); and S. Follet, *Athènes*, 259 and 315. The hierophant's name in *Agora* XV, No. 350, line 10(9), should read [Αἰ. Ἱεροφάντης ([*Αγν]ούσιος), 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): [Αἰ. Λόγισ]μος ([*Αγν]ούσιος) (cf. Clinton and Follet herein, 42, No. 31, and 259 respectively). In *Agora* XV, No. 377, line 9, the name should read [Πειν. Ἱεροκῆρ]υξ ([*Αγν]ούσιος) (169/70). It is interesting that an hierophant and hierokeryx served as prytaneis from Hagnous. *Arch. Ephém.* 1968, 191, note 4 (Ael. Logismos).

16. A hoplite general's name may be restorable in *Agora* XV, No. 383, attributed by the writer to 254/5 in *Epigr.* 43 (1981) 125, under No. 10; note 22 below.

Timokrates is honored by ἡ πόλις. Hegeias had served only as eponymous archon and panegyriarch some time after 250. This is the best chronological assignation for this particular archon¹⁷. However, the above chronological limitation for the στρατηγία may be upset by an entry in Hesychios, which implies that a στρατηγός (ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα?) was still elected at the lexicographer's time, that is, probably fifth century (Πινύξ· τόπος Ἀθήνησιν, ἐν ᾧ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ἤγοντο πάλαι μὲν πᾶσαι, νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ, ὅταν στρατηγὸν χειροτονῶσιν)¹⁸.

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 στρατηγός of Athens¹⁹. The whole passage of *Orat.* I, 8c is reproduced here: καλὸν ἴσως ἐνταῦθα καὶ τῶν ἀοιδίμων Ἀθηνῶν μνησθῆναι, ἃς ἐκεῖνος ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις τιμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον διετέλει· βασιλεὺς γὰρ ὢν καὶ κύριος πάντων, στρατηγός ἐκείνων ἠξίου καλεῖσθαι, καὶ τοιαύτης εἰκόνας τυγχάνων μετ' ἐπιγράμματος ἐγάνυτο πλεον ἢ τῶν μεγίστων τιμῶν ἀξιωθεῖς. As indicated above, Julian's στρατηγός 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 Philostratos (230-238)²⁰; *Orat.* I, 8d reads: ἀμειβόμενος δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῇ τὴν πόλιν, πυρῶν μεδίμνους δίδωσι πολλάκις μυρίουσ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος δωρεὰν καρποῦσθαι, ἐξ ὧν ὑπῆρχε τῇ πόλει μὲν ἐν ἀφθόνοις εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ δὲ ἔπαινοι καὶ τιμαὶ παρὰ τῶν βελτίστων. However, the distribution of grain by Constantine may not identify him at all as a hoplite general. For example, M. Ulpianus Eubiotos Leuros Gargettios distributed grain in Athens sometime between 230 and 250, it seems, but he was not hoplite general. He had only served as archon eponymos²¹. 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

17. A. Frantz, *The Athenian Agora*, vol. 24 (Princeton 1988), Pl. 47d = *I.G.* II² 3692. S. Follet, *Athènes*, 9, note 2, and 87.

18. If this is a reference to the lexicographer's time, it may be that the στρατηγία had been revived after its eclipse, or possibly Hesychios' στρατηγός may be the archon eponymos whose office is attested to the 5th century (see vol. of *I.G.* II², 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/ne). Julian, *Orat.* I, 46a: ἠξίου (= Ἀλέξανδρος) γὰρ υἱὸς Ἀμμωνος, ἀλλ' οὐ Φιλίππου νομίζεσθαι; cf. also *ibid.*, 14b and d, 31d, and 45a (on usage of ἀξιόω), and Plut., *Cicero*, xxxii. 5 and xxxix. 1 (ἠξίου). Note 33 below.

20. *Vit. Soph.*, 526: ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ αὐτῆ (= στρατηγία) ... νυνὶ δὲ τροφῶν ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ σίτου ἀγορᾶς. Th. Sarikakis (note 11 above) 21; A. Frantz (note 17 above) 16, note 4; T. D. Barnes (note 42 below) 72; and D. J. Geagan, *Proceedings of the VIIIth Inter. Epigr. Congress*, I (Athens 1984) 71.

21. *I.G.* II² 3697, 3698; J. H. Oliver, *The Civic Tradition and Roman Athens*, Baltimore 1983, 138-140.

συνάρξας τῶ πατρὶ ἐν θεσμοθέταις 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 *στρατηγός* to mean that Constantine had served instead as eponymous archon at Athens. In other words, Julian's *στρατηγός*, 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 16 above) is fragmentary; see the writer's comment in *RFIC* 112 (1984) 187.

23. *Hesp.*, Suppl. 12 (1967) 30, note 86. Domitian, Commodus and Gallienus held the archonship in Athens, and perhaps Hadrian, a second time, as emperor (*AAA* 16 [note 1 above] 53, note 15).

24. However, see under note 18 above.

25. Note 21 above, 106 and 109, note 27. *ZPE* 70 (1987) 235, note 1.

26. *Hesp.*, Suppl. 12 (note 23 above). For example, Julian is aware of correct terminology, *Orat.* III 107d: τὴν ἐπάνωμον τοῦ ἔτους ἀρχὴν (if Constantine had assumed such an eponymous office in Athens).

27. *Letters to Atticus* V, No. 11: ὑπομνηματισμόν tollerent, quem Polycharmo praetore fecerant.

28. Note 25 above.

29. Cf. *I.G.* II² 1041, line 9: [ἐ]ν τῶι ἐπὶ Πολυχάρμου ἀρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶι, of 45/4 B.C., in *Ἑλληνικά* 33 (1981) 218.

30. Th. Sarikakis, *Ἀθηνᾶ* 57 (1953) [reprinted by Ares Publishers, Chicago 1976] 151.

31. B. D. Meritt, *Hist.* 26 (1977) 190-191.

32. *Athenaeum* 63 (1985) 52-53. Cf. Livy, XXXI.xxiv.6: praetor Atheniensium (200 B.C.), and XXXIV.xxiv.1: praetorem Achaeorum (195 B.C.).

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 eponymos, or even as hoplite general, at Athens, surely Julian would have used some such verb as ἐλειτούργησε, προὔστη 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 ἐν τούτῳ πολλὰ ἔξω τῶν πατριῶν ἐξεδιητήθη, καὶ Διόνυσον ἑαυτὸν νέον αὐτός τε ἐκάλει καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὀνομάζεσθαι ἡξίου. Ἐπειδὴ τε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τε τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα τὴν Ἀθηναίων αὐτῷ καταγγύησαν, δέχεσθαι τε τὸν γάμον ἔφη καὶ προῖκα μυριάδας ἑκατὸν παρ' αὐτῶν ἐξέπραξεν³³. 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 Proharesios' 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 Proharesios by the emperor Constans, and it is, therefore, a purely Roman honorary office, even though the title στρατοπεδάρχης was bestowed on Proharesios in conjunction with his request that Athens be given certain islands for purposes of tribute and grain supply³⁴.

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 (ἡξίου) to be called (καλεῖσθαι) 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

33. For ἡξίου, cf. further Julian, *Orat.* III.114b (ἡξίου κοινωνὸν γίγνεσθαι) and 118b; and Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* XLIX. 4: ... ἀπάντων ἡξίου ἄρχειν (= Φίλιππος). For Dio Cassius, cf. *Hesp.* 58 (1989) 273-274. Note 19 above.

34. Eunapius, *Vit. Soph.*, 492; J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (New York 1973) 263 (a misnomer in note 4). A. Frantz (note 17 above) 16, note 6. For στρατοπεδάρχης, cf. Chr. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley 1985, 15, note 68, and Pseudo-Kallisthenes, Βίος Ἀλεξάνδρου (W. Kroll ed., 1958) 38, lines 8-9 [note 39 below].

immediately honored him to that effect with a statue and epigram which unfortunately have perished, apparently³⁵. 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 Cosntantine? This was practiced by the Athenians³⁶.

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 poetically³⁷. 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 ἡγεμῶν αὐτοκράτωρ of the Hellenes³⁸.

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 and 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: οὔτε οὖν Ξέρξην ἐκεῖνος (= Σωκράτης) ἐπήνει ποτὲ οὔτε ἄλλον τινὰ Περσῶν ἢ Λυδῶν ἢ Μακεδόνων βασιλέα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἑλλήνων στρατηγόν, κτλ. On the other hand, cf. *Orat.* II, 50c: οἶμαι (= Ἰουλιανός) κρεῖττονα τοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων βασιλέως (= Ἀγαμέμνονος) εἶναι ἐθέλοντα (= τὸν Κωνστάντιον)³⁹.

35. It does not seem such an epigram to have survived in the *Anth. Graeca*. However, a question emerges as to how much epigraphical material is extant between 250 and 330. The inscriptions of this period have not been studied in a monograph (A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesp.* 33 (1964) 63, note 4).

36. Cf. Paus., *Attika* (I.xviii.3): τὰς γὰρ Μιλιτιάδου καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους εἰκόνας ἐς Ῥωμαῖόν τε ἄνδρα καὶ Θρᾶκα μετέγραψαν. Plut., *Antony* LX.3.

37. *I.G.* II² 3575, lines 10 (κοίρανον) and 12 ('Αδριανόν), of 124/5.

38. For the coupling of στρατηγός-βασιλεύς, or variations of it, see Isocr., *To Philip*, 140; Diod. XVII.4.9 and 71.8; Plut., *Mor.* 401A and 417D; Arrian II.14.4 (ἡγεμῶν-[βασιλεύς]); and Lucian, *The Ship or The Wishes*, 29 (Lykinos). Note 39 below.

39. Στρατηγός-βασιλεύς references in Julian, with variations: *Orat.* I.15d and II.68b, 71a

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)⁴⁰. 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 δαδοῦχος who put all this into motion⁴¹, or possibly Praxagoras who wrote a history of Constantine in two books⁴².

Central Conn. State University

ELIAS KAPETANOPOULOS

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 Βίος Ἀλεξάνδρου 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.

41. See G. Fowden (note 12 above) 51-57; cf. *SEG* 37 (1987 = 1990), No. 1650. T. D. Barnes (note 42 below) 72.

42. The author's name suggests that he may have hailed from the family of Aelius (Claudius) Praxagoras of Melite (*BCH* 92, 1968, 511-512, No. 96). Praxagoras' history has been summarized by Photios (*FGrH*, 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.xxii.2 and 3, and xxiii.2 (Piraeus-ships).