The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Age Eponumoi at Athens

E Poste

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 4 - 6
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202837, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202837

How to cite this article:

E Poste (1896). Age Eponumoi at Athens. The Classical Review, 10, pp 4-6 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202837

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

palaeographically, nor does it yield a brilliant sense. I would suggest *clade*. The explanation is simple: *hacclade* came to be written *haclade*, and was 'corrected' into *hac laude*. We may, perhaps, find further support for *clade* in vv. 301—303:

VII.

One of my students, Miss F. L. Dunn of Barnard College, has suggested the following excellent and, I think, certain correction in Eurip. *I. T.* 1008 sq.: κοινόφρων δὲ σοὶ | καὶ ζῆν θέλοιμ' ἂν καὶ θανέιν λαχὼν ἴσον.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

AGE EPONUMOI AT ATHENS.

IN his valuable work on Greek Constitutional Antiquities Gilbert gives an entirely erroneous interpretation of the Age Eponumoi (οἱ τῶν ἡλικίων ἐπώνυμοι) mentioned in chapter 53 of Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution*. In spite of the language of this treatise, which he accepts as authentic, he identifies the Age Eponumos with the Archon Eponumos. The true theory has been broadly indicated by Dr. Sandys, but it requires some patient thought and an examination in various aspects for its full apprehension; and the following developments may be of service to the student.

The Ephebos was enrolled in his nineteenth year, not his eighteenth as Gilbert supposes. This follows from the fact that in forty-one more years he will be in his sixtieth. The citizen owed his country forty-one years of military service, and accordingly the hoplites were divided into forty-one sets, not forty-two as Gilbert states. The forty-second set furnished not hoplites but arbitrators. Each set of citizens, as they were annually enrolled, received the name of one of forty-two mythical heroes. Under this Eponumos they remained for forty-two years: after that they fell out of the roll, were no longer liable to serve as hoplites or arbitrators, and left their Eponumos free by a sort of metempsychosis to give his name to a younger generation. The following propositions give various consequences of this arrangement:—

All men of the same age, between the limits of nineteen and sixty, had the same Eponumos.

In different years the same Eponumos indicated a different age.

In any given year, in order to ascertain what age was indicated by a given Eponumos, a reference to the calendar would be requisite to see in what archonship or *anno domini*, to use an anachronism, the given Eponumos was Ephebos.

After serving as Eponumos to one set of Epheboi, as these kept him to themselves throughout their period of service, a hero could not serve again as Eponumos to a different set of men until an interval of forty-two years had intervened. The Eponumos of a new set of Epheboi would always be the hero who had designated the arbitrators of the last year. There could be no other hero available, as the remaining forty-one were already designators of sets who had not completed their period of duty. The Eponumos of the ex-arbitrators would be available because the ex-arbitrators had now dropped out of the rolls into private life, so far as regarded military service or arbitration. Two problems now remain, which require a little care in the solution:—

(1). We read: τὸν δὲ τελευταῖον τῶν ἐπώνυμων λαβόντες οἱ τετταράκοντα διανέμουν αὐτοῖς τὰς διαίτας. Here ὁ τελευταῖος is equivalent to ὁ πρεσβύτατος. How is this to be explained? Let us name the forty-two Eponumoi by the twenty-four letters of the English alphabet + the first eighteen of the Greek alphabet; i.e. A,B,C...X,Y,Z + α,β,γ...π,ρ,ς.

Let us suppose that in 1800 A.D. the Eponumos of the Epheboi is A: then in 1801 the Eponumos of another set will be B, and A will denote those in their twentieth year. In 1802 the Eponumos of a third set will be C; B will denote those in their twentieth year, A those in their twenty-first; and so on. A complete table of all the forty-two Eponumoi, embracing forty-two years, would make the result clear, but would occupy considerable space. Any one, however, who takes the trouble to count will see that in 1841 those who have A for Eponumos will be in their sixtieth year: those who have B in their fifty-ninth, and so on: those who have ρ in their twentieth, and those who have σ in their nineteenth. Let us advance to 1842. We assign A as Eponumos to the new Epheboi; we find

those under B in their sixtieth year, and so on; those under ρ in their twenty-first, and those under σ in their twentieth. We devote B to arbitration, and we have to find that B is the *last* set inscribed on the pillar. This condition will be evidently satisfied if the order of inscription on the pillar is the same as the order of age, and not otherwise: *i.e.* it must be the following: A, σ, ρ... γ, β, α, Z, Y, X... D, C, B. In other words the inscription must proceed from A backwards, first through the Greek alphabet from σ to α, and then through the English alphabet from Z to B.

(2). We read : *χρῶνται δὲ τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις καὶ πρὸς τὰς στρατείας, καὶ ὅταν ἡλικίαν ἐκπέμψωσι προγράφουσιν ἀπὸ τίνος ἀρχοντος καὶ ἐπωνύμου μέχρι τίνων δὲ στρατεύεσθαι.*

Very well. Suppose that the current year is 1842, and that an expedition is decreed of all the hoplites between the ages of thirty and forty inclusive: how must the programma be worded if the ages are to be defined by archons and eponymous heroes? Let me be permitted for the sake of clearness to call the archon eponumos by the name of the *annus domini*; *e.g.* 1800, 1801, &c. In the year 1842 if, as above assumed, σ is the eponumos of the hoplites aged twenty, and ρ of those aged twenty-one, we may easily see by counting that the Eponumos of those aged thirty will be θ, and the Eponumos of those aged forty will be X (of the English alphabet). Again if, as was assumed, σ was the Eponumos of Epheboi in 1841, and ρ in 1840, and so on; θ must have been eponymous hero of Epheboi in 1831, and X in 1821. If then the decree begins by naming the youngest hoplites and latest archons, it will be to this effect: *στρατεύεσθωσαν οἱ ἀπὸ 1831 ἀρχοντος μέχρι 1821 ἀρχοντος ἐγγραφέντες· οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ θ, ἡ, ζ, ε, δ, γ, β, α, Z, Y, X, ἐπωνύμοι.* If it begins with the earliest archons and oldest hoplites, its purport will be: *στρατεύεσθωσαν οἱ ἀπὸ 1821 ἀρχοντος μέχρι 1831 ἀρχοντος ἐγγραφέντες· οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ X, Y, Z, α, β, γ, δ, ε, ζ, ἡ, θ, ἐπωνύμοι.* It may be observed that ἀπὸ in the text of the *Athenian Constitution* has not the same meaning in connection with the eponymous archon and the eponymous hero: in the former case it denotes a number of enrolments successive in time; in the latter a number of contemporaneous divisions arranged in definite order. This double meaning produces an obscurity that perhaps is one of the factors that have caused the description of the Eponumoi to be misinterpreted. These details were not clearly before my mind

when I said in my Translation that the cycle of forty-two eponymous heroes corresponded to forty-two years in the calendar. Every one of the forty-two heroes might be mentioned in every year of the calendar. For instance in 1800 P. would represent citizens of sixty years of age, C those of fifty-nine, and so on; ρ those of twenty-one, σ those of twenty. And similarly in every year every Eponumos would denote a group of a certain age. No Eponumos, then, can be said to have had a special relation to any particular year of the calendar. We may note that an annual revision of the names under each Eponumos would be requisite, the group denoted varying from year to year as it was gradually diminished by death.

Before concluding, two kinds of eponymia may be distinguished: (1) One kind only involves paronymia: *i.e.* the names of φυλαί, φυλέται, δήμοι, δημόται, γένη, γεννήται, were not the very names of eponymous heroes, but only derivatives from them. (2) The second involves homonymia, *i.e.* the two objects that stand in the relation of eponyms have absolutely the same name. Nautical matters furnish a good example: *e.g.* τὴν ἐπώνυμον τῆς νεὸς θεὸν ἔχουσα τὴν Ἴσιν ἐκατέρωθεν ἡ πρῶρα, quoted by Cecil Torr in *Ancient Ships*, p. 36. Here the ship and the goddess have the identical name, Isis. In the nomenclature of judicial procedure letters of the alphabet often discharge the function of eponyms: *e.g.* A, B, Γ, &c. are eponyms of boxes (κιβώτια) containing juror tickets, of contingents coming from juror brigades (μέρη) and of the total brigades. Again other letters λ, μ, ν, &c. are eponyms of other boxes containing other juror tickets, of the composite juror sections whose tickets they contain, and of the courts where those jurors are detailed to serve. In the following lines of the *Ecclesiastical* :

καὶ κηρύξω τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ βῆτ' ἐπὶ τὴν στοιὰν ἀκολουθεῖν
τὴν βασιλείον δειπνήσοντας, τὸ δὲ θῆτ' ἐς τὴν παρὰ ταύτην,
τοὺς δ' ἐκ τοῦ κάπτ' εἰς τὴν στοιὰν χωρεῖν τὴν ἀλφιδόπωναν,

Theta is the homonym-eponym of a contingent from a brigade of jurors. The expression τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ βῆτα does not indeed employ the figure of eponymia to denote another contingent from another brigade by the letter Beta: but according as we suppose the preposition ἐκ to relate to the box

that held their tickets or to the whole brigade of which they are a contingent, it implies that Beta is an eponym of the box or of the brigade. The text, speaking of an

Eponomos as having arbitrated, shows that the 42 Eponymous Heroes were homonym-eponyms of the arbitrators and hoplites.

E. POSTE.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF φάναι.

THE last number of the *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* contains an article which purports to be 'Quaestiones de Elocutione Demosthenica,' but is in effect rather a careless analysis of the Index Demosthenicus of S. Preuss. Its compiler is Bruno Kaiser.

In the catalogue of *Verba dicendi et declarandi* on pp. 5 ff. the following passages are quoted: 16, 20; 19, 88; 20, 135; 22, 23; 24, 204 as supplying examples of φάναι with its sense completed by *ὅτι*, while other three passages are cited, viz. 4, 48; 21, 98; and 27, 19 as furnishing instances of φάναι followed by *ὡς*. Here are eight instances in all of a most abnormal construction. But any one who will look the passage out will find that Kaiser has misinterpreted 21, 98. As for 16, 20 and 19, 88, he does not appear to understand that a *τοῦτο φῆ* is a very different thing from a simple *φῆ*. Thus the examples are reduced to three of *ὅτι* and two of *ὡς*, and these are all most instructive, but not in the way which Kaiser imagines. In two of them the *ὅτι* clause begins the sentence: 20, 135 *ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν τοῦτο ἐν τι τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἐστὶ, πάντας ἀν' ἡγοῦμαι φῆσαι*. 24, 204 *καὶ μὴν ὅτι μὲν προσήκει πάντας κολάζειν τοὺς ἀδικούντας, εὖ οἷδ' ὅτι πάντες ἂν, εἴ τις ἔροιο, φήσαιτε*. In the other

three the construction with *ὅτι* or *ὡς* is used at a distance from the verb either to increase the orderliness of the sentence, or to add to it the suggestiveness which a late Greek would have called *πανουργία*. Perhaps I had better quote them: 22, 23 *ὅταν μὲν λαιδορίαν ταῦτα καὶ αἰτίαν εἶναι φῆ, ὑπολαμβάνετε ὡς ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐλεγχος, ἃ δ' οὗτος ποιεῖ λαιδορία καὶ αἰτία· ὅταν δ' ὅτι πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας προσήκεν ἐπαγγέλλειν ἡμῖν, ἐκείνο ὑπολαμβάνετε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*; 27, 19 *οὗτος δὲ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα ἐπιμεληθεὶς οὐδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνίοτε μὲν φησὶν ἀργῆσαι τὸ ἐργαστήριον, ἐνίοτε δ' ὡς αὐτὸς μὲν οὐκ ἐπεμελήθη τούτων, ὃ δ' ἐπίτροπος Μιλύας, ὃ ἀπελεύθερος ὃ ἡμέτερος, διψήσεν αὐτὰ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου μοι προσήκει λόγων λαβεῖν*; 4, 48 *ἡμῶν δ' οἱ μὲν περιϋόντες μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φασὶ Φίλιππον πράττειν τὴν Θηβαίων κατάλυσιν καὶ τὰς πολιτείας διασπᾶν, οἱ δ' ὡς πρέσβεις πέπομφεν ὡς βασιλέα, οἱ δ' ἐν Ἰλλυρίοις πόλεις τειχίζειν, οἱ δὲ λόγους πλάττοντες ἕκαστος περιερχόμεθα*.

It has seemed to me worth while to point out this mistake, on the one hand because it is characteristic of Kaiser's method, and on the other because any work upon Demosthenes coming from Halle at the present time is presumably deserving of confidence.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

CLAUDIUS AND THE QUAESTURA GALLICA.

WE are told by Suetonius that Claudius not only transferred the supervision of the harbour at Ostia and of the cornships from one of the quaestors of the year to a procurator of his own, but also abolished the quaestura Gallica (Suet. *Claud.* 25). What this Gallic quaestorship precisely was is matter for conjecture, but the following view is at least possible. The duties of a quaestor were always more or less financial. As long as Cisalpine Gaul continued to be a separate province under the government of a

proconsul, there must have been a quaestor stationed there, who may very well have been known as the quaestor Gallicus. When Cisalpine Gaul was incorporated with Italy by Augustus, it shared of course in the immunity from direct taxation which all Italy enjoyed, and thus one important part of the Gallic quaestor's duties must have come to an end. It is however conceivable that Augustus may have thought it expedient still to keep a quaestor in Cisalpine Gaul to look after the extensive