

Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents. II.

By William Scott Ferguson.

7. *The Ptolemaia in Athens.*

Pausanias ¹⁾ saw statues of Ptolemy Philometor and his daughter Berenike before the entrance to the Odeion at Athens. The Ptolemy in question was Philometor Soter II (117—81 B.C.) ²⁾. Hitzig and Blümner identify ³⁾ these statues with the one of a Ptolemy mentioned in IG II 464, but in so doing they certainly err; for, in the first place, this latter was an equestrian statue, and there is nothing said of a second to his daughter. His daughter was hardly represented on horseback, yet the two seen by Pausanias were doubtless paired, as were those of Philadelphos and Arsinoe mentioned by him in the same connection. Moreover, the equestrian statue referred to in IG II 464 was erected beside „the old temple of Athena Polias“ on the Acropolis, not in front of the Odeion.

Conclusive is that IG II 464 belongs before 117 B.C. Koehler affirms the writing to be of a slightly earlier period than this. Moreover, it is enacted that the honors conferred in the decree should be announced at the Ptolemaia as well as elsewhere — a practice abandoned in Athens at about the middle of the second century B.C. ⁴⁾. To be sure, this criterion would not exclude the period 103/2—88 B.C.; for the oligarchic government then in power ⁵⁾ reestablished the earlier custom of making proclamations at the Ptolemaia, but 103—88 is out of the question here for other reasons. Thus, from the association of Philometor Soter II and Berenike his daughter we must conclude with Mahaffy ⁶⁾ that the two

1) I 8 6 ff.

2) Dittenberger, OGIS 174 n. 1; Hitzig and Blümner, Pausanias I, p. 174; the note of Frazer (Pausanias II p. 100) is not to the point.

3) Following Gurlitt, *Ueber Pausanias* p. 257 f.

4) The word Ptolemaia appears in the publication-formula for the last dated occasion in 152/1 (IG II 446; cf. 953). It is lacking in the documents from c. 135—104/3 (Ditt., OGIS I 352, IG II 471, 469, 470, 465). It reappears in 100/99 (IG II 467), and is still present in 93/2 (IG II 468, 466). It is lacking again in the type of ephebe document which appears first after 86/4 (IG II 481 c. 80 B.C.). For the data see Larfeld, *Handbuch* II 2 p. 714 f. and p. 811. To Larfeld's examples are to be added IG VII 2411; BCH XXIX p. 169 ff.; Ditt., OGIS I 352 (150—130 B.C.).

5) *Klio* IV p. 1 ff. — 6) *The Ptolemaic Dynasty* p. 223.

statues seen by Pausanias were dedicated after the return of Soter to Egypt in 88; for between 101? and 88 Berenike was the wife of his usurping and hostile brother, Alexander I. Nor is the period prior to 101 and subsequent to 103 to be thought of, since Berenike, a girl of from 14 to 16 at her marriage¹⁾, became a personality only as the wife of her uncle, Alexander. Moreover, since she was in the power of Alexander in 101, she apparently did not accompany her father into exile in 108. Why then should father and daughter be associated in an Athenian dedication, seeing that the latter was a child in the hands of her parent's enemies?

After 88 the Ptolemaia were not used for proclamations: probably they were not celebrated at all²⁾. Hence, IG II 464 belongs to an earlier Ptolemy than does the group seen by Pausanias. Since the Ptolemaia disappear at about 150 B.C., and Koehler affirms that the writing of IG II 464 indicates *paullo antiquiora tempora* than 117—81, it is, perhaps, a fair conclusion that the equestrian statue represented Ptolemy Philometor I (181—146). Still, we cannot leave Epiphanes (203—181) and Philopator (222/1—203) out of account altogether; indeed, all the conditions, except, perhaps, the character of the writing, would allow it to be erected in honor of Euergetes I during the last two years and a half of his reign; but in asserting this much we have run ahead of our argument.

The Ptolemaia appear in our records as a festival of the first rank in 188/7 B.C.³⁾. That they were established in the early third century has been frequently affirmed, but this view rests upon a restoration of the text in IG II 341 which is quite unlikely. When were they established?

It is natural to think that they were introduced at the same time as the tribe Ptolemais⁴⁾, i. e. between 226 and 224, and this is the view which we shall ultimately accept⁵⁾, but first let us meet a possible objection. Does not IG II 402, in which the Ptolemaia are omitted in the formula of publication, while the Eleusinia, which are absent in this part of earlier documents, already make their appearance in it, prove that the Ptolemaia were created after the end of the third century? No: for the date of IG II 402, upon which the cogency of this argument depends, is not determinable in any way. IG II 403 belongs to 221/0: 402 may be

1) Her father married in 116 B.C.

2) It is true that the earliest document without the word Ptolemaia is dated after the death of Soter; cf. *above* p. 1 n. 4, but the type was established at the restoration in 86/4.

3) IG II 5 4176. — 4) Niese, *Gesch. d. griech. u. maked. Staaten* II p. 465.

5) Upon becoming an *eponymous* hero of Athens, and receiving as such his peculiar priest and cult, Ptolemy obtained admittance into the circle of Athenian deities. The Ptolemaia, which were celebrated all round about Athens — in the Cyclades for example —, could hardly fail to be received at the same time. The new god and the new games, doubtless, came together, as did the new gods and the Antigoneia and Demetreia in 307 B.C., as did the accession of Demetrios II and the Demetria in 240/39 B.C.

placed earlier than 224 B.C.¹⁾ — besides, the passage in which the word Ptolemaia might be expected is a restoration.

Ἀναγορεῦσαι δὲ τὸν στέφανον Διονυσίων τε τῶν ἐν ἄστει καινοῖς τραγωδοῖς καὶ Παναθηναίων καὶ Ἐλευσινίων καὶ Πτολεμαίων τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν. The great public occasions at Athens were, thus, the contest of new tragedies at the city Dionysia, and the athletic sports held in connection with the Panathenaia, Eleusinia, and Ptolemaia. Dionysia, Panathenaia, and Eleusinia were, of course, celebrated annually; and it is possible that new tragedies were still put in competition at Athens every year, and it may be that γυμνικοὶ ἀγῶνες accompanied the yearly Panathenaia and Eleusinia. August Mommsen²⁾, to be sure, maintains that athletic games formed part of these festivals only at the quinquennial, or great Panathenaia, and only at the *triennial* and *quinquennial* Eleusinia. But this cannot be proved decisively. The evidence is entirely negative, with the exception of one passage in Suidas. In the nature of the case, nine-tenths of the extant allusions would concern the great Panathenaia and Eleusinia, and that there is no clear reference anywhere in the ancient literature and documents of gymnastic contests at the annual Panathenaia and Eleusinia proves no more, perhaps, than their utter insignificance. But this is enough for our purpose. The festivals at which honors were conferred were obviously important occasions: hence, *triennial*, or *quinquennial*, and international — not annual, and local.

In the part of the formula of publication already discussed it is thus required that advertisement of honors be made at the annual fête of the Dionysia, and at gymnastic festivals which occurred in the second, third and fourth years of an Olympiad: for the *μεγάλα Παναθηναῖα* came in the third, the *triennial* Eleusinia in the second, and the *μεγάλα Ἐλευσινια* in the fourth year of the Olympic cycle³⁾. Since the other contests, at which proclamations were made, were not annual, parochial fêtes, but gatherings frequented by strangers from all parts of the world, it is fair to assume that the same was true of the Ptolemaia also. The same inference is also suggested by a document found at Thebes in which the Panathenaia, Eleusinia, and Ptolemaia (as well as the Dionysia) are mentioned side by side with the Isthmia, Pythia, and Olympia⁴⁾. We should thus expect the Ptolemaia to belong to only one year of the Olympiad.

From a difficult passage in Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*⁵⁾ it seems

1) Perhaps it belongs between 229 and 224 B.C. — 2) *Feste der Stadt Athen* p. 76.

3) The greater Eleusinia must have come in the first and third or in the second and fourth years of the Olympiad. They came in Diokles' archonship, 215/4, Ol. 141, 2; hence, in the second and fourth. The Eleusinia, celebrated in 215/4 (IG II 5 385 d = Ditt., *Syll.*² 650), are not designated *μεγάλα*; hence, they were the *triennial* games. Otherwise, Stengel, PW V 2 p. 2332. The dating of Diokles in 215/4 should no longer be doubted.

4) IG VII 2411. — 5) LIV, 7.

to result that an effort was made by the Athenians to distribute their most brilliant fêtes as equally as possible throughout the four years of this cycle. This was, of course, rendered difficult by the fact that their ancient festivals were religious in character, attached by traditions as old as their foundation to definite occurrences, and hence, not movable at pleasure. It was different in the case of a festival established late, like the Ptolemaia. Given the idea and given the situation, we should, therefore, expect to find the *γυμνικοὶ ἀγῶνες* of the Ptolemaia recurring in the first year of the Olympiad.

Our surmise finds complete demonstration through IG II 953. This document is now dated definitely in 152/1¹⁾, or Ol. 157, 1. It contains the names of over sixty one *hieropoioi* who in this year had charge of the Ptolemaia. Since two *hieropoioi* alone administered the Romaia in the same year, it is clear that we have to do with the officers, not of the annual — if such there were —, but of the *quinquennial* Ptolemaia.

We have already assumed that the tribe Ptolemais and the games Ptolemaia were created by the Athenians at the same time. Since the fête was introduced in the first year of an Olympiad, and the tribe was established between 226 and 224²⁾, it is clear that these two additions to the Athenian institutions were made in 224/3 — the year in which, for other reasons, we have already concluded that Ptolemais was created.

The Ptolemaia, inaugurated in 224/3, flourished vigorously in Athens until about 150 B.C. Then they disappeared, to be revived, however, by the oligarchic government which came to power in 103/2. They apparently did not survive the fearful blow which the city sustained in the course of the second Mithradatic War (88—86 B.C.). These are the facts: what is their explanation?

It is well known that Ptolemy Euergetes II (146—117 B.C.) espoused the cause of the native Egyptians in order to carry on his struggle with his brother Philometor, and that he grievously mishandled the Alexandrine Greeks after his ascent to the throne³⁾. We may, perhaps, discount the report of Justin⁴⁾ somewhat, and attribute to Greek animosity part of the atrocities with which he is credited. Still, the evidence of an eye-witness, Polybios⁵⁾, is conclusive that Euergetes, provoked by revolts, again and again let loose his soldiers upon the Alexandrians, and by repeated massacres dispersed in large part the Greek settlement. Such treatment naturally caused indignation throughout the Greek world, and, doubtless, also at Athens, where, moreover, Euergetes' rival, Philometor,

1) Archon Lysiades.

2) *Priests of Asklepios* (Univ. of Calif. Publ., Class. Phil. I) p. 158.

3) Mahaffy, *Op. cit.* pp. 195 ff.; pp. 190 ff.

4) XXXVIII, 8.

5) XXXIV, 14, cf. Mahaffy, *ibid.* p. 191.

had been especially well liked¹). We believe, therefore, that the decline of the Ptolemaia in c. 150 B.C. was a direct result of the personal unpopularity of Euergetes; for it need hardly be stated that the Ptolemaia owed their origin and importance more to political than to religious considerations. The dislike in which this king was held is shown in other ways as well. Thus no monument — so far as we know — was erected to him in Athens or in Delos by Athenians or Greeks. His courtiers were almost equally neglected. The only appreciation of their services, extant from Attic territory, was exhibited at Delos by the Roman traders and shippers doing business in Alexandria²), by individual Romans (brothers)³), and the by untided *presbyters* of the commission merchants of Alexandria⁴). The same is true of his successor Soter II, or, to be more accurate, of his widow Cleopatra⁵) who ruled for her son, Soter II, from 117 to 108 B.C. And the usurper, Alexander, is equally unfavored with marks of popularity among the Athenians and Greeks who frequented Delos. On the other hand, the exiled Soter, while king of Cyprus, counted an unusual following of devoted adherents in Athens. To be sure, we do not know that his bust was among those which the priest Helianax dedicated in 101/0 B.C. to kings and potentates from far and near; for it is not among the nine of which the dedicatory inscriptions have been found. But M. S. Reinach⁶), the excavator, affirms that others have been lost, and it is likely that one of Soter is among them. In any case, the promiscuous devotion of Helianax proves little personal feeling for any one of the number. On the other hand, we have evidence that no less than three statues of Soter II were put up at Delos between 108 and 88 B.C., one by Markos of Eleusis, the priest of Sarapis, to Ammon⁷); one by Areios of Alexandria to Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia⁸), and one by an Epyptian courtier to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto⁹). Nor was this all: he rated an Athenian, Stolos, son of Theon, among his kinsmen, and this person set up a statue at Delos to his friend, the Salaminian Simalos, son of Simarchos¹⁰). Simalos belonged to a wealthy Cyprian house. His father had been influential at the time of Philometor, and an Athenian decree is extant in his honor¹¹). The memorial to the friendship of Sima-

1) IG II 2 966 A, 968; II 5 417 b and c, 431 B and C; II 439, 377, 464?; BCH II 398. This last inscription records a dedication of the *demos* of Thera. Dittenberger (OGIS 136) refers it to the reign of Epiphanes or those of his two sons. But the dedication was authorized by the *demos* of Athens (in an appendix omitted by Dittenberger); hence it was probably made after 167, but in the reign of Philometor.

2) BCH VIII p. 107. — 3) CIG II 2285. — 4) BCH XI pp. 249 and 252.

5) Unless BCH IV p. 223 = Ditt., OGIS 144 refers to this Cleopatra.

6) BCH VII p. 342. — 7) BCH VI p. 342.

8) Lebègue, *Rech. sur Delos* p. 157 = Ditt., OGIS 171. — 9) BCH XXIX p. 219.

10) BCH XI p. 253: verses follow comparing Simalos to Alcinoos.

11) IG II 5 432 c.

los and the Athenian, Stolos, seems to us particularly significant. It indicates that Soter II had the same partisans that Philometor had; in other words, that the pro-Greek policy of Philometor, set aside by Euergetes II and by Cleopatra III, his widow, was adopted by Soter II. His brother, Alexander, doubtless was the real heir of Euergetes, and Soter, we are told, would have been passed over at the death of his father in favor of the younger son, had it not been for the championship of the Alexandrians¹). A pro-Greek *vs.* a pro-Egyptian policy was thus at the root of the dynastic struggles alike during the reigns of the sons of Epiphanes and the sons of Euergetes II. Euergetes crushed the Alexandrians and allowed the Museion to go into decay: Soter „so ruined Thebes, says Pausanias²), that not even a suggestion was left of its former prosperity“.

From 117 to 108 B.C. Soter II had little opportunity to show his pro-Greek inclinations; for his imperious mother ruled Egypt in his stead. This woman was apparently the incarnation of her uncle-husband's anti-Greek policy. She carried forward to another generation the rancours of the fraternal struggle of her father and her husband. In one particular, however, she changed the attitude of the court; in the matter of the Jews. Philometor had fostered their plantations in Egypt³): Euergetes, it appears⁴), counted them among his enemies. Upon them Cleopatra bestowed high honors⁵). It is possible that the antagonism between the Jews and the Greeks forced the former to take side with the Egyptians, and thus to ally themselves with the queen and the party which had been opposed to their benefactor, Philometor — the enemy of their arch-persecutor, Antiochos Epiphanes. They had never really belonged to the partisans of Greek culture in Egypt, and it is doubtful if they waited till the accession of Cleopatra to change over to the opposite camp⁶). At any rate, the pro-Greek sentiments of Soter meant anti-Jewish sentiments as well as anti-Egyptian, and one of the first acts of his own volition⁷) was to send 6000 men to the rescue of the Greeks of Samaria, at that moment (108 B.C.) fighting desperately against the Jewish chief-priest Hyrcanus. His sister and first wife, Cleopatra, had been taken from him already by the queen-mother. The ex-queen had gone to Syria and had married herself there to Antiochos Cyzicenus, to whose part of the Seleucid empire Samaria belonged. Hence this aid given to Samaria may have originated in personal motives, or, indeed, in the politic effort to keep alive the dy-

1) Mahaffy, pp. 208 f. — 2) I 9 cited by Mahaffy, p. 223.

3) Mahaffy, pp. 168 f.; Niese, III pp. 213 f.

4) Niese, III p. 274 n. 3; cf. p. 267 n. 3 and pp. 213 f.

5) Josephus, *Jud. Arch.* XIII 285; cf. Willrich, *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.* I pp. 48 ff.

6) Mahaffy, pp. 192 ff.

7) Josephus, *Ibid.* XIII 278: The troops were sent in opposition to the wishes of the queen mother. Their dispatch was, perhaps, the first clear declaration of Soter's pro-Greek sentiments, and it was followed closely by his expulsion from Egypt.

nastic war in Syria. No such ambiguity, however, attaches itself to the second intervention of Soter II in the affairs of Palestine. While in exile in Cyprus¹⁾ (103), he sent assistance to the Greeks against the fierce attacks to which they were persistently exposed through the expansion and fanaticism of Maccabean Judaea. At the same time, Cleopatra and Alexander sent assistance to the Jews. Thus Soter II identified himself with the Greek cause in its warfare with reviving nationalism, not simply in Egypt, but also in Palestine. The Athenians had been indifferent, apparently, to the fate of Samaria; for in April of 105 they voted a gold crown and a bronze statue to Hyrcanus²⁾, not withstanding that he had recently razed this city to the ground and „turned the water courses over its site“³⁾. This was in return for the escort of embassies and other public and private services. Perhaps they received less consideration from the successors of Hyrcanus; perhaps the formation of intimate relations with Ptolemy Soter roused the Athenians to a sense of the national peril in Palestine; perhaps the new government established in 103/2 had a new foreign policy, in spite of the fact that an influential member of it was the man⁴⁾ who had fathered the measure in honor of Hyrcanus. At any rate, the Athenians of 103—88 sympathized with the cause of Soter II — had not an Athenian been entrusted by Epiphanes with the arduous mission of stamping out the Jewish religion in Jerusalem?⁵⁾. They revived the Ptolemaia, loaded Soter with honors while he was in exile, and after his return in 88 they erected monuments of him and Berenike, his daughter, in their city. The statues erected at this time (84—81) were the ones which Pausanias saw in front of the Odeion.

We have tried to show that the statues of Ptolemy Philometor, *i. e.* Soter II and Berenike seen by Pausanias in Athens were different from the one erected in accordance with the enactment IG II 464, first, in that the former constituted a group of a male and female figure, while the latter was an equestrian statue; secondly, in that the former was seen before the Odeion, while the latter was placed in front of the old temple of Athena on the Acropolis, and finally, in that the two figures were made between 84 and 81 B.C., the Ptolemy on horseback, prior to 146 — as is shown by the fact that its dedication was advertised at the Ptolemaia.

This has led us to sketch the history of the Ptolemaia and the relations between Athens and Egypt during the later Hellenistic period. The fête, it appears, was introduced into Athens along with the tribe, Ptolemais, in 224/3 B.C.: it flourished until *c.* 150: it was abandoned during

1) Josephus, XIII 328.

2) Josephus, XIV 149 ff.; *cf.* Wilhelm, *Philologus* LX pp. 487 ff.

3) Bevan, *The House of Seleucus* II p. 256.

4) Theodotos, son of Diodoros, of Sunion; *cf.* Kirchner, PA No. 6803.

5) Bevan, *Op. cit.* p. 173; *II Macc.* VI 1.

150—103, and reappeared in 103, to be finally cast aside in 88. Its obscuration in 150—103, and its reappearance in 103—88, we find to be connected with the diverse attitude toward the Greeks displayed by the Ptolemaic rulers, the anti-Hellenic policy and consequent unpopularity of Euergetes II being the cause of the decline of the Ptolemaia: its revival being a result of the pro-Greek sympathies of Soter II.

8. *The Agonothetes of the Panathenaia.*

In a recent pamphlet on the institutions of later Athens¹⁾ Dr. Johannes Sundwall has brought together the inscriptional material which deals with the *agonothesia*, and from an analysis of it he has reached the conclusion that all the games of the Athenians were put in charge of one *agonothetes* from 309/8 B.C.²⁾ until about 229 B.C., and that subsequently distinct officials with this title arranged the Dionysia, Panathenaia, Theseia, Delia, and some other important contests. This is a novel view only in so far as the date is concerned; for Ulrich Koehler³⁾ had thought of the matter in a similar way. He dated the change, however, shortly after the introduction of the *agonothesia* (309/8²⁾), and in following up his arguments I had concluded that at least two *agonothetai* were appointed from the start, a second being demonstrable in 282/1, probably for the Panathenaia³⁾.

To my contention that there were two *agonothetai* in 282/1 Sundwall will not listen. Phaidros was, indeed, *agonothetes* in the archonship of Nikias, and so, too, was Glaukon⁴⁾, but different archons of this name are meant, the first belonging to 282/1, the latter to 296/5: I had maintained that neither of the two could have been *agonothetes* in 296/5; and this view I believe still to be correct.

Agonothetai of the Panathenaia are known for the following years: 30/29, 94/3, and 142/1. Each of these is the third year of an Olympiad⁵⁾. So is 282/1, to which we have assigned Phaidros.

It is possible that Glaukon was *agonothetes* in 296/5 and a general in the active service of Ptolemy Euergetes fifty years later⁶⁾; for strange

1) *De institutis reipublicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis. Acta societatis scientiarum Fennicae* 1907 pp. 19 ff.

2) *Ath. Mitt.* IX p. 52. — 3) *Klio* V p. 165 n. 4. — 4) Kirchner, PA No. 3019.

5) *Ep. Agy.* 1906 p. 193; IG II 5477 d; IG II 5421. The last is shown to be from the year after the third year of an Olympiad by the mention of the *peplos*, and from 141/0 by the secretary, — — *Βουράδης*.

6) To be sure, Medeios appears, in a list of the subscribers for the Athenian Pythais in 97/6 (Ol. 170, 4), as *agonothetes* of the Panathenaia, and Sarapion of Melite in 96/5 (Ol. 171, 1) in the same capacity; slet. the former was at the same time in charge of the public bank at Delos, *agonothetes* of the Delia, and *epimeletes* of Delos; the latter hoplite-general, *agonothetes* of the Eleusinia, *agonothetes* Dia —, and *agonothetes* of the Delia. The two men, in seeking an occasion for giving an additional subscription (See below p. 400), gave an unique emphasis to the annual Panathenaia, et which, of course, other than gymnastic contesis, arranged by *agonothetai*, were held.

though the case would be, it is not quite unparalleled. Eurykleides of Kephisia put this charge, prior to 229¹⁾, into the hands of Mikion, a son who was alive in 183/2, and victor in a chariot race perhaps as late as 178/7²⁾. The *agonothesia* could be held, as Sundwall points out, by a minor. But the question is not so simple as this. At the time the agonothetic monument of Glaukon was erected, or at some previous time, he was hoplite-general of Athens. Sundwall, indeed, remarks: *species litterarum inscriptionis agonothesiaae aliquanto antiquiorem aetatem indicat*; but though differences of lettering are suggested by differences of type in Koehler's publication in the *Inscriptiones Graecae*³⁾, Koehler himself did not comment upon them, and assigned all the parts of the document to the same year. Apparently the differing letter-forms are used in consecutive words of the inscription. Certainly Glaukon could not have been hoplite-general in or before 296/5. Nor could he have been *agonothetes* in this year, if for no other reason, because of his politics. He was a pronounced democrat, yet in 296/5, at the end of the year, Athens was in the power of the oligarchic 'tyrant' Lachares. The city was closely invested by the troops of Demetrius Poliorcetes; famine raged within the walls, and the government was obliged to melt down the temple dedications to get money with which to pay the soldiers⁴⁾. This was not the time for Glaukon, or anyone else, to erect an agonothetic monument. Moreover, the public career of Glaukon in Athens belongs to the period 290—276/5 and to 267 ff. He became *proxenos* of Delphi in c. 277/6⁵⁾. Should it prove that the agonothetic inscription is older than those which, though cut upon the same monument, record the hoplite-generalship, it must still belong to 282/1 — the others to 281/0—276/5 or to 267 ff. We should then place the phylarchship of Glaukon and his victory at the great Panathenaia in the year of his *agonothesia* — the latter being won in the games over which his colleague Phaidros presided.

Certainly, if we are to escape two *agonothetai* in 282/1, it is by transferring Phaidros to 296/5. But the order of events of IG II 331, which is strictly chronological⁶⁾, indicates that Phaidros was 'master of games' in 282/1⁷⁾. Koehler and Reisch, however, decided in favor of the earlier year. This they could do by assuming that the *agonothesia* of Phaidros was taken out of its context in IG II 331 that it might be entered in

1) IG II 379; Sundwall, *op. cit.* p. 17.

2) IG II 2 983 l. 8; Kirchner, PA No. 10186; IG II 2 966 B l. 39; see *below*.

3) IG II 3 1291.

4) Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* III 1 pp. 224 f. Koehler, *Zeitsch. f. Numis.* XXI p. 15.

5) Kirchner, PA Suppl. No. 3019.

6) The angular P and the horse shoe shaped O are not confined to the inscriptions of the eighties of this century. Wilhelm, *Oesterr. Jahresh.* V 1902 pp. 136 f.

7) So Sundwall, *Op. cit.* p. 20; Ditt., *Syll.*² No. 213 note 20; Kirchner, PA No. 13963.

the record of his services just prior to the *agonothesia* of his son (276/5)¹). But, since at this very time Nikias Otryneus was archon, the danger of mistake was so obvious that the demè name, or other distinguishing mark (*ῥστερος*?), of the Nikias of 296/5, if this archon were really meant, could on no account have been omitted; and apart from the fact that Phaidros was general *ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν* both before and after the *coup* of Lachares in 296/5, and thus occupied with other things, if not altogether disqualified for this office, he would not have described his services in the ordinary stereotyped phrases if he had given *κἀλλιστοι ἀγῶνες* in the year of the great siege and famine of Athens. To me it seems quite unlikely that the games were celebrated in 296/5 at all. The Dionysia, at any rate, were omitted at critical times in the third century B.C.²).

It must, indeed, be granted to Sundwall that *ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης* prior to 229 B.C. had charge of several *agones* during the year. Thus, in IG II 307 (Kallimedes 246/5 = OL 133, 3) it is stated that he superintended *τῶν ἀγῶνων τῶν τε Διονυσιακῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων καλῶς καὶ φιλοτιμίως*, and on another occasion, he is said to have managed all the *agones*³). The explanation of this is quite simple. Both the Dionysia and the Panathenaia formed, not one *agon* each, but a whole series. At the latter there were *μουσικοὶ, γυμνικοὶ, ἵππικοὶ ἀγῶνες*, and in addition the contest for *εὐανδρία*⁴): at the former there were the various divisions and subdivisions of both *θυμελικοὶ καὶ σκηνικοὶ ἀγῶνες*, and besides the Dionysia proper, other less important *agones* were associated with Dionysos⁵). Moreover, it was natural that the minor fêtes should be taken in charge by the *agonothetai* of the greater ones before as well as after 229 B.C.; in 97/6 and 96/5 for example, the one *agonothetes* who made subscriptions to the *ἀπαρχαί* attended to several festival in each year. These minor fêtes are the ones referred to as *οἱ ἄλλοι* in the passage quoted above from IG II 307. Since the year of this inscription is the third of an Olympiad, the *agonothetes*, had there been one only, must have superintended the great Panathenaia. That this festival included in *οἱ ἄλλοι* is incredible. Hence there was more than one *agonothetes*. To me it seems probable that there was a board of *agonothetai* from the start; at first each member, when referred to separately, was entitled simply *ἀγωνοθέτης*: subsequently (c. 229 B.C.) the *college* was broken up, just as that of the generals had been, and the individual *agonothetai* were assigned to particular festivals, and given specific titles. A similar *de facto* division, however, must have appeared at the same time as the institution itself.

We have thus concluded that the *agonothesia* of the Panathenaia was introduced along with that of the Dionysia under the *régime* of Demetrios

1) Reisch, *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus* p. 84 n. 1.

2) Ditt., *Syll.*² 192 n. 6 (238/7 B.C.). — 3) IG II 5 373g.

4) Arist., *Polit. Ath.* LX 3. — 5) PW V 1 pp. 1201 ff.

Klio, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte VIII 3/4.

of Phaleron. Since the great Panathenaia, at which alone, perhaps, gymnastic contests were held¹⁾, came in 310/9 (Ol. 117, 3), it is likely that difficulties of management, experienced at this time, had something to do with the reconstruction of the two festivals, which was made, it seems, by Demetrios himself as archon in the following year (309/8)²⁾.

On the Panathenaic amphorae for the period 367—312 B.C.³⁾ were placed the names of the archons in whose years the oil for the games was pressed⁴⁾, or in whose years the prize vases themselves were made. This custom ceased shortly after 312. On two later fragments of Panathenaic amphorae the name of the *agonothetes* was inscribed⁵⁾. This shows that the vases were made of pottery after 312. The partial disappearance of the series was thus not due to the substitution of metal for clay, as is generally maintained⁶⁾. The goddess Athena, painted on the amphorae, faces the left until 336 B.C.: from 336—312 she turns toward the right. In two specimens, however, dated by De Witte after 312, she is again facing the left⁷⁾. These two, as well as the fragments with the name of the *agonothetes*, are located by the archaeologists⁸⁾ in the last years of the fourth century, but until the whole class of vases has been rehandled the correctness of this assignment is problematical.

Another element in the problem is presented by the 'well-known' vase-fragment published by Berndorf⁹⁾, on which, according to Wilhelm¹⁰⁾, appears the inscription, *ταμ]ιεύοντος Εὐρυκλείδου*. Since the *ταμίας τῶν στρατιωτικῶν* had charge of the preparation of the *ἄθλα* for the Panathenaia¹¹⁾, and since Eurykleides of Kephisia was a most active and conspicuous treasurer of the military fund in 232/1 B.C.¹²⁾, Wilhelm naturally dates this vase fragment at that time. The oil or vases were prepared for the Panathenaia in the three years which preceded their celebration¹³⁾, and since we learn that Eurykleides made his son Mikion *agonothetes* in some year immediately prior to the liberation of Athens in 229¹⁴⁾, and since we know that Mikion was *agonothetes* of the *Panathenaia* at just about this time¹⁵⁾, it is natural to think that the vase in question was prepared by the father for the Panathenaic games given by the son in 230/29 (Ol. 157, 3).

1) See *below* p. 349 f. — 2) Koehler, *Ath. Mitt.* IX ff. 49 ff.

3) Hoppin, *American Journal of Arch.* 1906 p. 385.

4) Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* pp. 81 f.

5) Cecil Smith, *Annual of the British School at Athens* III pp. 194 ff.

6) Walters, *History of Ancient Pottery* I p. 389; Rayet et Collignon, *Histoire de la Céramique Grecque* p. 141.

7) *Mon. dell' Instit.* 1877 Vol. X 48 c and d; *Annales de l'Institut.* 77 pp. 327 ff. I owe these references to Mr. A. M. Harmon, Fellow of the American School in Rome.

8) Smith and de Witte, *loc. cit.* — 9) *Griech. u. Sikel. Vasenbilder* Plate X.

10) *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1902 p. 1100. — 11) Arist., *Polit. Ath.* XLIX 3.

12) IG II 334. — 13) See the table compiled by Hoppin *loc. cit.*

14) IG II 379. — 15) IG II 2 858.

Accordingly, Mikion was *agonothetes* of the Panathenaia prior to the withdrawal of the Macedonian soldiers in May 229 B.C. A class of vases with the name of the *agonothetes* in place of the archon appears after 312, perhaps in the last years of the fourth century. This, of course, could be the one *agonothetes*, to whom the Panathenaia and Dionysia alike were assigned, according to Sundwall, but it is more probable that it was an official specifically in charge of the Panathenaia. In 282/1 (Ol. 124, 3) we have two *agonothetai*, Glaukon for the Dionysia, and Phaidros for the Panathenaia. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that Lol-ling¹⁾, Koehler²⁾, and Dittenberger³⁾ were right in assuming that Herakleitos of Athmonon was *agonothetes* of the Panathenaia in some year not long after 278. References to Antigonos Gonatas in IG II 5 b 371 — the Athenian decree passed in honor of Herakleitos — show that this document belongs later than 276/5⁴⁾. On the other hand, the dedication by the *agonothetes* of paintings in commemoration of the Gallic victory of Antigonos attaches it closely to 277/6. Since the Panathenaic games came only twice during this period of friendship with Macedon — in 274/3 and 270/69 B.C. — and since the ones in question are doubtless those which came nearer the Gallic invasion, it is probable that Herakleitos was *agonothetes* in 274/3, the year of the establishment of the Soteria in Delphi⁵⁾. Herakleitos, a partisan of Antigonos and subsequently his governor in the Peiraieus (256/5 ff.)⁶⁾, saw to it that the achievements of the Macedonian king were not forgotten when the rewards for saving Greece from the Gauls were being distributed.

9. Certain Panathenaic Inscriptions.

A group of inscriptions recording victories won at the Panathenaia in Athens is dated in the early part of the second century B.C. That they belong to the Panathenaia has never been disputed⁷⁾, and it is generally agreed, moreover, that they belong to the great Panathenaia, which came in the third year of every Olympiad. Granted that they have to do with the Panathenaia at all, this latter assumption is inevitable; for although the evidence for the non-celebration of athletic games at the annual Panathenaia — the affirmation of Suidas⁸⁾ that the gymnastic *agon* was *quinquennial*, the dating of the Panathenaic amphorae in every year but that of the great fête⁹⁾, the repeated reference to gymnastic *agones* at the *quinquennial* and the entire lack of reference to them at the annual Pan-

1) *Δελτίον ἀρχαιολογικόν* 1889 p. 58. — 2) IG II 5 421. — 3) *Syll.*² 207 notes.

4) The year in which Athens made peace with Antigonos; cf. *Klio* V pp. 167 ff.; Lehmann-Haupt, *ibid.* pp. 377 ff.; Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios* pp. 149.

5) *Cornell Studies* X pp. 23 ff.

6) Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 ff. pp. 382.

7) Mommsen, *Feste d. Stadt Athen* pp. 69; Martin, *Les cavaliers Athéniens* pp. 228 ff.; Koehler, IG II 2 p. 384; Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.* 1905 p. 219.

8) *Sub voce Παναθήναια*. — 9) See above p. 348.

athenaia¹⁾, the appearance of Panathenaic *agonothetai* in the third years of the Olympiad alone²⁾ — is indecisive, it suffices for our purpose. The games with which our inscriptions had to do were frequented by foreign kings and potentates, and recorded by elaborate memorials. Had the annual Panathenaia been of such a character, they could not have escaped notice in our records. Hence, even if it were proved that gymnastic games formed part of the annual Panathenaia, we should be obliged still to connect our documents with the *quinquennial* festivals.

Since the individual inscriptions belong to the third years of Olympiads, it should be possible to assign them to particular years. This we shall here attempt to do³⁾.

The documents in question are IG II 2 966 A and B, 967 A and B, 968, 969 A and B, and 970. With the last nothing can be done. With the two catalogues which follow one another on 969 the matter is relatively simple. The first belongs to a great Panathenaia which falls within the limits of the reign of Antiochos Epiphanes, of Syria. This king was slain between the first of Nisan (April) 162 and the first of Dios (November) of the same year⁴⁾. He was not entitled king till 165. In the interval falls only one third year of an Olympiad, *viz.* 162. Hence Antiochos was still alive in Hekatombaion (August) of 162. IG II 2 969 B then belongs to 158.

With IG II 2 968 the dating is equally easy. The chief competitor in the games was king Ptolemy the elder, the son of king Ptolemy. This can be none other than Philometor I, and the distinctive epithet, *πρεσβύτερος*, belongs only to the period 171/0 to 164/3 B.C.; or, leaving out the period of the Syrian invasion, as Koehler does, only to the period 168/7 to 164/3. In this interval one great Panathenaia alone comes into question — that of 166.

With 966 A and B and 967 A and B the points of attack are less obvious. Still, Koehler has already determined the *terminus post quem* for the first pair. It belongs after 191; for in its time Messene was a member of the Achaean League, whereas this state was admitted, according to Livy and Polybios, in 191⁵⁾. Hence, this pair of catalogues may be ascribed to 190 186, 186 182, 182 178, 178 174, or 174 170. It is not clear whether 967 A and B preceded 966 A and B or followed them.

1) Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. 76. There is a reference to the *γυμνὰς ἀγῶν* of 306/5 in the inscription put together by Wilhelm and published in part by Hiller in the *Inscr. von Priene* p. 207 no. 488. See also Wilhelm, *Urk. dram. Aufführ.* p. 238.

2) See *above* p. 16.

3) Bergh (*Zeitschr. f. Altertumsw.* 1855 pp. 151 ff.) has already made an effort in this direction. He put IG II 966 B in 194 which Koehler (*Ath. Mitt.* 1880 p. 285 n. 1) properly characterizes as impossible.

4) Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* III 2 p. 143; cf. Lehmann-Haupt, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1906 p. 1265. — 5) Niese, *Gesch. d. griech. u. maked. Staaten* II pp. 711 ff.

A noteworthy circumstance in all these documents is the absence among the competitors in the chariot races of members of the Macedonian royal house. In fact, one Macedonian alone is found in the entire list. He appears as — *Πτολεμαίου Μακεδών* in 966 A. Their absence is explained by a remark of Livy¹⁾ that between 200 and 172 B.C. the Athenians would not allow the Macedonians to enter their territory. They did not retain the public maledictions upon Philip and all his race and people; for already in 188/7 (IG II 417) the imprecations prescribed in 200 B.C. had ceased to be pronounced. It was doubtless during the period of friendship between Athens and Philip (197—190 B.C.) that the curses were rescinded. However, the Macedonians were not readmitted to the city. Their absence in the Panathenaic documents, therefore, shows only that these are to be dated after 200 B.C.

Among the competitors in 966 B and 967 B was Polykrates, the son of Mnasiades, an Argive; and prominent among those in 966 A and 967 A were the daughters of Polykrates. It is natural to suppose that the victories of Polykrates and his family belong to the period of his premiership of Egypt. Now Polykrates came back to Egypt from Cyprus, where he had been governor, in the fall of 196²⁾, and shortly after his return he obtained a decisive ascendancy over the young king Epiphanes³⁾. This probably gives a *terminus post quem* for the victories of Polykrates: besides, the war with Macedon must have reduced the Panathenaia of 198 to modest dimensions. In the twenty fifth year of Epiphanes' life and the nineteenth of his reign (185 B.C.), Polykrates was the chief-of-staff in the army with which the king set out to suppress a native rebellion⁴⁾. It is probable that he maintained his position until the death of Epiphanes in 181, and perhaps beyond it; for no report exists as to his downfall. He was a grown man and a well known soldier in 222⁵⁾, when he left Argos for the Egyptian court with all his family and possessions. He cannot have been less than 35 in 220. In 185 he must, therefore, have been a man of over 70. He can hardly have retained his interest in sport after 175. We are dealing here with probabilities alone: still, it is perhaps admissable to contend that we dare not date a Panathenaic victory of Polykrates later than 178.

Should we put IG II 2 967 A and B in 194 and 190 and IG II 2 966 A and B in 186 and 182 we would get into grave difficulties; for the most striking feature of IG II 966 B is the remarkable number of entries and victories set down to the credit of the Attalids of Pergamon. Their presence in 182, however, would be quite inexplicable; for in this year they had to face a most formidable coalition of Asia Minor kings

1) XLI 23. — 2) Ditt., OGIS 93. — 3) Niese, *op. cit.* III pp. 86 f.

4) Mahaffy, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty* p. 159. — 5) Niese, *op. cit.* II p. 335 n. 1.

and peoples, a coalition all the more serious in that Rome was giving it her moral support¹⁾. The Attalids could not have made their greatest display of power and magnificence in precisely the time when the jealousy of Rome was most dangerous to them, and they had to strain every nerve to meet their domestic enemies.

It is possible, however, to put IG II 2 967 A and B in 194 190 or 190 186 and IG II 2 966 A and B in 182 178, the alternatives being to place 966 A and B in 190 186 and 967 A and B in 182 178. Between these assignments, then, the decision has finally to be made.

Two considerations favor the former of the two locations. First, in 186 the Attalids were engaged in war with Prusias of Bithynia²⁾: secondly from the precedence given Attalos over Eumenes in the list of victors in 966 B it has been concluded by Koehler³⁾ that Attalos was present in Athens at the games. In 186 he was conspicuously occupied in the war against Bithynia, whereas it is in itself probable that his residence in Athens belongs in or about the year 178 B.C.; for while Attalos was almost constantly employed in state business between 192 and 181 and between 175 and 171, he disappears from notice between 181 and 175⁴⁾. Furthermore, it is probable that the Athenian citizenship was conferred upon Philetairos, the younger brother of Attalos, in 175/4⁵⁾: Attalos himself must have obtained this honor earlier. Philetairos apparently received it at the time of his residence in Athens: it is likely that the same was true of Attalos. Hence the residence of Attalos in Athens preceded 175/4. Finally, Attalos and Ariarathes of Cappadocia were fellow-students in Athens after Carneades became school-head, and after he had acquired Athenian citizenship⁶⁾. Carneades died in 129/8 at the age of 85⁷⁾. He was hence born in 214/3. In 180 he was less than 35. He cannot have become school head much younger. Unfortunately, the chronology of the Academic succession is lost at the end of the third century B.C., so that we do not know precisely when Euandros gave place to Hegesinos, and Hegesinos to Carneades, but the dates, Enandros 224—200?, Hegesinos 200? to 180?, are quite possible⁸⁾.

Ariarathes was the son of Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia. The elder Ariarathes had as wife Antiochis, the daughter of Antiochos III of Syria.

1) Niese, *op. cit.* III pp. 75 ff. — 2) *Ibid.* pp. 70 ff.

3) *Ath. Mitt.* V p. 235.

4) See Wilcken *s. v. Attalos II* in Pauly-Wissowa.

5) IG II 435; cf. Ditt., *Syll.*² 299 n. 2. Ditt., OGIS 248 belongs to the same year, and line five, according to Dittenberger's cautious restoration runs: [τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν] νεώτερον Φιλ[έταιρον]. The context is, unfortunately, lost.

6) Ditt., *Syll.*² 298. — 7) Kirchner, PA no. 8257.

8) Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* pp. 344 ff.; cf. p. 349; §§ XXVII 15 and XXVIII 1. Mekler, *Academicorum Philosophorum index Herculensis* pp. 93 ff.

His marriage took place after the return of Antiochos from his campaign in the East (205/4), but before the outbreak of the war with Rome¹). It cannot have been consummated earlier than 204: for Antiochos III, married in 221²), begot, probably, a son first and daughters afterwards. At any rate, he cannot have had a female child older than 16 in 204. On the other hand the marriage of his daughter to Ariarathes IV cannot have occurred later than 203; for from this union Stratonike sprang³), who was married to Eumenes of Pergamon in 188. Ariarathes, the son, was much younger than Stratonike; for, if Diodoros⁴) is to be trusted, two (suppositious) sons (and perhaps also two other daughters) preceded him into the world, and they probably did not follow Stratonike closely. Diodoros, to be sure, does not mention Stratonike at all, but he omits Demetrios also, who was doubtless a full brother of Ariarathes, since he sided with him, and not with the suppositious one, Orophernes, in the later struggle for the throne of Cappadocia⁵). Accordingly, Ariarathes cannot have been older than 18 in 180. He was thus an ephebe in about 178. Now, in the early part of the first century B.C. it was traditional for the crown princes of Cappadocia to go for study to Athens during their ephebate. Thus Ariobarzanes and Ariarathes, the sons of the king whom the Cappadocians chose for themselves in 95 B.C., were ephebes at Athens in Apollodoros' archonship (c. 80 B.C.). They were enrolled in the deme Sypalettos⁶), to which Ariarathes V had also belonged, and thus by their choice of deme sought to preserve the traditions of the house to which their father had succeeded. The son of Ariarathes V, likewise named Ariarathes, and, doubtless, one of the five whom their unnatural mother poisoned in 130 B.C., was in Athens in c. 132. Since he was old enough to be an Athenian citizen, but was still a youth on his father's death in 130, it is probable that he too was a member of the ephebe-corps while in Athens. The practice was, doubtless, begun by Ariarathes V, who, if in Athens as an ephebe, must have been there in c. 178. Hence the college association of Ariarathes and Attalos, who was twice as old as his friend and perhaps already in love with his sister, belongs to somewhere in the period of 180—178; and, since Koehler's observation is probably correct, we have a definite reason for placing it in 178 precisely. Another memorial to the friendship of the Attalid and the Cappadocian prince is preserved in the Attic name *'Αγιαγάθης Ἀττάλου* borne by a *pythaïstes* to Delphi in 128 B.C. He appears in con-

1) Appian, *Syr.* 5. — 2) Niese, *op. cit.* II p. 366.

3) Ditt., OGIS 350.

4) XXXI 19 7; cf. Niese, *op. cit.* p. 248.

5) Polybios XXXIII 12 1; cf. Niese, *op. cit.* III p. 248 n. 3.

6) Wilhelm, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1902 p. 1908; Kirchner, PA Suppl. Nos. 1608 a and 1621 a.

junction with boys whose birth years fall, so far as determinable, between 145 and 135 B.C. His father was, doubtless, born shortly after 159, and named Attalos after the reigning king of Pergamon. This Attalos Sundwall (*Klio* VII pp. 454 f.) has taken to be none other than the king himself. After his accession to the throne he married Stratonike, his brother's widow, and begot several children, but refused to own them, says Plutarch (*De frat. amore* 18): he sent one of them, named Ariarathes after his friend and brother-in-law, the Cappadocian king, to Athens, explains Sundwall, and it is this one who appears in 128/7 B.C. as an Athenian citizen, probably a *Συπαλλήτιος*.

There is much that is staggering in this suggestion, much that would deepen still more the mystery which surrounds the later Attalids. Besides, while it is true that Stratonike was not older than 44 in 159 B.C., and hence still capable of bearing children to Attalos, the only report which affirms this fact affirms also that Attalos disowned them; yet our Ariarathes is designated son of Attalos. Moreover, a son of the king of Pergamon could not have been old enough to hold an Athenian magistracy in 132 B.C., yet a prince Ariarathes was *epimeletes* in Delos, probably prior to 132 B.C. Still, had the Ariarathes, son of Attalos, of 128/7 B.C. been denoted *Συπαλλήτιος*, we should not have found anyone of these difficulties insurmountable. Unfortunately, however, his deme-name is not given, and this leaves the contention of the Finnish scholar without a starting point. Had the *demotikon* been lacking, while those of the other *pythaïstai* were given, the omission would have been significant; but, since none at all are given, there is nothing noteworthy in the reference except the foreign names.

That of the father need not trouble us much. There was a mild epidemic of *Ἀτταλοί* in Athens in the last half of the second century B.C. At least nine new ones are found in the documents relating to the Pythaïs alone. Nor need Ariarathes betray the foreigner. In view of the friendship of the two kings to one another and to Athens, an Athenian, who had been named Attalos from the king of Pergamon, might readily call his son after the king of Cappadocia. That there was a fad for regal names at this time anyone may see for himself who looks up the occurrences of Ptolemaios, Seleukos, Amyntas, Alexandos, Pyrrhos, in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica*. On the other hand, the appearance of an Ariarathes without patronymic or *demotikon*, as *epimeletes* of the *emporion*¹⁾ in Delos suggests the presence of a Cappadocian prince a fact still to be reckoned with after Weil²⁾ and Sundwall³⁾ have shown that the

1) BCH XXIX pp. 18, 226. — 2) *Ath. Mitt.* VI p. 327.

3) *Untersuchungen über die attischen Münzen des neueren Stils, Öfversigt of Finska Vetenskaps Societetens Förhandlingar XLIX 1906—07* Nr. IX p. 218; cf. *Klio* VII p. 455.

third magistrate on the Nikogenes-Kallimachos series of Attic coins is not Ariarathes, but Andreas. As to the identity of this Cappadocian prince see *Classical Philology* III.

The dates thus assigned to the Panathenaic inscriptions are the following:

IG II 2 967 A	190 B.C. (or 194).
" 967 B	186 B.C. (or 190).
" 966 A	182 B.C.
" 966 B	178 B.C.
" 968	166 B.C.
" 969 A	162 B.C.
" 969 B	158 B.C.

It thus happens that — *Πτολεμαίου Μακεδών* (IG II 2 966 A) entered the chariot race in 182 B.C. I surmise that we have to do with a member of the Egyptian royal family — perhaps with Epiphanés himself, but possibly also with his son, afterwards Philometor. The Ptolemies were technically classified as Macedonians¹).

The presupposition with which we entered this enquiry must always cast a shadow of uncertainty over its results. Still, it is clear that the documents in question can be dated satisfactorily even though intervals of three years are assumed to have fallen between them. This, we contend, is a confirmation of the general belief that they belong to the great Panathenaia.

1) See *Classical Philology* III.