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Summary

Several gymnasiarchiai are testified for Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Rhodes: a gymnasiarchos of the presbyteroi, another of the neoteroi, and a tribal office connected to torch races. Within the predominantly epigraphic sources, the most revealing are Hellenistic CV inscriptions, a unique feature of Rhodian epigraphic habit. They enable us to place offices chronologically within the sequel of individuals’ public functions, showing that each gymnasiarchia was held at a certain age. Comparing Hellenistic and Roman Imperial inscriptions reveals a remarkable continuity in the representation of the Rhodian gymnasiarchiai, the single major divergence being a pronounced emphasis on the distribution of oil in the Imperial age.
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From the Hellenistic age onwards, the gymnasion was not only one of the buildings a proper Greek polis could not do without, developing into an important public space called a “second agora” by Louis Robert. It was also one of the major institutions of a polis, organizing the military and intellectual education of the young citizens as well as the athletic activities of various age classes.\(^1\) Given this status, control of the gymnasion, usually exercised by an official named gymnasiarchos, should have ranked among the top priorities of polis governments. Despite this, the gymnasiarchia has received comparatively little systematic attention: Following Jean Delorme’s seminal investigation into the gymnasion, which is focused on archaeological questions, the office is illuminated by some recent articles as well as Olivier Curty’s very useful collection of Hellenistic decrees honouring gymnasiarchos.\(^2\)

Due to the fact that especially in the epigraphic sources, gymnasiarchos usually figure not so much as magistrates active in an administrative context but as public benefactors, spending parts of their private wealth to support the costly institution, the main focus of recent research into the office has been embedded in the discussion of how euergetism defined the interaction between the population of the polis and its elites. This article is a minor contribution towards a more balanced view of the relationship between magistracy and liturgy, based on a cluster of local evidence not analyzed in detail so far.

1 Magistracy and liturgy

Before looking into the Rhodian evidence, it is necessary to address the basic question of whether the gymnasiarchia is to be understood primarily as a magistracy (arche) or as a liturgy (leitourgia). In his article on the Hellenistic gymnasiarchia, Christof Schuler has proposed that the gymnasiarchia was established as a proper magistracy in the second half of the fourth century, but that an earlier ‘liturgical model’ remained active throughout the Hellenistic period. On the relationship between arche and leitourgia, he cites Friedemann Quaß’ definition of the gymnasiarchia as a ‘liturgical magistracy’, meaning that while the gymnasiarchia was a public office of the polis, it also involved financial burdens imposed upon the magistrate.\(^3\) In contrast to Schuler, Olivier Curty sees the main distinction between types of the gymnasiarchia not in its liturgical aspects, but in the question of whether it was a magistracy of the polis or an internal function of the gymnasion.\(^4\) Focussing on the Hellenistic period, both Schuler and Curty adopt the widely accepted position that in the Roman Empire, the gymnasiarchia developed into a pure form of liturgy. As Louis Robert pointed out, parallel to the meaning of gymnasia in the Latin West, γυμνασιαρχεῖν could adopt the meaning of “to provide oil” in the Greek East also, and in some places the gymnasiarchia was one of the burdens that could be avoided by paying a summa honoraria.\(^5\)

There is, however, one well-known problem with the evidence for financial expenses associated with office-holding in the Hellenistic and Imperial poleis: We usually cannot tell whether these expenses were demanded by law (which they should have been in the case of a proper liturgy) or were a result of voluntary munificence, in which case they should correctly be called euergesia. In everyday life, the difference between these two options was probably of no great import, since members of the elites may have been more swayed by the expectations of the citizenry and their peer group than by legal

---


\(^3\) Schuler 2004, 171–172 and 189; Quaß 1993, 298–299 (“leiturgisch bestete ‘Ämter’”).

\(^4\) Curty 2015, 282–291 and 344. Because the Rhodian evidence does not contribute to the discussion of this undoubtedly pertinent question, I will not address it in any detail. Cf. my criticism of Curty’s assumption that a decree for a gymnasiarchos enacted by an association of gymnasiarchia users (e.g. koumophylax) indicates that the honorand was a functionary of this group and not of the polis (Kah 2017).

\(^5\) Robert 1939, 736 n. 2 (Robert 1969, 628 n. 2); Robert 1943, 192–194; BE 1953, 194; BE 1983, 84; cf. Delorme 1960, 301 (arguing that spontaneous acts of generosity developed into obligations over the long term); Schuler 2004, 189–191; Quaß 1993, 320; van Bremen 1996, 68–73; Curty 2009, 3; Curty 2025, 293–294; Scholz 2015, 83–86. For the meaning of Latin gymnasia cf. Fagan 1999 and Lafer 2013 (arguing that in the North African provinces, the term was used to designate athletic contest).
prescriptions. Then again, public functions in Hellenis-
tic poleis could also be understood as archai and leitour-
giatai at the same time. A well-documented example for
the gymnasiarchia is Priene: In a document announcing
the sale of a priesthood (diagraphe) dated to the middle of
the second century BC, the gymnasiarchia is named as one
of the liturgies that the buyer could avoid by meeting
a certain minimum offer in the auction. However, only
several decades later the gymnasiarchoi appear among the
officials the honorand of a decree had invited to an offi-
cial banquet, and this same group is referred to as “the
synarchiai” in two later decrees.6

As such, when looking at Greek magistrates one
should keep in mind that many of them had to make
expenses that would not be reimbursed by the polis. At
And it is important to recall that with each
time. A well-documented example for
Rhodes is Priene: In a document announc-
ing the honorand as an office holder, offerings with
the gymnasiarchia from the hellenistic age to the roman empi-

Rhodes may be regarded as a problematic example for
an investigation of the social evolution of the Greek polis
from Hellenism to the Roman Empire, since, in a
number of aspects, it was hardly typical: It was unusually
big, prosperous and powerful and, most importantly, it
managed to combine a democratic constitution with a
strong aristocratic elite throughout the Hellenistic age.
So, while there are indications of an evolution towards a
smaller, more concentrated aristocracy in the Early Em-

What makes Rhodes interesting in the context of
the gymnasiarchia is a unique epigraphic habit that allows
the hierarchy of public offices to be much better recon-
structed than in other poleis. Usually, the fact that a citi-
zen had held a magistracy is documented by statue bases
naming the honorand as an office holder, offerings with
the dedicant bearing the respective title, or honorific de-
crees that praise a citizen for having performed excel-


7 Athens: Hansen 1980, 152–154 (discussing Aischines. 3.14–16 and 29) and 167–169 (for the age limit). A minimum age of 30 for a Hellenistic gymnasiarchia can be found in a law of Koresia on Kos from the early third century BC, regulating a festival (IG XII, 5, 647; LGS 94; SIG III, 938; LSCG 98, l. 21–22). For exemptions from liturgies in Priene see above, for Kos (where, curiously, the gymnasiarchia is never mentioned among the liturgies listed specifically) cf. Wiemer 2003, 289–290. The magistracy left vacant διὰ τοῦ τῆς λειτουργίας βάρος is attested in I. Priene6 68 (I. Priene 112), l. 20–22. 

lently in a specific magistracy.9 From Rhodes, there is only a very small number of extant decrees, and of these hardly any are honorific.10 What we have instead is a considerable number of inscriptions, mostly on statue bases, recording the public *curriculum vitae* of the honorand. These inscriptions, which are typologically similar to the Roman Imperial *cursus* inscriptions, are first attested in the second century BC and continue into the Roman Empire. They list civic offices, military activities, priesthoods and other religious functions a citizen had performed, and they also name honours he (or occasionally she) had received from various corporate entities such as associations and foreign polities. These lists can be quite short or rather long, and they apply to adults of all ages. In the late first century BC, honours gain predominance over offices, the latter being sometimes completely omitted from the Early Empire onwards. Most of these CVs seem to be ordered chronologically, and only some thematically.11

In these CVs and other epigraphic evidence from Rhodes, three kinds of *gymnasiarchoi* are mentioned: a *gymnasiarchos* of the older men (presbyters), one of the younger men (neoteroi), and a tribal *gymnasiarchos* (γυμνασιαρχός φυλάς).12 I will examine the status of these offices and how they were connected to partitions of the *polis*, starting with the two *gymnasiarchoi* distinguished as *presbyters* and *neoteroi* respectively. They can be identified with the *gymnasiarchoi* named in the plural in some other Rhodian inscriptions: two in a dedication (13),13 and an unspecified number in a catalogue of the board of leading magistrates (*synarchontes*) (9) and in the still largely unpublished collection of decrees concerning the Rhodian library (5). When named separately, both offices are usually denominated either with an adjective (e.g. γυμνασιαρχός πρεσβυτέρος) or with a noun in the genitive plural (e.g. γυμνασιαρχός πρεσβυτέρων), the two forms each office’s designation being assumed to be synonymous.14

As is evident from their appearance among the *synarchontes* and the decrees regulating the library, these *gymnasiarchoi* were proper magistrates of the *polis*.15 As the title *gymnasiarchos* is occasionally qualified by the addition of the name of a festival (*κατὰ μεγάλα Ἀλίεια* or *κατὰ Ρωμαίες*), the *gymnasiarchoi* are sometimes assumed to have been involved with the organisation of these festivals, adding a special liturgical aspect to the office. But this kind of connection is only attested twice for *gymnasiarchoi*, whereas the qualification *κατὰ (μεγάλα) Ἀλίεια* is attested for a number of other offices, including military functionaries like *strategoi* and *hegemones* for whom it is difficult to see how they could have been directly involved with a festival, especially on a regular basis. So while holding an office in a year when the pentaeteric Halieia (for the Rhomaia cf. Appendix II) were celebrated obviously generally carried some kind of distinction, there is no special connection to the *gymnasiarchia*.16

---

9 There are some late Hellenistic decrees for lifetime achievements, but these usually emphasize the last offices held by the honorand, as these were normally the most prestigious. For instance, the extraordinary long decrees on the western wall of the *bouleuterion* in Priene mention surprisingly few offices held by their respective honorands (cf. Kah 2014, 158).

10 Cf. IG XII, 1, 890 (Lindos, ca. 161 AD: cf. Badoud 2015, 164–165 no. A 4); IG XII, 1, 2 (53 AD).

11 For this type of document that still has to be researched in detail cf. Kah 2016, 254 with n. 6.

12 The Rhodian *gymnasiarches* have been investigated rather cursorily: van Gelder 1900, 259; Cordiano 1997, 137–138; Schuler 2004, 166; Chankowski 2010, 199–200; Badoud 2015, 120–121. For public education in Rhodes in general cf. Bringmann 2002 and Drellos-Ilklidou 2014. – A note on Greek terms: Rhodian inscriptions are usually written in the Dorian dialect used on the island. Since simply transcribing these dialect forms might lead to confusion (for example *phyla*, *boule*, *boule*), I either use the standard Greek equivalents in the transcriptions (*boule*, *hegemon*) or I cite the Greek form (for instance *ἱγμοῦν*). I also do not transcribe inflected Greek words or phrases (such as *πρεσβυτέρων* and *κατὰ μεγάλα Ἀλίεια*). However, I retain the dialect forms in the transcriptions of names (e.g. Damagoras, Athana Linda and Halieia).

13 Numbers in bold type refer to the catalogue of epigraphic testimonia in Appendix I.

14 Hiller von Gaertringen 1894, 30; van Gelder 1900, 259; Maiuri 1925, 36; Chankowski 2010, 200. For the evidence see 11, l. 2, 10, l. 11 and 18, l. 8 (πρεσβυτέρος); 10, l. 6, 19, l. 14 and 26 (νεωτέρος); 8, l. 3 (πρεσβυτέρων); 12, l. 7, 17, l. 5, 20, l. 9 and 21, l. 6 (νεωτέρων).

15 Contra Chankowski 2010, 200 (“Le deux gymnasiarques semblent ne pas être les ‘chefs’ du gymnase … mais assumer leur charge … uniquement pour préparer un groupe des jeunes à la participation aux fêtes”), combining two erroneous interpretations: of the character of the age groups, and of the meaning of the addition of a festival to the title (cf. below).

16 *Gymnasiarchos* of the *polis*: 11, l. 2: *γυμνασιαρχὸς* πρεσβυτέρος κατὰ Ρωμαίες and 13, l. 3–4: *γυμνασιαρχήσαντες* κατὰ μεγάλα Ἀλίεια. There is also one attestation for a tribal *gymnasiarchos* (7, l. 13: *γυμνασιαρχήσαντες* φυλάς κατὰ Αλίεια μεγάλα). Cf. an inscription from the second century AD, where the honorand’s activities are listed separately as *gymnasiarchos*, *agonothetes* of the Halieia, and priest of Halios: 24, l. 3–6. Rhodian *gymnasiarchos* involved in the organisation of festivals: Maiuri 1925, 47; Cordiano 1997, 133; Chankowski 2010, 200; Drellos-Ilklidou 2014, 44 with n. 33. Other offices linked to the Halieia: Segre and Pagliani Carratell 1949–1951, 215 no. 75; tomas: Jacob 1932b, 188–190, no 18, l. 16; SEG 39, 739 (Kontorini 1989a, 164–165, no. 73); Badoud
Apart from one fragment from Megiste (28) and one from Loryma (3), epigraphic evidence for Rhodian gymnasiarchis is confined to the island itself.17 The earliest clear evidence for the two gymnasiarchoi of the polis is from the second century BC. But the magistracies should predate this since the tribal gymnasiarchoi are documented in the early third century BC (1), and the two gymnasiarchoi of the polis can feasibly be restored in a fragmentary dedication dated to the first half of the third century (2).

The architecture of the Rhodian gymnasion is not documented very well. Archaeological research has identified a building on the eastern slope of the acropolis below the temple of Apollo as a large gymnasion, but – as far as I know – apart from the big stadium, not much of the complex has been excavated to date. Several dedications of ἐπιστάται τῶν παιδῶν from a large peristyle building in the south-eastern part of the lower city indicate that it served as a palaistra for boys. Since the literary sources persistently speak of only one gymnasion in Rhodes, it is likely that only the building on the acropolis slope was called by that name in antiquity.18

Leaving the exact definition of the age groups aside for later inspection, I will begin not with one of the CVs mentioned, but with an equally extraordinary monument that strikingly illuminates the status of a Rhodian gymnasiarchos under the Roman Empire (26): In the late second century AD, the town of Lindos, one of the island’s three original cities that had formed the new polis of Rhodes in 408 BC, honored Publius Aelius Kallistratos, also called Plancianus – the “eternal, most ambitious eponymous gymnasiarchos” – by erecting a group of no less than eight statues of him and some members of his family: his grandfathers, his wife, his mother, his father, his uncle and his fraternal grandmother. On the base of each statue, his gymnasiarchia is described as being perpetual (δι’ αἰώνος) as well as eponymous. But the gymnasiarchos himself is not the most prominent figure on the monument: That place is held jointly by his uncle (26 e) and grandmother (26 g), who had promised the foundation to the polis of Rhodes and other beneficences to the Lindians. So, at first glance, these inscriptions conform closely to what is expected of a ‘liturgical’ gymnasiarchos in the Imperial age, the emphasis being on the provision of funds for the gymnasion, for which the magistrate in this case – obviously being rather young, with three grandparents still alive – did not even provide the money himself.19

An ‘eternal’ gymnasiarchia, meaning that there was

---


18 For the big complex below the acropolis see Laurenzi 1938, 25-26 and 146 pl. XVI and Kondis 1932, 363-371; cf. Delorme 1960, 121-122; Filimonos 1989, 129-132; Hoepfner 2002, 68-72 (with a very hypothetical reconstruction, especially of the library); Chankowski 2010, 224-226. Filimonos 1989, 122-133, identifies the peristyle with the Ptolemaion mentioned in Diod. 20.100.4 (ουσιαστηθένων δι’ των χρυσισιων τέμνων ἀνήκαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τετράγων, συνδυασμένοις παρ’ ἐκείνης πλευρὰς σταδίου πλευρὰς ἀνήκαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τετράγων, οἰκοδομήσαντες παρ’ ἑκάστην ἑπίκτητην πλευρὰς στοὰν σταδίου, ὃ προσηγόρευσαν Πτολεμαῖον), a building she interprets as a gymnasium for boys. Since the literature is confined to the island itself.

19 Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1 argued that Kallistratos had received his gymnasiarchia posthumously, referring to the phrase ἐκείνης πλευράς ἀνήκαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τετράγων, meaning that there was a place held jointly by his uncle and grandmother, obviously being rather young, with three grandparents still alive – did not even provide the money himself. An ‘eternal’ gymnasiarchia, meaning that there was...
a foundation providing money for the funding of the gymnasion in the future, is attested for Rhodes only in this text, and an eponymous gymnasiarchia just in one other.\(^{20}\) However, the accentuation of financial aspects, specifically the distribution of oil, is associated with both gymnasiarchia of the polis in a number of other inscriptions since the middle of the first century AD. But in all instances, the office and the distribution, the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαιοθέσια, while being closely connected, remain two distinct entities. And there is no indication that the distribution was not a voluntary act of the gymnasiarchos. On the contrary: The frequent emphasis of the fact that the gymnasiarch had contributed oil for a whole year – in one instance (22) explicitly even for all 13th months of an intercalary year – suggests that at least the extent of the distribution was not taken for granted. And in a Rhodian decree of the first century AD regulating the distribution and the sale of oil, probably in the gymnasion, the gymnasiarchoi are not mentioned at all. Rather, the duty is assigned to unspecified men who were responsible for allotted days (29). If a gymnasiarchos defrayed the costs of the distribution, he was probably relieving these men voluntarily. So there is no indication that on Rhodes γυμνασιαρχεῖν ever came to mean ‘to distribute oil’ in itself. And supplying the gymnasion with oil had of course already been a issue in the Hellenistic age. For Rhodes, there is the well-known passage in Polybius documenting that Hieron and Gelon of Syracuse donated oil for the “choregia of providing oil to the users of the gymnasion” after the great earthquake of 227 BC, and evidence for the term θέσις τοῦ ἐλαιοθέσιον dates back to the first century BC.\(^{21}\)

Kallistratos’ young age at his gymnasiarchia has a parallel in another inscription from the Imperial age: In the middle of the second century AD, a man called Damagoras was gymnasiarchos neoterōs in the year his father held the eponymous priesthood of Halios (23, l. 3–6). Yet if we look at the Hellenistic evidence, the picture is rather similar. A number of CV inscriptions make it possible to reconstruct patterns in the chronological order in which Rhodians exercised public functions, and some of these texts are detailed enough to estimate the approximate age of the office holder at certain stages of his CV. The best example is a block of a statue base from the first half of the first century BC, featuring the longest known Rhodian CV from the Hellenistic age (10). This inscription probably includes the most detailed report on the offices a single person held in a polis of the Hellenistic age. Since it is nearly impossible to translate the catalogues of technical terms while retaining (or at least imitating) the syntactic structure and the layout of the original, I instead provide tabular overviews which separately list the honorand, the dedicants and – most importantly – the individual offices and additional information related to them, and also sum up longer entries of minor interest in the present context, such as decorations bestowed upon the honorand.

The honorand, whose name can be restored as Polykleos based on the plausible assumption that he was the fraternal grandfather of the fourth dedicant, had held a number of military posts and high civic offices in Rhodes. During his career which reached its peak when he was chairman of the Rhodian council (pyraτανις) in the First Mithridatic War,\(^{22}\) he had held all three aforementioned gymnasiarchiai, having been, in this order, tribal gymnasiarchos, gymnasiarchos neoteros and gymnasiarchos presbyteros. Leaving the first function aside for later inspection, the other two are clearly placed in

---

\(^{20}\) For the meaning of αἰώνος (or δι’ αἰῶνος) γυμνασιαρχεῖν see Robert 1960, 294–298 (Robert 1969, 810–814) and Robert 1966a, 83–85; cf. Scholz 2015, 87–88. The qualification of an office as ‘perpetual’ was not limited to the gymnasiarchia; Laun 1914, 46–50. While Blinkenberg was puzzled by the apparent contradiction between ἐπώνυμος and δι’ αἰῶνος in the denomination of the gymnasiarchia (I. Lindos II, 465, comm. to f), Louis Robert believed that the problem could be explained easily (Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1); Based on his assumption that Kallistratos was honoured posthumously (see above), he argued that ἐπώνυμος is used to demonstrate the link of the honorand’s name to the annual distributions made in his memory. But this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with the fact that a gymnasiarchos quite certainly appears in a dating formula alongside the priest of Athana Lindia on the Lindian statue base 25. Why and in which context this kind of epymonic dating was used remains unclear. It is improbable that the practice was confined to Lindos, since there is no discernible reason why the Lindians alone should have distinguished a magistracy held in the city of Rhodes in this way.

\(^{21}\) Polyb. 5,88,5: ἔρων γὰρ καὶ Γῆλοι … ἐδώκαν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἀργεῖριον τάλαντα πρὸς τὴν εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον τὸις ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ χορηγοῖς. As the sum of 75 talents of silver is disproportionately high, a reference to the restoration of the city’s fortifications has probably been lost in the textual tradition: Wallbank 1957, 617–618. For the provision of oil to the Hellenistic gymnasion in general and the growing requirements put on local elites by the end of royal euergetism see Frohlich 2009. The first reference to the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαιοθέσιον in Rhodes is 15; the testimonial of the Imperial age are 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22; cf. the ἐποθέσεις to the Lindians mentioned in 26 e, l. 13–14 and g, l. 12–12.

\(^{22}\) l. 13: ἐν τῶι πολέμῳ. This war can be identified by the naunarchos Damagoras mentioned in l. 14, who is also known from narrative sources (cf. Kontorinis 1993, 94–96). For the dating of his latest offices cf. Appendix II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>line</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>honorand</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polykles – – –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosos, Polykles and Kalliarista,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polykles, son of Polykles, grandson of Polykles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(grandchildren)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedicants</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military service on light and heavy warships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ἀφράκτοι and κατάφρακτοι νάες) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsalaried commander (ἄγιμων ἄμισθος) in the Lindian chora</td>
<td>4–5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiasarchos of a phyle and victorious at the Poseidania,</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhomai and Halieia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiasarchos neoteros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presided over elections of jurors by lot</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30–35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commander of a squadron of light warships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ἄρχων ἀφράκτων)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commander of a squadron of 'fives' (ἄγιμων πεντηρέων)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102 BC</td>
<td>35–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed by the People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as commander of commanders (ἄγιμων τῶν ἄγιμων)</td>
<td>8–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant in a sea battle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategos on the Mainland (Peraía) and re-elected twice</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiasarchos presbyteros</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretary of the council (γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς) and crowned by his colleagues in office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἴτισι 'in the war' and crowned by his colleagues in office</td>
<td>12–13</td>
<td>88–85 BC</td>
<td>50–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>councillor of the nauarchos Damagoras</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phylarchos and victorious at the Epitaphia</td>
<td>14–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triarchos of a 'four' (τετρήρης) and victorious</td>
<td>15–16</td>
<td>55–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the examination of the ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choregos of the pyrrhiche</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triarchos of a 'four' (τετρήρης) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78 BC (†)</td>
<td>60–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choregos at the tragedies and victorious</td>
<td>17–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the Alexandria and Dionysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honours</td>
<td>18–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honoured by various associations and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tinct areas of his CV: He was *gymnasiarchos neoteros* in an early phase of his career after the general military service in the navy frequently recorded at the beginning of Rhodian CVs, a command in the territorial army (ἐγκήρυκον ἀμίσθους) that is also associated with young men in two other inscriptions, and being tribal *gymnasiarchos*.25 When he was *gymnasiarchos presbyteros* he was evidently older, as he already had been *strategos* (στρατηγός) three times and was on his way to becoming secretary of the council and *prytanis*. For this stage of his career, we have a close parallel in another, fragmentary statue base (8); Before the *gymnasiarchia*, the honorand whose name is lost had been treasurer, *strategos* and *prytanis*; afterwards, he had commanded a heavy warship, been victorious as a *choregos* (χορηγός) and held the eponymous priesthood of Kamiros (*damiourgos*).

Combining the positions of the *gymnasiarchia* in the CV with the observation that the offices are sometimes qualified with adjectives leads to the conclusion that the *gymnasiarchos* belonged to the respective age groups. However, the alternative use of the genitive plural implies that they were not simply a team of one younger and one older magistrate, but that each was responsible for his own age group. In recent literature, the Rhodian *neoteroi* and *presbyteroi* have been interpreted as age classes of the Rhodian youth (perhaps influenced by the *neoteroi* and *presbyteroi* in Chios and some other places), or as minors and adults.24 But there is no compelling reason to assume that on Rhodes the terms were used any differently from what was customary in the Greek world, the *presbyteroi* being the older citizens, the *neoteroi* the younger, the dividing line usually set at the age of 30.25 That the *neoteroi* were not called by the more frequent term *νεωτέροι* may be a simple linguistic variation reflecting the contrast to *presbyteroi* implied in the denomination of the two *gymnasiarchia*. Or it may be connected to the fact that no *ephebeia* is attested on Rhodes, so that the *neoteroi* may have been comprised of the age classes called *neoi* and *epheboi* elsewhere.26

If the *gymnasiarchoi* were members of the respective age groups using the *gymnasion*, this constituted a limiting factor in the control the *polis* exercised over the *gymnasiarchia*. In the case of the *gymnasiarchos* of the *neoteroi*, an obvious alternative would have been to select an older citizen to keep them in line.27 And it is highly likely that the groups active in the *gymnasion* generally formed exclusive circles within their own age classes. For Rhodes, this assumption is supported by a statue base for a man holding this office dated to ca. 80–70 BC (11), listing about 450 names of Rhodians who participated in erecting the statue and who therefore are generally identified as *presbyteroi*. Even if the exact size of the Rhodian citizenry in the first century BC cannot be determined, it is obvious that 450 can only have been a small percentage of all male citizens aged over 30.28

---

23 In Rhodian CVs, naval service is usually indicated by στρατηγούμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀμφότεροις καὶ ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί and similar formulas (cf. Gabrielsen 1997, 95 and, for the evidence, 7, l. 10–11 and 12, l. 5–6). The posting as an unaltered *legemon* is also part of the CVs documented in 7 (l. 14: γενόμενος ἀμισθοσ ἐπισκέπτθει τῇ πόλει τῆς νάσου, positioned likewise in between the naval service and the tribal gymnasiarchia) and on a stone stele dedicated by a Carian *koinon* listing naval service as the only other function of the honorand (Blümel 1991, 175–175 no. 782; Bresson, Brun, and Varinlioglu 2001, 188–189 no. 63, l. 4–7: γεγονός ἀμισθοσ ἐπισκέπτθει τῇ πόλει τῆς νάσου). It is also mentioned in the dedication IG XII, 3, 71: Γέων Ἐρωνος ἐπί τοὺς ἀμφότερος καὶ τοὺς πολεμικούς καταφράκτους τῆς πόλεως. Chankowski 2010, 200 (age classes of the Rhodian youth); Badoud 2010, 133 no. D 8 (*presbyteroi* meaning ‘adult’, i.e. aged over 18 years); Badoud 2015, 120: “En l’absence de classe d’âge intermédiaire, le premier [sc. of the gymnasiarchia] était responsable des mineurs, le second de majeurs”.

24 For ephebic age classes, see Hin 2007, 147 n. 21–22 and Fröhlich 2013, 81–82.


26 For the terms *neoi* and *neoteroi*, see Forbes 1953, 60–61 (referring to L. Sestos 1, l. 71, where *νεότεροι* is employed instead of *νεωτέροι* for *epheboi* used otherwise in the decree); Knoepfler 1979, 176; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 77; Dreyer 2004, 214; van Bremen 2013, 33–34 (with n. 9: “Neoteroi was used only in opposition to presbyteroi”); cf. Fröhlich 2013, 82–84; Kennell 2013; Curty 2015, 63 with n. 83. For the arguments against an *ephebeia* in Rhodes see Chankowski 2010, 198–206 with Kah 2016, 268. According to Chankowski’s convincing argumentation, the *epheboi* mentioned in 2 are a case in point, since in the early Hellenistic age the term usually denoted the members of an *ephebeia* and not an age group in athletic contests. Therefore, the divergent Rhodian usage indicates that the Rhodians did not have the institution at this time, and there are no later epigraphic attestations to an *ephebeia* apart from local institutions in the subject Peraià (cf. n. 17).

27 For the *neoi* as a “disruptive element” in the *polis* cf. van Bremen 2013, 33–44.

28 For 11 cf. Appendix II. According to various demographic models, individuals over 30 years of age made up between half and three-quarters of a pre-modern adult male population (cf. the literature cited in Kah 2014, 161 n. 90), and the Rhodian citizenry must have been substantially larger than 2000. A similar small sample is documented in a decree of the *presbyteroi* of Iasos, probably from the second half of the second century BC, indicating a total of 74 ballots cast in the voting (I. Iasos 93; Fröhlich 2013, 106–107 no. 2, l. 23). Parallel accounts in decrees of the *polis of Iasos* specify between ca. 800 and 1100 votes in the assembly (for the evidence see Fabiani 2012, 114–115, Fröhlich 2013, 80 n. 86 and Kah 2014.
It is interesting to compare an instance where an honorand of an inscription is called γυμνασίαρχος νεωτέρων in his CV (12): The man in question, called Pausanias, son of Leon, was active in the first half of the first century BC, and must have been rather young when his statue base was commissioned by the council of Rhodes, as most of the functions listed are typical of the early part of a public career: victory in a boys’ wrestling contest, honour from the boule (SEG 55, 1251; Curty 2015, 330–333), in contrast to voting results numbering between ca. 900 and 2000 documented for the assembly of the associated polis of Kolophon (Duplouy 2013).
service in the navy, command of a light warship (ἀφρα-κτον), and the gymnasiarchia of the neoteroi. Assuming the CV is ordered chronologically, one could argue that it is unlikely that Pausanias was trierarchos of a regular warship while still being a neoteroi. So it is possible that he became gymnasiarchos of the neoteroi later, the designation γυμνασιάρχος νεωτέρων indicating that he did not belong to this age group himself anymore. Yet the positioning of the command of a small two-banked warship and the phylarchia before general military service in the navy is difficult to reconcile with a chronological order. In most other CVs, the military service is the first entry, only occasionally preceded by activities of boys (such as the wrestling victory here). One solution might be that the first three entries all cover activities of the honorand as a minor, since an explicit attestation of a gymnasiarchos of men might indicate that there were phylarchos of boys as well. However, the CV’s chronological order could simply be jumbled.

In any case, it does not seem possible to explain the variation γυμνασιάρχος πρεσβυτέρων in a similar way. Since the office holder can hardly have been too young to be a presbyteros, the only alternative explanation would be that he was too old. But even accepting the assumption that there was a maximum age for the presbyteros – which is, as far as I know, neither supported by the sources in general nor by the Rhodian evidence – this explanation would not conform to the only attestation of the term gymnasiarchos πρεσβυτέρων which appears in a seemingly chronologically ordered CV before the command of a heavy warship and several other public offices (8, l. 3), virtually excluding the possibility that the honorand was already elderly at the time.

The third gymnasiarchia attested on Rhodes is the office of γυμνασιάρχος φυλαρχον φυλάς. In 10 discussed above, it is attested for a young man at the start of his public career. This age is confirmed by two other inscriptions: In 7, the honorand Lysimachos was probably in his late twenties or early thirties, as he was already married and had two daughters, while his public career was still limited to his service in the navy, a posting as ἄγγε-μὼν ἀμφέτος in the territorial army on the island and the tribal gymnasiarchia. In the second inscription (4), the tribal gymnasiarchia is named first in a compact selection of public functions cumulating in the offices of tamias, strategos and prytanis.

In the CV of Polykles (12, l. 7–8), the entry γυμνασιάρχος φυλαρχον φυλάς is combined with victories at agonistic festivals. Two fragmentary victory lists of the Great Erethimia from the early third century BC show that the tribal gymnasiarchia were connected with the torch race teams (1). The official named first together with the victorious tribe is not the gymnasiarchos but the phylarchos, the latter function being attested more often in Rhodian CV inscriptions. It is usually listed with victories at agonistic festivals and seems to have been performed by older men, like the gymnasiarchia of the presbyteroi. Since in other places, torch racing teams were organised by lampadarchoi, the Rhodian phylarchia and the tribal gymnasiarchia should be local variations of this liturgy. As there were two races, one of andres and one of ephebei, Vassa Kontorini has proposed that the phylarchos was responsible for the former group, the gymnasiarchos for the

---

29 Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 262 no. 6: Πέθων Λύσωνος | Ιπτάμος | ψυλλορρύσας ανδρῶν | και νικάσας | Διᾶ Ορλυγίω|a. There were torch races of ephebos in Rhodes, but the official in charge of their teams was probably the tribal gymnasiarchos (cf. p. 282–283). If the honorand of 12 was phylarchos of boys as a minor, he must have been something like the team captain, and the trierarchia of the two-banked ship mentioned before (12, l. 2–3: τριηραρχησαντα | δικρότου, to be complemented by πλοῖον or ναός) might have been a specific position in a boys’ boat race. The term deviates from the usual, well-attested Rhodian naval nomenclature, with only a single parallel in IGR IV, 1116, l. 4 (τριηραρχησαντος | ἐπικώπου πλοίου δικρότου) that is conspicuous by asserting that the dikrōtos was a ship (πλοῖον) as well as equipped with oars (ἐπικώπου), both characteristics being self-evident in a warship. I am not convinced by the interpretation offered by Gabrielsen 1997, 122–125, that these expressions designate privately owned warships, especially since the scant attestations do not correspond to the widespread use of these kinds of vessels assumed by Gabrielsen.

30 An inattentive redaction of the inscription might also explain the entry stating that the honorand had been crowned by (several) synarchai (12, l. 7–8: στομονούσθητας ἐπὶ τῶν | [π]υλαρχ[αυν]) although the inscription mentions only one office (the gymnasiarchia) that could have been part of such a board of magistrates.


32 The festivals named are the Poseidania, the Rhomaia and the Halieia (l. 5–6), indicating that Polykles had either been tribal gymnasiarchos repeatedly or (since that should be indicated by the addition of a multiplicative adverb) that the festivals named had all been held in a single year. In this case, the Halieia mentioned should be the lesser annual version of the festival (cf. SIG1 III, 1067 comm. at l. 12; Arnold 1936, 455; Morelli 1959, 97), since the pentaeteric μέγα λάιον (cf. e.g. 7, l. 15) were celebrated within two years distance of the Rhomaia (cf. the reconstruction of the Rhodian festival cycle in the first century BC by Badoud 2015, 133–134).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>honorand: Lysimachos, son of Aristeidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aristeidas, son of Aristeidas (father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gorgon, Aristeidas, Philinna, Timakrate (brothers and sisters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boulakrate, daughter of Isidotos (wife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boulakrate and Gorgo, daughters of Aristeidas (daughters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Isodotos, son of Aratogenes (father in law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Line age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>dedicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>military service on <em>tribomoiadas</em> and heavy warships (κατάφρακτοι ναίες)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>and honoured by an association of soldiers (Παναθηναϊστᾶν στρατεύομένων κοινόν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>and crowned with a golden crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>unsalaried commander (αγμην ομισθος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>in the <em>chora</em> on the island (Rhodes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>gymnasiarchos</em> of a <em>phyle</em> (in a year with the) <em>Halieia megala</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 190–192 no. 19 (7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 192–193 no. 20 (4).
latter.\textsuperscript{33} That seems plausible, but it is curious that the tribe’s name is recorded only with the phylarchos, giving the impression that he and the gymnasiarchos belonged to the same phyle. Since the two victorious teams can hardly have been from the same tribe on a regular basis, it should also be considered that both officials belonged to the team of the andres, making the gymnasiarchos some kind of team captain.

Another unexplained point is why the tribal officials were called gymnasiarchoi in the first place. Their attested area of activity, their youthful age and their subordinate position to the phylarchoi virtually exclude the possibility that they were responsible for local gymnasia. Furthermore, there is no evidence for such institutions in the first place. The urbanised tribal centres of Lindos and Kamiros may have had some kind of facilities for physical training that remain unknown due to the limited archaeological exploration of these sites. The foundations promised by the family of Kallistratos in the late second century AD illustrate the situation in Lindos, distinguishing a ‘perpetual’ gymnasiarchia for the polis from equally ‘eternal’ annual distributions of oil (ἐλαιοθέσια) for the Lindians (26 e, l. 6–16 and g, l. 5–3). Thus, the latter apparently had need of oil without possessing an institutionalised gymnasion. And the lalysis did not have any reason to have a gymnasion of their own in the first place, as lalysos had evolved into a village after the synoikismos in 428 BC, with the majority of the population migrating to the new city of Rhodos. Finally, the possibility that the tribal gymnasiarchia refers to a local institution antedating the synoikismos is rendered improbable by the evolution of the gymnasiarchia in general. So the reason for this denomination of the function remains enigmatic.

In any event, the tribal gymnasiarches demonstrate that apart from the magistracies of the polis, one also has to take into account the possibility of offices of subdivisions such as tribes. In this context, it is interesting to observe that the tribal gymnasiarchia not only appears in the context of the phylai of the city of Rhodes, but also in a victory list of an association (6). In a close parallel to the victory lists mentioned above, the catalogue has seven entries dated by an agonothetes, followed by the victorious phyle, the phylarchos and the gymnasiarchos. The association had obviously copied a part of Rhodian public organisation on a lesser scale: Like the polis, the koinon was divided into three phylai, named after its founder, his wife and his daughter-in-law, and held games with contesting tribal teams.

3 Conclusion

The Rhodian evidence shows that while the distribution of oil was an increasingly important aspect of the gymnasiarchia under the Roman Empire, there is no indication that it was ever seen as primarily liturgical. In the inscriptions, the distribution is added to the office and treated as a voluntary munificence. Other aspects of the office remained unchanged: Since the Hellenistic age, the Rhodians had two annual gymnasiarchoi, one for the younger men (neoteros) and one for the older men (presbyteros). While these officials were magistrates of the polis, their positions in Rhodian CV inscriptions show that they were recruited from the respective age groups, limiting the control the polis could exercise over the gymnasion. The third Rhodian gymnasiarchia was a tribal office exercised by young men in cooperation with an older official, the phylarchos, both offices being mentioned only in the context of organizing teams for torch races. Combined with the fact that these tribal offices were copied by a Rhodian koinon, this variation demonstrates that not every attestation of a gymnasiarchos has to be connected to a gymnasion or a public magistracy.

A further perspective for research offered by the Rhodian CVs would be a review of the status of the gymnasiarchia within the magistratures of a polis, the commonly held opinion being that the gymnasiarchia was one of the most important offices of the Hellenistic polis but lost some of its standing under the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33} Kontorini 1975, 109–111; cf. Schuler 2004, 166 and Chankowski 2010, 205 discussing only the gymnasiarchia. For the lampadararchia in general see Oehler 1924 (cf. the evidence from Priene cited above). The phylarchos is also mentioned in 10, l. 14–15 and 12, l. 3. For further epigraphic evidence cf. l. Lindos I, 222, comm. to l. 4–5 and Kontorini 1975, 109.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. Scholz 2015, 89–90. The surprisingly low number of texts in the new collection of Hellenistic decrees for gymnasiarchos (Curty 2015) actually encourages to question the importance of the gymnasiarchia in this age. Even allowing for the fact that Curty did not include decrees giving no information about the activities of a gymnasiarchos or fragmentary texts, the number of only 40 – including three excerpts from decrees for an honorand who had held a greater number of offices from Priene (no. 24–26), and to be enlarged by the addition of seven decrees from Pergamon only listed in a short appendix (Curty 2015, 335–336) – seems quite mod-
Contrasting with this, evidence for the *gymnasiarchia* in
the Rhodian CVs seems to stay remarkably unchanged
over time. While the few references to the tribal *gym-
nasiarchos* are all from Hellenistic inscriptions, both *gym-
nasiarchoi* of the *polis* feature in CVs from the second cen-
tury BC to the second century AD. The rich Rhodian
material would make it possible to contrast the nine CVs
mentioning the *gymnasiarchia* to those which do not. The
overall number of CVs in Rhodian inscriptions being
at least several dozen, *gymnasiarchoi* are obviously men-
tioned in just a fraction of them. It would take a detailed
investigation of this type of inscription to reveal the in-
formation necessary to put this observation into perspec-
tive, such as the chronological development of the CVs
and the public functions listed in them, or the selective
criteria discernible from their composition.
Appendix I: Epigraphic sources

(A) The Rhodian gymnasiarchoi


2 The restoration is suggested by the parallel in 13.


5 Collection of decrees concerning the library (βιβλιοθήκη), Rhodos, second century BC.

Chaviaras, Bresson hesitantly dates the inscription to the fourth or third century BC (“les eta ouverts” must be a misprint since there is only one Eta in the preserved text and the letter form cannot be characterised as “open” anyway). The mention of the gymnasiarchos makes a fourth-century date improbable, and if the inscription comprised a CV, this should date it to even later than the third century.

In l. 3, Bresson retains the restoration [Ἀπόλ]λ]ων proposed in the editio princeps, but Blümel, arguing that a dedication to Apollo made by a gymnasiarchos is unlikely, considers reading – – – ὉΝ I – – –.


The inscriptions have been palaeographically dated to the second century. There are some historical arguments for a date after 168 BC (Wiemer 2002, 334 with n. 38) that will have to be reappraised once frg. b has been published in full. The narrowing of the date to 140–120 BC proposed by Rosamilia 2014, 354–355 is based on a weak prosopographical parallel only.

In the second and third decree of frg. b, the first two lines after the date contain the phrase πρυτανεύντων τὰ μεγάλα Ἐρεθίμια·
The gymnasiarchia are mentioned several times in other parts of the decrees: frg. a, l. 6: (i.e. δὲ τὰς κατὰ τὸν γυμνασιαρχὸν φήματα κατὰ Καμίρῳ) and more often in the unpublished text (cf. Papachristodoulou 1986, 267; Rosamilia 2014, 333-336). The plural probably refers to the gymnasiarchos presbyteros and the gymnasiarchos noterōs concurrently in office (cf. Sege 1935, 219), rather than to a series of individual gymnasiarchi in the future.


The list has seven entries following the pattern ἐπὶ ἄγωνονθετα τὸν δείνος ἐνίκησε φυλᾶ, . . ., φύλαρχος ὁ δείνα, γυμνασιαρχὸς ὁ δείνα. There are three pHyllai (Nikaisos, Basili, Olympias), named after the founder of the koion, Nikasion from Kyzikos, his wife Olympias from Soloi and their daughter-in-law, a Rhodian called Basilis, daughter of Demetrios (cf. face B, l. 58-64).  

7 Statue base, Rhodos, late second century BC: Jacopi 1932b, 190-192 no. 19; DNO V, 3986.  

I. 10-15: στρατευασάμενον ἐν τριμηλία καὶ ἐν ταῖς κατασφακίκαις ἔν τε τοῖς ἀφράκτοις καὶ γνώμων ἀμείβαι ἐπί τῶν παναθηναΐκων καὶ γυμνασιαρχῆς φυλᾶς Σύριας καὶ τιμαθέντα ὑπὸ Παναθηναϊκῶν καὶ τιμαθέντας κωρῆς καὶ πυρρίχαις τῆς εἰς τὰ βυβλίον, ἀστυνόμοι, ἐν πορίου καὶ νικασάντας ἐν τῶι πολέμοι καὶ στεφανωθέντας καὶ ἀποδειχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασιαρχῆς καὶ τοὺς συνάρχαντας χρυσέωιστεφάνωι καὶ αμφιπολακές, καὶ δρόμωι καὶ δάμωι.  

8 Fragment of a statue base, Rhodos, second or first century BC: Maiuri 1925, 35-36 no. 21 with corrections by Pugliese Carratelli 1952-1954a, 311 n. 2.  


Maiuri’s restoration and κατασταγείαν ἐπὶ τὰς χώρας in l. 1 is to short, and the spacing between KA and the lower end of a vertical stroke indicated by his drawing fits KAT better than KAI. In l. 4, Maiuri has πεντή [pente] (with PENTE in the drawing) but when a type of ship is added to the title of a triarchos in Rhodian inscriptions, it is always named in the singular.  

9 Statue base, Rhodos, ca. 100-90 BC: Maiuri 1925, 32-35 no. 20; Badou 2015, 398 no. 31.  


13 Dedication, Rhodos, ca. 60 BC: Maiuri 1925, 46–47 no. 36. On the date: Badoud 2015, 210 no. 127.

14 Fragmentary dedication, Rhodos, first century BC: Konstantinopoulos 1964, 11, no. 14; pl. 4 β.


16 Fragment, Ialysos, Hellenistic: Jacopi 1932a, 127 no. 8; Papachristodoulou 1989, 175 no. 15.


18 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, ca. 45 AD: I. Lindos II, 384 d; Badoud 2015, 439–441 no. 63. On the date see Habicht 1990 (SEG 42, 668).

19 Statue base with CV, Lindos, ca. 70–120 AD: I. Lindos II, 454.


21 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, between 80 and 90 AD: Pugliese Carratelli 1939–1942, 154–155 no. 14;
pl. XII; Bresson 2004, 228–230 no. 2; SEG 54, 723.

L. 5–14: γυμνασιαρχήσαντα | νεωτέρων καὶ ποιη|
sάμενον τάς θέσιν του ἐλάιου | ἐξ [τη]ς [ν]ής | [ε]ῖνον ἐπί | μήνας δέκα δόο | καὶ πρεσβύτερα | ἀνθυπάτους | καὶ τριτούς καὶ 
τυχόντα τάς | Ρωμαίων | πολιτείας | καὶ τεῖς | της οὐς | Σε|
βαστοὺς καὶ ποτὶ ἀνθυπάτους καὶ | ποτὶ ἐπί | τριτούς καὶ 
tυχόντα τάς |

The honorand whose name is lost is probably T. Flavius Aglochartos, honoured in 20 (as proposed by Bresson 2004, 230–232) since both CVs exhibit a number of similar entries: honours by the three tribal centres, the gymnasarchia of the neoteroi and the thesiis of the elaiou, the priesthood of Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus, the embassies, and participation in epangelia and proeisphoriai. However, both CVs also show some differences, which may be due to their respective redactions. But since neither the identical functions nor their sequence are uncommon, it is not impossible that the bases belonged to statues of two separate honorands with similar CVs.


L. 5–8: τριμερεῖσαντα, ἡμετέρα | τῶν ἀντικριτῶν, 
γυμνασιαρχήσαντα ποιήσαμε | τοὺς | 
τάς θέσιν 

For the intercalary 13th month in Rhodian chronology see Badoud 2015, 138–140.

23 Statue base with CV, Lindos, middle of the second century AD: I. Lindos II, 482 (see Appendix III).

L. 2–5: ἡμετέρας ἐπί τοῦ προπάτου Αλίου κατά 
τὸ δῆθος | τοῦ νικὸς τοῦ Δαμα | γόραν δ' 
γυμνασιαρχὸς | νεώτερος | οὐ | 

Τοῦ 
μᾶς ἐπὶ 


L. 5–6: τοῦ γυμνασιαρχοῦ | καὶ 
τῶν ιερᾶς | καὶ 
τῶν μεγάλων | τῶν 

This list of public functions is unusual for Rhodian CVs insofar it uses nouns and not participles. Since it is very unlikely that the honorand was gymnasarchos, ago


- - - | [ - – - ] 

If the re

Badoud 2015, 142 no. 38 dates the base to ca. 141/142 AD, identifying the priest of Athen Lindia mentioned as the one honoured in IG XII, 1, 832 whose name was previously restored as [Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Ἀγήτορα βʹ | (l. 1). Prosopographically, the identification seems plausible, and the restoration [Μάρκου Ἀφρί]λιου Ἀγήτορος βʹ | is | 


All statues were dedicated by the priest of Athen Lindia and of Zeus Polieus, the mastoros and the Lindians. They honour the gymnasarchos himself (f, l. 3–8): Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Καλλιστρατόν | τὸν καὶ 

Πλαγκιανόν | τοῦ διὰ 

θεοῖς. | [Μάρκου Ἀφρί]λιου Ἀγήτορος βʹ | (l. 1). Prosopographically, the identification seems plausible, and the restoration [Μάρκου Ἀφρί]λιου Ἀγήτορος βʹ | is | 

Base g, l. 5–13: ἐπαγγελματίας νοθετήσαντα τοῦ γυμνασιαρχοῦ | Πν. Αἴλ. | Θεοῦ 

γραφεὶς καὶ τῇ μεγάλῃ π[ῶ]θει Ὀδόν | τῶν διʼ

Part i (set below the bases): έπει[το] γυμνασιαρχοῦ νεωτέρου Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Καλλιστάρατου τοῦ καὶ Πλαγκιανοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου Ἐρεινάεως.

The uncle Publius A[elius] Theon, son of Zenodotos alias Theon, had also been gymnasiarchos, a fact only mentioned on the base of the statue of the grandmother Aelia Zenodote (g, l. 6). Since he is not called γυμνασιαρχήσας, strictly he should have held the office at the time the bases were dedicated, resulting in a ‘family team’ of uncle and nephew officiating in both gymnasiarchiai in the same year. But the use of the noun could also be explained as resulting from Latin influence (cf. the comment on 24).


Face a, l. 1–6: ...ου Θεοδώρου[ου] | γυμνασιαρ-χή[σαντος (?)]


The kind of monument the fragment belonged to cannot be determined, since the editio princeps offers no information beyond the letters themselves and the findspot in a private house, and the stone itself seems to be lost. The remains can be restored either as a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας or one of γυμνασιαρχὸς, probably referring to a Rhodian gymnasiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

(b) The gymnasion in Rhodes

29 Decree regulating the furnishing of oil, Rhodos, first century AD: IG XII, 1, 3; SIG3 III, 974; Badoud 2015, 360–361 no. 17.


A day-by-day list of contributors deriving from this or a similar regulation is IG XII, 1, 4 (Badoud 2015, 361–366 no. 18).

30 Fragmentary regulations concerning the pentathlon, Rhodos (in the vicinity of the gymnasion), first century AD (?): Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 289–290 no. 65; Moretti 1956; SEG 15, 501.

Col. I, l. 18–20: [ἐν γυμνασίῳ δοκοθε]ς [- - - γυ]μαστος [- - -]

The scant remains of the first column allow no certain restorations. In l. 19, supplementing a form of γυμ-νασιαρχός as well as one of γυμνασίου, would result in a word division not conforming to the syllabification usually employed in Greek inscriptions.

31 Fragment of an honorary decree, Rhodos, second century AD: Maiuri 1925, 6–7 no. 3.

l. 2–4: προνοῳσἐμον το[ῦ] γυμνασίου ἐλαιοθεσίας [- - -] ἀκολούθως ταῖς θείαις νομοθεσίαις [- - - - - - - - -]

The context cannot be restored with any certainty from the remains. Instead of τοῦ γυμνασίου ἐλαιοθεσίας, one could consider either a genitive singular (with ταῖς) or the supplement χρείας, giving the passage a more general sense.

Appendix II: Dating IG XII, 1, 46 (11) and Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10)

A monument of special interest for the Rhodian gymnasiarchiai is IG XII, 1, 46 (11), a statue base for Asklapia-adas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασιαρχός πρεσβύτερος κατά Υφρωμία, that has recently been reedited and re-dated by Nathan Badoud (Badoud 2015, 399–424, no. 3). The inscription consists of four columns of names after a short dedicatory text already cited in Appendix I. Badoud 2015, 121 calculates ca. 446 names; the total is uncertain, as in the first column the beginnings of several lines are lost, and some of the extant endings may not belong to a patronymic, but to the name of a grandfather or an adoptive father, in which case the name would extend to two lines. Since the honorand was
gymnasiarchos presbyteros, it is generally assumed that the men listed were the presbyteroi (cf. Hiller von Gaertingen 1929, 351).

The dating to the first half of the first century BC proposed by Holleaux 1893, 173–175 (Holleaux 1938, 383–386) has been specified to ca. 70 BC based on prosopographical arguments by van Gelder in the commentary to GDI III, 1, 3791 (p. 457). Since according to the chronology established by Blinkenberg 1938, 25, the closest Rhomaia had been held in 69 BC, Benediktsson 1938 proposed dating the base to ca. 68 BC. Fraser 1953, 41 n. 3 summarized the discussion to “ca. 75 B.C.” while the text is dated to “ca. 75–68 B.C.” in SEG 53, 824. Nathan Badoud now dates it to 80 BC (Badoud 2015, 131–132; cf. Badoud 2010, 133, no. D 8, with 81 BC).

One important element of Badoud’s argumentation is that since a gymnasiarchia exercised κατὰ Ῥωμαία is not attested anywhere else, the festival must have been special. That is probably correct: not so much based on comparison with the single other gymnasiarchos attested as having officiated κατὰ μεγάλα Ἁλίεια, but because of the fact that while this addition can be found with a considerable number of other public functions, it provides the only instance where another festival is linked to Sulla’s return to Rome, such as having officiated κατὰ πόλειμον: 10, l. 17. While dating this trierarchia to 85 BC is not impossible, it would mean that three of the functions mentioned before – a phylarchia, a command of a tetrereis – Polykles had apparently not performed κατὰ πόλειμον, and a choreia (10, l. 14–16), each combined with a victory in a competition – have to be compressed into a period of just three years. Thus it seems more plausible that these activities should be dated after 85 BC and that the war mentioned was one of the Roman campaigns against ‘pirates’ between 78 and 67 BC or the Third Mithridatic War (74–63 BC). This would date Polykles’ statue to ca. 70 BC, arguing that if it is to be dated at least a short time later, one should reconsider the proposal made by van Gelder and Benediktsson.

Badoud’s main line of argumentation is prosopographical. Here only a extensive analysis of the catalogue, which Badoud does not provide and which I cannot attempt here, will yield a definite result. I will explicate only one point arguing against Badoud’s date which is relevant in the context of the inscriptions discussed in this article:37 Despite having been gymnasiarchos presbyteros himself, the honorand of 10, Polykles, is not mentioned in 11. Assuming that the catalogue in 11 names all presbyteroi alive or at least active when the statue was erected, the simplest explanation is that Polykles was already dead at this time.38 Following Maiuri, Badoud dates 10 to ca. 80 BC, so that it could predate 11 slightly.39 But this date is difficult to maintain: As mentioned above, Polykles reached the pinnacle of his political career during the First Mithridatic War (88–85 BC), and he held at least five public functions afterwards, one of them a posting as trierarchia in wartime (κατὰ πόλειμον: 10, l. 17). While dating this trierarchia to 85 BC is not impossible, it would mean that three of the functions mentioned before – a phylarchia, a command of a tetrereis – Polykles had apparently not performed κατὰ πόλειμον, and a choreia (10, l. 14–16), each combined with a victory in a competition – have to be compressed into a period of just three years. Thus it seems more plausible that these activities should be dated after 85 BC and that the war mentioned was one of the Roman campaigns against ‘pirates’ between 78 and 67 BC or the Third Mithridatic War (74–63 BC). This would date Polykles’ statue to ca. 70 BC, arguing that if it is to be dated at least a short time later, one should reconsider the proposal made by van Gelder and Benediktsson.

35 Cf. p. 2.
36 Badoud 2015, 132. A Rhodian embassy to the senate including the orator Apollonios Molon and pleading for a reward for the Rhodians’ assistance against Mithridates is placed by Cicero shortly before his defence of Sex. Roscius in the year 80 BC (Cic. Brut. 90 [312]; eodem tempore Moloni de domus operam; dictatore enim Sulla legatus ad senatum de Rhodiorum praemis venerat). Accordingly, Schmitt 1957, 182 dates the visit to 81 BC, but it might have been even later. Therefore, it is not certain that the Roman decision was made soon enough for the Rhodians to turn the Rhomaia of 82 BC into a special event.
37 There is one additional basic point of criticism: A cornerstone of Badoud’s prosopographical reasoning, also employed by others (cf. Badoud 1938), is the mentioning respectively omission of an adoption in the name formulae used in 11 and parallel texts obviously recording the same person. Yet as it is at least possible that an adoption could be omitted in certain documents because it was regarded as inconsequential in the context (L. Lindos I, col. 96 n. 1; Fraser 1953, 31; Poma 1972, 197–198; Gabrielsen 1997, 198 n. 5), there needs to be a broader discussion as to the validity of this argument.
38 Of course there is the possibility that members of the presbyteroi had abstained from participating in the honours for Andronikos for personal or political reasons. But this seems rather unlikely.
39 Maiuri 1923, 22; Badoud 2015, 212, no. 122.
The office of gymnasiarchos is mentioned twice in a part of a CV on a fragmentary statue base found on the acropolis of Lindos and published by Christian Blinkenberg as I. Lindos II, 482. The inscription has now been dated by Nathan Badoud to the middle of the second century AD (Badoud 2015, 237 no. 841). With the correction proposed by Badoud 2015, 186 n. 429 the text reads as follows:


The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1–7) and other public offices (l. 7–12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (supplementing the shorter ierēia instead of iereteύσαντα does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασιαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The gymnasiarchia of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3–4. Therefore, the priesthoods following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύναντας should be preceded by iereteύσαντα. (3) After πρεσβευσάντα ποτὶ τυχὼς Δ[εντόρ]σας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as “très douteuse” is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.40

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:


The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1–7) and other public offices (l. 7–12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (supplementing the shorter ierēia instead of iereteύσαντα does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασιαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The gymnasiarchia of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3–4. Therefore, the priesthoods following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύναντας should be preceded by iereteύσαντα. (3) After πρεσβευσάντα ποτὶ τυχὼς Δ[εντόρ]σας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as “très douteuse” is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.40

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:


The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1–7) and other public offices (l. 7–12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (supplementing the shorter ierēia instead of iereteύσαντα does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασιαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The gymnasiarchia of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3–4. Therefore, the priesthoods following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύναντας should be preceded by iereteύσαντα. (3) After πρεσβευσάντα ποτὶ τυχὼς Δ[εντόρ]σας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as “très douteuse” is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.40

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:


The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1–7) and other public offices (l. 7–12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (supplementing the shorter ierēia instead of iereteύσαντα does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασιαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The gymnasiarchia of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3–4. Therefore, the priesthoods following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύναντας should be preceded by iereteύσαντα. (3) After πρεσβευσάντα ποτὶ τυχὼς Δ[εντόρ]σας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as “très douteuse” is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.40

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:


The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1–7) and other public offices (l. 7–12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (supplementing the shorter ierēia instead of iereteύσαντα does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασιαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The gymnasiarchia of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3–4. Therefore, the priesthoods following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύναντας should be preceded by iereteύσαντα. (3) After πρεσβευσάντα ποτὶ τυχὼς Δ[εντόρ]σας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as “très douteuse” is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.40

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:
Appendix IV: The gymnasiarchia of Nisyros

In addition to the evidence for the gymnasiarchiai of Rhodes proper, there is one inscription mentioning a gymnasiarchos active on Nisyros. Situated north-west of Rhodes, the island had been incorporated into the polis of Rhodes probably at the very end of the third century BC, forming a damos of its own. A CV inscription on a statue base dated to the first century AD documents that the honorand, a member of the local damos, had served in the (Rhodian) navy, had been crowned several times by the council (of Rhodes), had been priest of the Emperors in Nisyros, damiourgos and gymnasiarchos in Nisyros and had distributed oil for 13 months. Since it is evident from the text that the gymnasiarchia is a local institution and not one of Rhodes, I did not include it in the catalogue in Appendix I.41

The inscription is the sole evidence for a gymnasiarchia on Nisyros or one of the other islands belonging to the Rhodian state (cf. the commentary to 28). As far as I know, there is no archaeological record of a gymnasion on Nisyros (or, for that matter, for a temple of a local Imperial cult). Based on this scant evidence, there is no way to determine whether the gymnasiarchia was a relic from the independent polis of Nisyros of the third century BC or, like the imperial cult, a new development of the first century AD. The CV itself reveals a special position of Nisyros: Following the Rhodian model in its overall arrangement, it offers some apparently local variations, one of them in the description of the distribution of oil: The text from Nisyros has θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον, whereas the Rhodian inscriptions use ποιησάμενος τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἔλαιου, and there is no parallel text from Rhodes where the recipients of the distribution are named, much less enumerated as distinct groups (cf. the evidence discussed in note 21).42

41 IG XII, 3, 124, l. 1–11: Γνωμαγόραν Δωροθέου | Νεισύριον | στρατευσάμενον ἐν τριημιολίᾳ, ᾗ ὄνομα Εὐανδρία Σεβαστά, καὶ στεφάνη | ητέχαν ὑπὸ τᾶν βουλῆν πλεονᾶς στρεφόμενος καὶ ἰερατεύσαντα | ἐν Νισύρῳ τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ δαμιουργήσαντα καὶ | γυμνασιαρχήσαντα{ν} ἐν Νισύρῳ καὶ θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον πᾶσι ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς κατοικούσι ἐν Νεισύρῳ καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδαμεῖσιν ἐπὶ μῆνες (l. μῆνας) iγʹ. For the historical evidence for Nisyros as a part of Rhodes see Papachristodoulou 1989, 47.

42 The other variation is the description of the honorand’s merits concerning the local associations heading the otherwise conventional list of honours awarded by associations at the end of the CV (l. 11–12: γενόμενον εὐάρεστον πᾶσι τοῖς κοινοῖς τοῖς ἐν Νισύρῳ), the term κοινόν being a synonym for κοινών rarely found in inscriptions generally and never on Rhodes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorand</th>
<th>Damagoras, son of Damagoras, grandson of Damagoras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicator(s)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthoods</td>
<td>[priest of Athana in Achaia polis (Ialysos)] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[diámourgos] to Hestia and Zeus (Teleios) in Kamiros 1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[priest of the Halios in the city] 2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[his son Damagoras (being) gymnasiarchos neoteros] 2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or of the neoteros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the year of his father’s (eponymous) priesthood 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priest of Athana Polias, Zeus Polieus and Herakles 5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ - - - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commander of the territory (ἀγεμὼν τᾶς χώρας) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temple-treasurer (ἰεροταμίας) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ - - - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>superintendent of the archive (χροφύλαξ) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gymnasiarchos [presbyteros (or of the presbyteroi)] 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secretary of the council (γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς) 8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treasurer (tamias) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[strategos] 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[prytanis] 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agonothetes of the Rhomata 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ - - - ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambassador to emperors as well as (to governors) 10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participating in major proeisphoriai 11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6 CV in I. Lindos II 482 (25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorand</th>
<th>Gnomagoras, son of Dorotheos, from the damos Nisyriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public offices and functions</td>
<td>military service on the trihemiolia named Euandria Sebasta 2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crowned several times by the (Rhodian) councils 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priest of the imperial cult in Nisyros 5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>damiourgos 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gymnasiarchos in Nisyros and distributing oil for 13 months 6–11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 7 CV in IG XII 3, 104.
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