— Δαιτίας (Αἰαντίδος φ.).

He was killed in action as trierarch c. 410 (SEG XIX. 42 (b), col. iii, line 30).

3112 Δαματίας Πρατιεύς. See 10535.

— Δαμομένης.

He was victorious choregos in men's dithyramb (Anth. Pal. vi. 339 = Theokr. *Epig.* iv. (12) = Gow and Page 3388-91). The form of his name is very variously given, and it is very dubious whether his victory was at an Athenian festival. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff implied that it was (Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker (= Philol. Unt. XVIII) (Berlin, 1906), 118-19), in identifying the choregos with Demomeles (II) of Paiania (PA 3554: see 3597, III). However, quite apart from the arbitrariness of selecting one version of the name in preference to another, the absence from the epigram of any mention of tribe (contrast, e.g., [Simonides] F 148 Bergk⁴), or of the didaskalos, makes an Athenian origin unlikely. (See Gow, Theocritus, II. 537, for alternatives.)

× 3126 Δαμόστρατος (I) Μελιτεύς. Damostrator of Mehle (Leme)

The undistinguished relatives and descendants of Damostratos (I), known in considerable detail from Demosthenes lvii, deserve inclusion in the Register only because Demostratos' daughter married into the family of Diodoros (I) of Halai (see 3933). Though Nikostratos' service as treasurer of Athene in 340/39 indicates that he was, or claimed to be, a pentakosiomedimnos, this need not have meant very much by that date (cf. Ath. Pol. xlvii. 1), and the undeniable poverty of some branches of the family (cf. §§ 25, 34 f., 41, and 45) and the paucity of offices held by known relatives suggest that we have to do with a family of small means, whose members lacked the luck or ability to escape from their inherited position. The speech by Euxitheos in defence of his status as citizen must alongly follow in time Demonstrates degree of a 16/15 (Andretion). closely follow in time Demophilos' diapsephisis-decree of 346/5 (Androtion, FGH 324 F 52; Philochoros, FGH 328 F 52; Aisch. i. 77), since the councillorship of Euxitheos' opponent Euboulides (§ 8) is known to have been in 346/5 (ii.² 218, lines 6-7).

Damostratos (I) cannot have been born after 460, and cannot have lived long into the fourth century, if at all. He was twice married. By his first wife he had two children: (a) a daughter (§ 37) who married Diodoros (I) of Halai (see 3933) not later than 408, and perhaps a considerable time earlier; and (b) a son Amytheon (§37), who must have been born by 440. (Since he died on the Sicilian expedition in 415-413 (§ 37), the $[A\mu\nu]\theta[\epsilon]\omega\nu$ (?) named as secretary in 410/09 on i.² 110a, line 3, is a different man). He left three sons. (i) Damostratos (II) was still alive in 346/5 at an age of at least 70, and gave evidence for Euxitheos

(§ 37); (ii) (iii) Kallistratos (I) and Dexitheos (§ 37) were both dead by 346/5, and Kallistratos' son Kallimachos died about 360 (ii.² 6857), presumably as a fairly young man. The two women named on ii.² 6857, Lysistrate and Nikostrate, must have stood in some close relation to Kallistratos. The filiation Kallimachos-Kallistratos recurs much later (ii.² 958, line 41), but the names are both too common.

Damostratos' second marriage to Chairestrate (§ 37) is unlikely to have taken place after 420. Of Chairestrate's family nothing is known, but her sister married $A\pi o\lambda\lambda\delta\delta\omega\rho oc$ (I) $\Pi\lambda\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\epsilon\dot{\nu}c$ (§ 38) evidently before the end of the fifth century: besides their son Olympichos, whose son Apollodoros (II) gave evidence in 346/5 (§ 38), they had another son named $[\Delta\iota\delta\delta]\omega\rho[oc]$ or $[\Theta\epsilon\delta\delta]\omega\rho[oc]$, the date of whose gravestone (Hesperia, 30 (1961), 275, no. 121) indicates that he, like his brother Olympichos, had died before 346/5. In view of the possible restoration $[\Theta\epsilon\delta\delta]\omega\rho[oc]$, note the other occurrences of the name Theodoros in the deme; ii.² 1700, line 49; ii.² 499, line 3, and 500–5; Prytaneis 47, no. 10, line 23; ii.² 7238.

By his marriage to Chairestrate Damostratos had two more children:

- (A) Timokrates ($\S 37$), adult by the 390s ($\S 40$), who was father of Euxitheos (the recurrence of the name suggests that it was borne by a forebear of Damostratos (I)) and grandfather of three men who were all alive in 346/5 ($\S 39$); and
- (B) Nikarete. It seems to have been her lowly status as seller of ribbons in the Agora (§§ 31 and 34) and former wet-nurse (§§ 35 and 42) which provided part of the ammunition for Euboulides' attack on Euxitheos. She must have been an old woman in 346/5, since from §42 her birthyear can hardly be brought down later than 420. Since her brother Timokrates was her $\kappa \nu \rho \iota \iota \iota \iota$ at the time of her first marriage (§41), her father Damostratos must have been already dead. By her first husband, Protomachos (§40), she had two sons, who gave evidence for Euxitheos (§43), and a daughter whose son by her marriage to Eunikos of Cholargos was adult by 346 (§43). When Protomachos divorced her in favour of a rich heiress (§41) she married again; her second marriage is likely to belong ι . 395. By Thoukritos she had in all five sons, of whom four were dead by 346 (§28) and Euxitheos alone survived.

Thoukritos himself belonged to a family of Halimous of which at least ten other members are known. His father Thoukritides (I) (§ 20) had three or four brothers:

- (A) Charisios, whose sons Thoukritides (II) and Charisiades gave evidence for Euxitheos in 346/5 (§ 20); their father could well be the Charisios known as a non-eponymous archon from the first half of the fourth century (*Hesperia*, 5 (1936), 390, no. 9, lines 13–14).
 - (B) Lysanias, whose son Nikiades (I) also gave evidence (§§ 20-1).

- (C) A third brother, whose grandson Νικόστρατος (I) Νικιάδους (II) also gave evidence (§ 21). This Nikostratos served as tamias of the joint board in 340/39 (ii.² 1455, line 5) and as councillor in 335/4 (ii.² 1700, line 82). He is not to be confused with the Nikostratos (II) whom Euxithcos alleges (§ 59) to have bought his way into the deme with Euboulides' connivance. Either Euxitheos is being less than frank, or this is a case where homonymity even in a small deme does not imply relationship.
- (D) In addition $\Theta_o(\acute{v})\kappa\rho\iota\tau oc$ (II) $K\eta\phi\iota co\delta\acute{\omega}\rho o(v)$ (I) $[A\lambda\iota]\mu o(\acute{v})c\iota oc$, who served as councillor in the first half of the fourth century (ii.² 1742, line 15), perhaps in 370/69 (Meritt, Hesperia, 16 (1947), 151), should be a relation, unless the homonymity-rule breaks down again. $K\eta\phi\iota c\delta\delta\omega\rho oc$ (II) K. (I) A., named on an undated gravestone from Salamis (ii.² 5542), could be a brother of Thoukritos (II). Raubitschek's restoration (in Hesperia, Index I-X, 78) of $[\Thetao\acute{v}\kappa\rho\iota\tau oc\ K\eta\phi\iota c]o\delta\acute{\omega}\rho ov\ (A\lambda\iota\muo\acute{v}c\iota oc)$ as the name of an ephebe of Leontis in 333/2 (Hesperia, 9 (1940), 59, no. 8, col. ii, lines 28-9) is possible but venturesome; if correct, the ephebe should be a grandson of Thoukritos (II), but this hypothesis only increases the difficulty of explaining why Euxitheos did not bring forward as a witness a member of this branch of the family.

Thoukritos (I) must have been born by 425 if he did in fact, as his son asserts, serve in the Dekeleian War and suffer capture and sale at Leukas as a slave (§ 18). By the date of his return (? in the early 390s) his father was dead; his uncles gave him his share of the family estate (§ 19), which cannot have been large (§ 25). He served under Thrasyboulos (§ 42) and held some unspecified magistracies (§ 25), but was dead before his son came of age (§ 52).

Euxitheos' birth-year is uncertain, since we cannot be sure that he was one of the sons born to Nikarete by the early 38os (§ 42). By 346/5 he had been phratriarch (§ 23) and demarch (§ 63) and had held other local offices (§ 46). The fact that he could afford to commission a speech from Demosthenes is some evidence in favour of Euboulides' allegation that he was $\epsilon \tilde{v}\pi o\rho oc$ (§ 52), but we do not know how or why, and he is not attested later. One cannot conclude therefrom that Euboulides won his case.

(For Stemma see folder.) - in the library