In the discussion of the *nomophulakes* in chapter two, it was suggested that Demetrius created these officials by modifying a previously existing institution, that of the eleven gaolers (*hoi hendeka*).\(^1\) A not dissimilar pattern—the creation of a supervisory board out of a relatively minor panel of sortitive magistrates—may be traced in the development of Demetrius’ *gunaikonomoi*. Bayer has already proposed (although failing to volunteer much supporting evidence) that the *gunaikonomoi* bore some relationship to officials existing under the Athenian democracy, namely the *astunomoi*, and that upon their creation, the *gunaikonomoi* may have assumed some of the duties earlier performed by the city magistrates.\(^2\) As detailed by Aristotle and the lexicographers, the main duties of the ten *astunomoi* involved the supervision of roads and buildings, a far cry from the enforcement of laws on women.\(^3\) Nonetheless, it is clear that the *astunomoi* in the late 320s were responsible for luxury provisions that, in a later context, might quite plausibly have been assigned to the *gunaikonomoi*. For example, the *astunomoi* enforced those laws fixing the charges exacted by flute-girls, harp and lyre players (so [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 50.2; Hyp. 4.3); this brought them within the ambit of regulating feasts, and the best documented law regulated by *gunaikonomoi* under Demetrius’ regime similarly concerned the conduct of banquets. Moreover we learn from Diogenes Laertius (6.90) that the cynic, Crates, was allegedly accosted by the *astunomoi* for wearing muslin. The anecdotal nature of this account prompts caution; it is moreover undatable, coming in a list of similarly undatable stories designed to illustrate Crates’ character. Even if the incident with Crates is fictitious, however, the association of the *astunomoi* with sumptuary laws may well reflect Athenian practice. There is no explicit statement of an analogous law banning the wearing of
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\(^1\) For discussion of claims that ‘the eleven’ were dismantled by Phocion, see above, 28 n. 48.

\(^2\) Bayer 1942, 51, following Lipsius 1966, 98.

\(^3\) Arist. *Pol.* 1321b (not specifically of Athens); Hesychius *s.v* *astunomia*; *Schol.* Dem. 24.112.
certain garments in the Phalerean period, but in other states which had *gunaikonomoi*, regulations governing dress fell to them, and it is plausible that such laws were transferred to the Athenian *gunaikonomoi* upon the establishment of those magistrates. A final area of overlap between the two sets of officials may be found in the regulation of religious processions. *Astonomoi* were involved, both prior to and after Demetrius’ regime, in maintaining the paths along which processions moved; *gunaikonomoi* may have shared an interest in festival processions, since such officials are well attested as doing this in other Greek states. It may be noted that in Thasos, a funeral law has both *gunaikonomoi* and *agoranomoi* (magistrates which, according to Pouilloux, combined the functions of Athenian *astonomoi* and *agoranomoi*) working in concert to oversee aspects of the burial procession. In generalised terms, too, there is continuity: sources repeatedly define the *astonomoi* and *agoranomoi* in terms of a concern for *eukosmia*, the very quality associated with the *gunaikonomoi*.

There may thus have been competences once held by the *astonomoi* that were transferred to the *gunaikonomoi* upon the establishment of that magistracy. There are also traces of alterations to the *astonomoi* that may have paved the way for Demetrius’ subsequent creation of the magistracy, for a diminution of the *astonomoi* is attested under the regime of Phocion. Under the fourth-century democracy, the *astonomoi* numbered ten, with five allocated to the Piraeus and to Athens respectively, but from *IG ii*² 380 (320/19) we learn that, on the instigation of Demades, the functions of the Piraeus five were transferred to the *agoranomoi*. Demades’ measure has been taken by some to mean that the *astonomoi* were essentially disbanded, and remained so until well into the third century. This interpretation is largely founded upon the absence, between 320/19 and 287/86 (in which year they feature in *IG ii*² 659), of any record of their existence, but the dearth of inscriptive matter from the Phalerean period renders this sort
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4 For the enforcement of a dress code by *gunaikonomoi*, see Pouilloux 1954, no. 144. A list of *gunaikonomoi* enforcing such regulations is compiled by Gehrke 1978, 168 n. 97.

5 For the *astonomoi*, *IG ii*² 380 (320/19); *IG ii*² 659 (287/86).

6 Pouilloux 1954, no. 141.

7 See particularly Arist. *Pol.* 1321b; Plato *Nomoi*. 849a.

8 The inscription does deal specifically with the Piraeus *agoranomoi* (ll.9, 140: they are to assume the duties of the *astonomoi*). The changes were probably pragmatic rather than ideologically driven: so Gehrke 1976, 94.