

### THREE ATHENIAN ARCHONS (*ET ALIA*)

#### A: SALLOUSTIANOS AIOLION PHLYEUS

As it is commented further in the Appendix below (pp. 252-3, under H1), the archon's correct name in lines 5-6 of *I. G. II*<sup>2</sup> 1763 (= B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Agora XV*, No. 329) is Σαλλουστιαν[οῦ / Αἰολ]ῳλίωνος Φλυέως and the rectification has the support of both space and nomenclature<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, *I. G. II*<sup>2</sup> 1763 (= *Agora XV*, No. 329) dates now from about A.D. 175/6 (previously dated about A.D. 132/3) and the archon of this document was probably a son of Σαλουστιάνοδς Δημόστρατος (I) Φλυεὺς of *I. G. II*<sup>2</sup> 3314, lines 4-5 (about A.D. 132). This inference seems to be strengthened also by the fact that in A.D. 220/1 among the σωφρονισ(ταί) is listed first Σαλουσ(τιανόδς) Δημόστρατος (II) Φλυε(ύς)<sup>2</sup>, who may have been a son of the archon Salloustianos Aiolion Phlyeus. The archon is undoubtedly the hoplite general (Salloustianos) Aiolion Phlyeus [see in the Appendix below, under H1] of *I. G. II*<sup>2</sup> 1792 (= *Agora XV*, No. 423), lines 4-5: σ[τρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τὰ ἔπλα] / Αἰολίωνος [Φλυέως], which have been slightly altered to read σ[τρατηγοῦ τῆς πόλεως Σαλουσ(τιανοῦ)] / Αἰολίωνος [Φλυέως]<sup>3</sup>. The hoplite generalship of (Salloustianos) Aiolion Phlyeus is attributed by the writer to A.D. 190/1 in a forthcoming study in the *Ἀρχ. Μελέτωρ* (see NOTE in Greek below).

The archon Salloustianos Aiolion Phlyeus was the scion of a leading Athenian family, which appears to have been divided into three branches, with the name Aiolion occurring in all three (I of Antipatros, II of

---

1. The references to the prytany catalogues may be reversed at times, but this was unavoidable (full title of *Agora XV*: *The Athenian Agora, vol. XV, Inscriptions, The Athenian Councillors* [1974]). For a new reading of line 1 (*ad init.*), see Appendix below, under H2.

2. *I. G. II*<sup>2</sup> 2223, line 20. For the date, see J. A. Notopoulos in *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 54; J. Kirchner: *a.* 218/9 *aut paullo post*.

3. Cf. [ἄρχοντος τῆς] / πόλεως in lines 3-4 = A. E. Raubitschek in *Hesperia*, Suppl. 8 (1949) 284. Meritt and Traill in *Agora XV*: [ἐπ' ἄρχοντος τῆς] / πόλεως.

Vipsanius Aiolion and III of Sal(l)oustianos Demonstratos (I)). The first branch of Antipatros Phlyeus does not seem to have possessed the *civitas*, at least according to the evidence, for if it did, surely its *nomen* would have been inscribed in one of the documents<sup>1</sup>. As for the name Sal(l)oustianos, it is not known how it came into the third branch of the family, but it presupposes the *nomen* Sallustius, which is not attested in Attica, except perhaps in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1105 (= *TAPA* CIII [1972], p. 137, line 13 (Face B) of A.D. 138-161 and 1830, line 5 (= *Bull. Épigr.* 1950, p. 152, No. 81), dated after A.D. 216 in *Agora* XV, No. 471. However, none of these two possible examples could be considered as the source of the name Sal(l)oustianos, because of chronological considerations. For according to the evidence, the name Sal(l)oustianos makes its appearance with Saloustianos Demonstratos (I) Phlyeus who flourished under Hadrian (above). This would imply that the name Sal(l)oustianos was adopted in the reign of Hadrian and in one instance [= Salous(tianos) Demonstratos (II) Phlyeus above] it is abbreviated in the manner of a *nomen*. The name Sal(l)oustianos, as a *nomen*, is of course atypical (however, compare the name Kasianos below)<sup>2</sup>, but its use seems to suggest possession of the *civitas*, although in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 7701 (*s. II p.*) we have Αἰλῖα Ἀβιδιανῆ Εἰσιᾶς ἐξουσιέων<sup>3</sup>. Finally, since the name Sal(l)oustianos makes its appearance under Hadrian, it may not be erroneous to presume that this emperor awarded the third branch of the family with the *civitas*<sup>4</sup> [if indeed it possessed it].

The second branch of Vipsanius Aiolion Phlyeus possessed the *civitas*, as it is explicit from its *nomen*, which undoubtedly should be traced to M. Vipsanius Agrippa, whose father's *praenomen* was Lucius (= EK Nos. 338 and 340)<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, the *nomen* Vipsanius is not com-

1. W. B. Dinsmoor has presented the stemma of this branch in *Hesperia* 30 (1961) 189-192 (necessary corrections in Nos. 5, 6 and 8).

2. See Appendix below, under H3.

3. In support of possessing the *civitas*, cf. also *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3678, lines 6-7: Σαβει/-νιανῆν Ἀμιλλῶν, and 3679, lines 7-8: Ὀνορατιανῆ / Πολυχαρμῖς (daughter of Ὀνορατιανὸς Πολύχαρμος = *BCH* 92 (1968) 507, No. 50, and 511, No. 93 respectively). There are also other such examples. In addition, cf. the brother ephebes Γ. Βουσσηνὸς Διονύσιος [ς] Γαρ. and Γ. Βουσσηνὸς Τυχιδὸς [Γα]ρ. of A.D. 155/6 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2068, lines 75-76).

4. Demonstratos (I) Phlyeus calls Hadrian τὸν ἴδιον σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργέτην in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3314, which could be interpreted to mean that one of the benefits to Demonstratos (I) may have been the *civitas*.

5. This type of abbreviation refers to the writer's dissertation: *The Early Ex-*

mon in Attica, for it occurs only about eight times there<sup>1</sup>, and it is possible that the family from Phlya may have brought it to Attica from Samos<sup>2</sup>. In any case, the evidence for this second branch comes both from Eleusis and Samos. The inscription from Eleusis which K. Clinton published in the *'Aρχ. Έφημ.* 1971, p. 131, No. 27, was known to the present writer, who had found its squeeze (the large fragment) at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton (summer of 1965)<sup>3</sup> and had obtained permission to publish it (= ELEUSIS No. 368). In this inscription from Eleusis, which P. Herrmann republished in *Z. Pap. Epigr.* X (1973), p. 82, [Οὐψαν]ία Λαυλιανή [ἐκ Φλυέων (= Kapetanopoulos)], who was the daughter of Λού[χιος Ο]ὐψάνιος [Αἰολίων Φλυ]εύς<sup>4</sup>, honored her son (line 3 *ad fin.*: [τὸν ἑαυτῆς (= Kapetanopoulos)]) Τίτος Οὐψάνιος [Αἰολίων *aut* Λαυλιανός (= Kapetanopoulos) Φλαβιανός Κηφεισιεύς, as an initiate ἀφ' ἑστίας<sup>5</sup>. The dedication was set up when Flavia Laodameia daughter of Kleitos Phlyeus was priestess of Demeter and Kore, that is, at the end of the first century after Christ<sup>6</sup>.

In another inscription from Eleusis which Clinton published and I had transcribed at the Institute (August 1970), as the previous inscription from Eleusis, an Aiolon is honored and Herrmann identified him with L. Vipsanius Aiolon Phlyeus, the father of Vipsania Lailiane from Phlya (above), by restoring the *nomen* Vipsanius in lines 3-4; [Οὐψανι/-ο]ν Αἰολίω[να Φλυέα]<sup>7</sup>. This restoration has the support also of the title

*pansion of Roman Citizenship into Attica during the First Part of the Empire, 200 B.C.-A.D. 70* (Yale University, 1963) [see *Historia* 19 (1970) 562, note 10].

1. See Appendix below, under H4.

2. Cf., for example, the archon Scribonius Kapiton of about A.D. 173-185, (TAAANTA 6 (1975) 28-29 = *'Aρχ. Έφημ.* 1968, p. 203 = *ibid.* 1971, p. 71, No. 6) who could perhaps be identical with P. Scribonius Kapiton from Samos (= *SEG* I, No. 394 = *Ath. Mitt.* 75 [1960], p. 151, i), even though *SEG* says «Litt. saec. I. p. Chr.».

3. See *'Aρχ. Έφημ.* 1964 (1967) 120, notes 1 and 2, and *ibid.* 1968, p. 177.

4. The writer, like Herrmann, had concluded that the demotic [Φλυ]εύς should be restored, because of space requirements.

5. The names of the initiate Τίτος... Φλαβιανός suggest that Vipsania Lailiane had married into a family which had received the *civitas* from the Flavian emperors (= Titus Flavius) and that her son had been adopted into her father's family, by which legal action the initiate acquired the *nomen* Vipsanius and the *cognomen* Phlabianos. This interpretation explains also the *praenomen* Titos in place of Loukios. Of course, if an adoption occurred, there was no change of deme (initiate was a Kephaisieus).

6. See Appendix below, under H5.

7. *'Aρχ. Έφημ.* 1971, p. 135, No. 31 = *Z. Pap. Epigr.* X, pp. 79 and 81 (= *Bull.*

ἐξηγγῆτης Εὐμολπιδῶν which appears in both inscriptions from Eleusis and Samos. My transcription of line 4 (*ad init.*), since it was made with no restoration in mind, is unclear, that is, whether to read the traces as nu (=Herrmann) or as alpha (=Clinton). In the inscription from Samos, Vipsanius Aiolion, son of Vipsanius Lailianos and grandson of (Vipsa? or Scribo?)nius Philopoimen, was honored (No. 45)<sup>1</sup>. In No. 46 Vipsanius Aiolion was honored again, but here the *nomen* had been omitted. In both No. 45 (as restored) and No. 46 Vipsanius Aiolion had served as agonothete (at Samos according to Herrmann) and this is probably correct, since in the inscription from Eleusis there is no mention of an ἀγωνοθεσία, at least in the surviving part, but it should have been listed after his gymnasiarchy (lines 7-8) [otherwise, a re-identification may be in order]. Finally, the ἐξηγγῆτης Vipsanius Aiolion is Known also from yet another inscription which the writer recognized and presents here: 'Aρχ. 'Εφημ. 1899, col. 212, No. 45 (ELEUSIS):

[ - - - - - ] — [ - ] I [ - - - Λουκίου ]  
 [Οὐψα]νίου Αἰο[λίωνος Φλυ]-  
 [έως ἐ]ξηγγ[τοῦ - - - - -]  
 [ - - - - - ].

The distinguished ephebe Lailianos of about A.D. 68<sup>2</sup> belonged without any doubt to this family from Phlya, even though he lacks the *nomen* Vipsanius, because the name Lailianos is indeed very rare in Attica and because it is attested only in the family from Phlya. The same may be said of the archon Lailianos (so also Herrmann) of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1759 (= *Agora* XV, No. 312), which this writer has ascribed to A.D. 108/9 in the *Athens Annals of Archaeology*<sup>3</sup>. The archon may be equated with the ephebe Lailianos (above), but he is not Vipsanius Aiolion's father (so Herrmann), because of chronological considerations. Rather he is possibly a junior brother of Vipsanius Aiolion or a son of his.

*Epigr.* 1973, p. 91, No. 160) [= **ELEUSIS** Nos. 102 + 154]. (Cf. *TAPhS* N.S. 64 (3), 1974, 109, No. 27).

1. *Ath. Mitt.*, loc. cit. [p. 250, note 2 above], p. 153 = *Z. Pap. Epigr.*, loc. cit. [p. 250, note 7 above], p. 80.

2. *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1992, lines 4 and 17 = *AAA* 6 (1973) 138 = *ibid.* 7 (1974), p. 393.

3. *AAA* 6 [note 2 above], 392. A sequel to this may be found in the Appendix below, under H6 (see p. 261, note 2 below).

## APPENDIX

H1 (=p. 1 above). In *AAA*, VI (1973), pp. 125-127, W. Peek republished a fragmentary ephebic epigram from *Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1971, *Χρονικά*, p. 26, No. 15 (Plate XIIβ) and recognized Aiolion (line 7: Αἰολίω[να]) as archon of the ephebes (line 6 [below]). However, both the interpretation and recognition are erroneous (below). Moreover, Peek gave the archon's name of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1763 (= *Agora XV*, No. 329) as Salloustianos Aiolion (= *loc. cit.*, p. 125), but this must be accidental. In any case, this was noticed after the completion of an original manuscript on the archon's correct name in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1763 (= *Agora XV*, No. 329), lines 5-6: Σαλλουστιαν[οῦ / τοῦ Αἰο]λίωνος Φλυέως = Σαλλουστιαν[οῦ / Αἰο]λίωνος Φλυέως (above).

After this, the above ephebic epigram was reexamined and it was recognized that the Aiolion of line 7 was the archon eponymous Salloustianos Aiolion Phlyeus and accordingly lines 6-7 of the epigram are being republished below, having been restored anew (Peek: κοσμητής, ἤρχε[ν δὲ φιλοστεφάνων συνεφύβων] / Αἰολίω[ν, πόλεως δ' ἀρχὸς ἔφυ υ υ —]):

κοσμητής, ἤρχε [κρατερός Σαλλουστιανός τε]  
Αἰολίω[ν κλεινῶν ἐκ πατέρων πεφυώς].

LINE 6 (*ad init.*): ἤρχε and not ἤρχε[ν]. From the published photograph, it can be said that no ἐφελευστικὸν ν had been inscribed after the epsilon, because an uninscribed space, as it seems, was allowed between the epsilon and the word that followed (*cf.* also the uninscribed space before the word ἤρχε). *Ad fin.*: [Σαλ/λουστια/νός τε]. Concerning the quantity of the alpha in the name's penult, *cf.* *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3734, lines 3-4: Διογένης δ' ἐχάραξ' ἐτάρου / [νεκα Μ]αρκιανοῖο, and 4251/3, line 3: μύστιν Ἀθηναῖοι Κλημεντιανὴν παρὰ Δηοῖ (compare also *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3575, line 1).

The κοσμητής 'Ροῦφος ('Ρούφου) Ἐλεούσιος [lines 5-6 (Peek: ἡνίκα 'Ροῦφος [ἔην οὔνομα πατρὸς ἔχων] / κοσμητής)] is attested to have been κοσμητής, as Peek has also indicated, in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2193, line 11: παρέστησα (= Τρύφων Θεοφίλου Ὑβάδης, below) τῷ ἰδίῳ κοσμητῇ 'Ρούφῳ ('Ρούφου) Ἐλεουσίῳ. Notopoulos has ascribed *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2193 to A. D. 205/6 (see under note 2, p. 248 above) and as it is commented under line 19 of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1793, where Rhoupfos is attested as prytanis = *Agora XV*, No. 397, Rhoupfos would have been κοσμητής about thirty years before the κοσμητεία of Tryphon Hybades (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2193, lines 8-9), since Tryphon had been ephebe during the κοσμητεία of Rhoupfos (above and NOTE below). Because of this, it is possible to ascribe now the archonship of

Salloustianos Aiolion Phlyeus to about A.D. 175/6. The archon, of course, has been identified with the hoplite general of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1792 = *Agora* XV, No. 423 (above). Peek associated the archon and the hoplite general, with the then available evidence, as father and son (= *AAA*, *loc. cit.*, p. 125).

NOTE: The *κοσμητῆς* Rhoupfos Eleousios may be mentioned as ephebe (= *γυμνασίαρχος*) in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2050, line 22: [...?...'Ελ]εούσιος = ['Ροῦφος) 'Ελ]εούσιος, of the year A.D. 143/4. Such a restoration has the support of both space and chronology. As a final comment, Rhoupfos was eponymous of the tribe Hadrianis in A.D. 188/9 (= *Agora* XV, No. 419, line 12: [ἐ]πώνυμος 'Ρ[οῦφος) (= *Hesp.*, Suppl. VIII, 1949, p. 283)] 'Ελεούσιος).

H2 (= p. 248, note 1 above). The 'Επιμελήτρια of the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, Madame Dina Peppas-Delmouzou, sent me a squeeze of E.M. 10414 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1763 = *Agora* XV, No. 329) and I was able to establish also a new reading for line 1 (*ad init.*), previously read as Φλάβ. The correct reading of the honorand's name is A. (sign) Λάρ(κιον) Πικυλεῖνον 'Α/γνούσιον. Both Ross and Koehler had read the *nomen* as MAP· and ///ΛAP respectively; Pittakes has ...λαρ (= 'Αρχ. 'Αφημ., No. 344). The *nomen* Larcus appears also in *Agora* XV, No. 402 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1794) and lines 24-25 should read A. Λ(ά)ρ(κ)ιος Σευῆρος / A. Λάρ(κ)ιος ΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΟΣ ('Α[γ]νούσιοι), according to Fourmont's transcription (= *CIG* No. 194 and *Agora* XV, No. 402). Previously the *nomen* Marcius had been suggested. The degree of relation of these two prytaneis of A.D. 180/1 with Larcus Pauleinos cannot be conjectured. The same is true of Λαρκ(ιος) Δημοκράτης 'Αγνούσιος, συνστρε(μματο)άρχης and γυμνασίαρχος in the month of Πο-(σειδεών) [= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2113 (III 1145), line 43]. The new reading was verified from a squeeze (as above). Previously Koehler had read the *nomen* as Λ.'Κ, but Kirchner preferred Graindor's Λικ(ίνιος). Moreover, Λαρκία 'Αρχελ[αῖς] of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 10106 [about A.D. 200] was probably a member of the Larcii from Hagnous, since that *nomen* is so rare in Attica. Finally, the *nomen* Larcus may have possibly come to Attica from Crete (*cf.* Αῖλος Λάρκιος Γάλλος and Αῖλος Λάρκιος Λέπιδος Σουλπικιανός of *Inscr. Creticae* I, No. 292).

NOTE: The *nomen* Larcia has been suggested for line 2 (*ad med.*) of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 9087a (= *SEG* XIII [1956], p. 42, No. 148), but the photograph of E.M. 12844 clearly shows that the lady's *nomen* was Laria (ΛΑΡΙΑΝΕΙΚΩC = Λαρία Νεικώ(ς)).

H3 (= p. 249, note 2 above). The abbreviation of the name Sal(l)oustianos (= Σαλουσ(τιανός) Δημόστρατος (II) Φλυεύς) has a parallel in the name Κασιανός, which was borne by a family from the deme of Steiria. J. H. Oliver considers the name Kasianos (or Casianus) to have been used as a *nomen* (= *Hesperia*, Suppl. 13, 1970, p. 106) and explains the form Κάσσιος, which is attested in *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 60, No. 25 [= *Agora XV*, No. 416], line 6: Γ. Κασσίου Ἀπολλωνίου Στ[ε]ρι[έ]ως, as being a scribe's or stonecutter's misinterpretation of the abbreviation Κασ̄ (= Κασ(ιανός)) (= *loc. cit.*, p. 107, note 8). This explanation is plausible, but the expansion of the form Κασσίου to Κασσι(αν)οῦ may be closer to the truth. That is, the stonecutter omitted to inscribe the alpha and nu, as he apparently left out the first iota in the demotic [Στ]ε(ι)ρι[έ]ως. In any case, the family's name was Kasianos, which was abbreviated as either (a) Κασ(ιανός) (= *Agora XV*, No. 419, lines 7-8: [στρατ]ηγούντ[ος] ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα Κασ(ιανοῦ) / [Ἀπο]λλωνίου Στ[ε]ρι[έ]ως; *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2199, line 7: ἄρχοντας Γ(αίου) Κασ(ιανοῦ) Ἀπολλωνίου Στ[ε]ρι[έ]ως; and *SEG* 24 [1969] 94, No. 200, col. II, line 89; Κασ(ιανός) Φίλιππος), (b) Κασι(ανός) (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3012, line 2: [ἀντι]κοσμητέοντος Κασι(ανοῦ) Ἀπολλωνίου Στ[ε]ρι[έ]ως = *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2079, lines 3-4: [ἀντι]κοσμητέοντος Κασιανοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου Στ[ε]ρι[έ]ως), or (c) Κασιαν(ός) (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2235, line 89: Κασιαν(ός) Φίλιππος) [*cf.* also *TAPhS* N.S. 64 (3), 1974, 80, under No. 10].

The appearance of the family name Kasianos had been preceded by the Roman names Γ(αίος) Ἰούλιος (below) and this explains why the archon Kasianos Apollonios (above) possesses the *praenomen* Γ(αίος). Cassii [= Κάσ(σ)ιοι] in Attica are attested also with the *praenomen* Gaius (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3647, lines 6-7: Γαίου / Κασίου Σημαχίδου [*cognomen* rather than demotic], and 4481, lines 3-4; Γ(αίου) Κασίου [...<sup>c</sup>... K]ολυτέως), but this has no bearing on the Kasianoι from Steiria. The first known *civis* member of this family from Steiria is G. Julius Kasios Steirius, the archon of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2037, line 3<sup>1</sup>, and he may be thought to have been the eponymos of the Kasianoι from Steiria. The archon's *cognomen* Kasios may not ultimately derive as a personal name from the Roman *nomen* Cassius, though this may be implied by the form Κασσιανός<sup>2</sup>, and it may be instead Greek in origin, as one may infer, for

1. EK No. 793 [pp. 249-50, note 5 above]. For a new date of this archon, see Mlle S. Follet in *Mélanges... à Pierre Chantraine* (1972) 43 [ca. A.D. 111/2 (see below)].

2. The form Kassianos appears in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2203, lines 36, 38, etc. (Kassianos Bassos, Kassianos Mousonios), which Notopoulos ascribed to about A.D. 209/10 (p. 248,

example, from *SEG* 24, p. 345, No. 1196: Διὸς Κ/ασίου Κέ/ρδων Κασί/ου τοῦ Δ(ι)/δύμου (*s. I/II p.*) and examples from Attica<sup>1</sup>. But in creating the name Kasianos, the family from Steiria may have been emulating the Romans (*viz.* Cassius=Cassianus), even though the eponymos concept was an old Greek tradition, and perhaps imperial permission may have been necessary for its creation.

The elevation of an apparent local family name to the status of a *nomen* is significant, as it is its implication of possessing the *civitas*. Moreover, this Attic origin of the *nomen* Kasianos could account presumably for its atypical form (*cf. Hesperia*, Suppl. 13, p. 106), but it has its parallel in the name Sal(l)oustianos (as mentioned above), which of course was of Roman origin. The adoption of the name Kasianos occurred in the reign of Antoninus Pius and not «in the Severan period» [so Oliver in *Hesperia*, Suppl. 13 above], for in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2079 (A.D. 158/9), 3012 (A.D. 158/9) and 1772 [= *Agora XV*, No. 364] (A.D. 162/3 = *Ἀρχ. Δελτίον* 26 [1971] 286, under No. 12), we have Κασιανοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου Στειριέως and Κασι(ανοῦ) Ἀπολλωνίου Στειριέως (above) and Κασιαν[ὸς Ἀπολλώνιος] (Στε[ιριεύς]) respectively, though in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2085 (A.D. 161/2) the full name is Γ. Ἰούλιος Κασιανὸς Ἀπολλώνιος Στειριεύς<sup>2</sup>. But in the first third of the third century after Christ, more members of the family are found with the name Kasianos prefixed before such names as Antiochos, Apollonios, Bassos, Demetrios, *hierokêryx*, Isochrysos, Mousonios and Philippos<sup>3</sup>. One final comment here is that the

note 2 above). The writer restores it also in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2125, lines 5-6, in *R. belge philol. hist.* 52 (1) (1974) 60, No. 2.

1. *Cf.* Κασία Ἀντιπάτρου Ἀντιόχισσα, whose name must derive from the Κάσιον ὄρος in Syria (= EK No. 200 [p. 249, note 5 above], *s. I a.*); Γ. Καικίλιος Κάσιος Ἀχαρνεύς, *med. s. I p.* (= EK No. 592); and Μίλων Κασίου Μελήσιος, *aet. imperat.* (= EK No. 1414); also, [Κ?]άσιος, *med. s. I p.* (= EK No. 602). The Cassii in Attica before A.D. 70: Πρόπλιος Κάσσιος Γάβου Ῥωμαῖος, *s. I a.* (= EK No. 175); Αεύκιος Κάσιος, *init. s. I p., ut videtur* (= EK No. 470); Κό[ιντος] Κάσ[ιος], *aet. Claudii* (= EK No. 550); [and Κά(σιος) Σῆμος?, no date (= EK No. 1469)]. Moreover, *cf.* Κασιδωρος / Μερίτωνος / Ἀπαμεύς (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 8335, *s. I a.*). NOTE: See also *BCH* 46 (1922) 160-189, and *Bull. Épig.* 1974, pp. 206, No. 137, and 222, No. 220.

2. EK No. 1000 [p. 249, note 5 above]. The first attestation of the name Kasianos is found in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3968, line 13 (A.D. 148-150), which is a list of ῥαβδοφόροι. The list displays an economy in inscribing the names and Kasianos is probably the above Kasianos Apollonios, the ἀντικοσμητής.

3. *Cf. Agora XV*, Nos. 466, 477 and 491 and *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2199 (above), 2203 (above), 2230 (= *Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1950/1, p. 47, No. 29), 2235 (above), 2241, 3707 and 3712 (= *Hesperia*, Suppl. 13, 1970, 106). This writer has collected the family's members.



family's Roman names G. Julius (above) imply that it owed its *civitas* to one of the Julian emperors and I have collected the Julii in my dissertation (see under pp. 249-50, note 5 above). [cf. also *R. belge* (p. 254-5, note 2 above), p. 65].

NOTE: In *SEG* 21 (1965), 268 No. 747 = *Hesperia* 30 (1961), 272, No. 109, lines 6-8 (ων Γάιος ----- / σιανός ----- / ...ον, κτλ.) should be restored to read ων Γάιος [Ἰούλιος Κα]/σιανός [Ἀπολλώνιος/ος τ]όν, κτλ. (*s. II/III p.*). This Gaius (Julius Ka)sianos (Apollonios) may be the archon of A.D. 207/8 Γ. Κασ(ιανός) Ἀπολλώνιος Στειριεύς (= *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2199, line 7 [above] = *Hesperia* [p. 248, note 2 above], p. 53). Moreover, the names Γάιος Κασιανός should be read also in an E.M. fragment whose squeeze I found at the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton) on the 27th of August 1970.

H4 (= p. 250, note 1 above). The Vipsanii in Attica: (a) Α. Οὐψάνιος Αἰολίων Φλυεύς (*ter*), (b) Οὐψανία Λαιλιανή ἐκ Φλυέων and (c) Τ. Οὐψάνιος [---] Φλαβιανός Κηφεισιεύς of the end of the first century A.D. (above); (d) [Λού]κιος Οὐψ[άνιος Λαι]λιανός of about the same time, as he is probably Vipsanius Aiolion's father (= *Ath. Mitt.* 75, p. 83 (stemma) = *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 1956 (No. 3), p. 40, No. 148 = *Agch. 'Eφημ.* 1971, p. 131, under No. 27) [see also below]; (e) Οὐψάνιος Γαργ[ήτ(τιος)], πρωτένγραφος, of about A.D. 103/4-106/7<sup>1</sup> (= *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2017, line 14); (f) Οὐψαν[ί]α [-----] of at least after A.D. 112 (= *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2776, line 27 = *Hesperia* 41, 1972, 69, line 27); (g) Οὐψάνιος Ἡρακλείδης Μαρκαθ(ώνιος), ephebe shortly before A.D. 140 (= *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2046, line 32); and (h) Ἰουψανία Ἀθήνιον of about A.D. 170-190 (= *Hesperia* 29, 1960, 30, No. 37, line 5 = *SEG* 19, 1963, 70, No. 172 = Oliver, «The Athens of Hadrian», *Actes du colloque internationale sur les empereurs romains d' Espagne ...* [1965], 126).

[Cf. *TAPhS*, *loc. cit.* [p. 250, note 7 above], p. 80, under No. 10 (No. 10 is probably the same as the preceding No. 9, as it is pointed out in *R. belge* [p. 254, note 2 above], p. 65, No. 8)].

1. As limited by the writer (see below, p. 262), after Mlle Follet's new chronology (p. 254, note 1 above). In *R. belge* (p. 254, note 2 above), p. 71, note 40, it was suggested that *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2017 be dated immediately after the archonship of Flavius Makreinos Acharneus (= *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2026) because of πρωτένγραφοι and επένγραφοι (= vs. Μειλήσιοι). However, such a date would conflict with Mlle Follet's new chronology and order of παιδοτρίβαι, since the paidotribe in *I. G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2026 is Demetrios Rhamnousios,

The Vipsanii are indeed in the minority in the Greek East and besides those already cited from Attica, there are also these (collected as fully as possible): Βεψανία Νείκη, *I.G.* X(2, 1), No. 530, line 3; Βεψανία Λουκι[ανή?] (the writer's suggestion for the *cognomen*), *Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ.*, No. 3206 (Aigion); [Ο]ύ[ψαν]ία (?) Σατορνείνα, *I.G.* XII(2), No. 371; Α. Βεψ[νιον ----] /τιον/[----], *FD* III(1), No. 243; Μ. Βεψάνιος Σαννίδας, *Inscr. v. Olymp.*, Nos. 110, line 7, 117, line 5, and 118, line 5(?); Μ. Ούψάνιος Σελέας, *ibid.*, No. 461, lines 3-4; Μάρκος Ούψαν[ιος.....], *Ath. Mitt.* 68 (1953) 21; the father and daughters [Ούψαν]ία Ὀλυμπιᾶ[ς] Λουκίου Ούψανίου [οὔ Ἀπ]ελλήους and Ούε[ψανία] Πῶλ[λα] Λουκ[ίου Ούψανίου] Ἀ[πελλήους], *Jahreshefte* 45 (1960), Beiblatt, cols. 87-88, No. 14 (I & II), lines 3-6 and 3-8 respectively; and Ούψάνιος Καικιλιανὸς Ἄξιος, κρᾶτιστος ἐπίτροπος δοικηνάριος in the reign of Caracalla, *Bull. Épigr.* 1974, p. 282, No. 508 (see *I.G.R.R.* IV, No. 499, line 5: [Φλ?]ώρου Βεψανία[ι ἀρχιερεῖσι?]). *Addendum*: Α. Ούψάνιος (*SEG* 3, No. 335, line 6).

NOTE: Vipsanius Aiolion (Phlyeus) and his father Vipsanius Lailianos are attested in Samos (= *Ath. Mitt.* 75, p. 153), but they are listed above among the Vipsanii from Attica. Moreover, the grandfather (---)nius Philopoimen may have been also a Vipsanius (above, p. 251).

H5 (=p. 250, note 6 above). The priestess Flavia Laodameia from Phlya is mentioned also in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3546 (I & II [= *GRBS* 14, p. 393]), 3559, 3560, 4753 and 4754; and possibly in 3558, too (this document needs to be reconsidered [below]) [*cf.* *TAPhS* N. S. 64 (3), p. 74, No. 10; the chronology and identifications followed here are erroneous (below)]. Flavia Laodameia may have succeeded, as priestess of Demeter and Kore, Kleo adopted daughter of Eukles Phlyeus of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2879, etc. [= *TAPhS*, *loc. cit.*, p. 73, No. 9], and that Flavia Laodameia herself may have been succeeded in turn by Claudia Teimothea daughter of Teimotheos Gargettios of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3584, etc. (= EK No. 777) [= *TAPhS loc. cit.*, p. 74, No. 11]. George Stamires (according to the handwriting) dated this last priestess «*in. s. II p.*» in B. D. Meritt's *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> copy (previous date: *aetate Hadriani*).

C. P. Jones has identified Flavia Laodameia as the wife of M. Annius Pythodoros Cholleides and as mother of M. Annius Thrasyllus Cholleides who was ephebe in A.D. 112/3 (= *HSCPh* 71, 1966, 210 = *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2024, lines 2, etc.). However, this identification is erroneous and the family's stemma requires to be redrawn. For according to

Jones' identification, Flavia Laodameia would have been priestess of Demeter and Kore in the middle of the second century after Christ, since in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3557 (= *'Αρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1968, p. 211, No. 17a [*cf.* also *TAPhS*, *loc. cit.*, p. 87, No. 9]), the priestess honored the initiate ἀφ' ἐστίας Junia (Laodameia?) he kai Melitine (=EK No. 736), who was the daughter of Annia Aristokleia (a daughter of Annius Thrasyllus and granddaughter [son's side] of Flavia Laodameia) and Junius Patron Bernikides (=EK No. 893). If Junia Melitine had been the granddaughter of M. Annius Thrasyllus Cholleides, the ephebe of A.D. 112/3 (according to Jones' identification), she would have been about ten years old at about A.D. 144/5 by conservative estimates (=a twenty-year generation cycle), that is, at an appropriate age when she could be initiated ἀφ' ἐστίας (see *'Αρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1964 [1967], p. 121, note 2 [*cf.* also *TAPhS*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 98ff.]). But this is impossible according to the evidence and Flavia Laodameia could not have been the wife of M. Annius Pythodoros Cholleides and the mother of M. Annius Thrasyllus Cholleides, the ephebe of A.D. 112/3 (above), as proposed by Jones. That Flavia Laodameia belongs to the end of the first century after Christ, it is also clear from *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3546(II) [this is the only document of those in which Flavia Laodameia is attested which securely dates her priesthood to that period]. In this last document is honored T. Claudius Oinophilos (Hierophantes) Trikorysios (=EK No. 633 [*cf.* also *TAPhS*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 29-30, No. 18]).

H6 (p. 251, note 3 above). Of Tribal Cycles (20/19 B. C. - A.D. 118/9): After the publication of my article (Οἱ ἀρχόντες Γάτος καὶ Αούκιος) in *AAA* 7, 1974, 391-394, it was observed that *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1759 (= *Agora* XV, No. 312) had erroneously been ascribed to A.D. 96/7 in *Hesperia* 18 [p. 248, note 2 above], pp. 49 and 52 = Oineis VIII = *AAA*, *loc. cit.*, p. 391, note 8, while, for example, in *AJPh* 64 (1943) 48, the correct tribal cycle had been given (= Oineis VII [*cf.*, for example, *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1945 from A.D. 45/6]). The tribe of Oineis came to occupy the eighth position (= VIII) in the tribal cycle, after the creation of the tribe Hadrianis (=VII). Graindor has argued that the creation of Hadrianis belonged to the year A.D. 124/5 (= *Athènes sous Hadrien*, 1934, pp. 18-35 [p. 264, note 5 below]), while Notopoulos has shown that the inauguration of Hadrianis in the tribal cycles occurred in A.D. 127/8 (= *TAPA* 77, 1946, 53-56 = *Hesperia* 36, 1967, 50, note 18 [p. 264, note 5 below])[since then various arguments have become obsolete, as a result of Mlle Follet's new chronology (p. 254, note 1 above)].

At any rate, the above observation requires a certain readjustment in the tribal cycles and the author concludes that the seventh position (= Oineis VII) in the tribal cycle must be assigned now to A.D. 108/9, just as the archonship of Philopappos and Lailianos has been dated in *AAA*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 391-392. The reasons for dating these two archons to A.D. 108/9 have already been presented in *AAA* (above) and undoubtedly the previous erroneous order in the tribal cycles has led us to the correct placement of the archonship of Philopappos and Lailianos.

The new readjustment in the tribal cycles before the creation (= A. D. 124/5) or inauguration (= A. D. 127/8) of the tribe Hadrianis assigns the archon Apolexis (= *Agora XV*, Nos. 291 and 292) to 20/19 B.C., to which year the archon Apolexis, known also from an inscription from Eleusis which honored the  $\delta\alpha\delta\omicron\tilde{\omega}\chi\omicron\varsigma$  Themistokles (II) son of Theophrastos (II) Hagnousios, has been ascribed by W. B. Dinsmoor (see *TAPhS* [p. 250, note 7 above], p. 50 and note 30) [tribal cycle: Attalis XII]. Moreover, the archon Sekoundos, attested in *I.G.* IV<sup>2</sup> 83 and 84, lines 7 and 21, is placed now at A.D. 39/40 (see *BCH* 92, p. 505, note 1, and *TAPhS* (above), p. 29) [tribal cycle; Aiantis X]. Furthermore, the archonship of T. Coponius Maximos Hagnousios (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1072 = *GRBS* 14 398 [see p. 261 below]) must be assigned now to A.D. 118/9 (= Ptolemais V). Of course, according to the new chronology of Mlle Follet (p. 254, note 1 above), p. 43 = *AAA* (above), p. 391, and the previous identification of T. Coponius Maximos Hagnousios (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1072) with the archon Coponius Maximos (= *Inscr. d. Délos*, No. 2535, lines 22-23 = Follet), the archonship should be placed to the year A.D. 94/5 (= Ptolemais V), but according to the evidence it would not be incorrect to identify two archons by the name of Coponius Maximos. That is, (1) Coponius Maximos from about A.D. 98/9 (= *Inscr. d. Délos*, No. 2535) [for date, see p. 262 below] and (2) T. Coponius Maximos Hagnousios of A. D. 118/9 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1072) [see p. 261, note 3 below].

#### B: FLAVIUS STRATOLAOS (II) PHYLASIOS

P. Graindor published in *BCH* 38 (1914), 373, No. 8, and *Chronologie des Archontes Athéniens sous l'Empire* (1922), p. 277, No. 195, the text of E. M. 4037, which J. Kirchner reproduced as follows under *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3673:

$\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha$ [ $\theta\tilde{\eta}$   $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ ]  
 $\tau\omicron\nu$  [ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ ]  
 $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron$ [ $\nu\tau\alpha$  - -]

στρα[τ - -  
 O - - - (demot.) 5  
 [β]ασιλε[ύσαντα]  
 πολε[μαρχήσαντα]  
 - -

*I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> date: s. II/III p. (Graindor: fin du II<sup>e</sup> siècle ou III<sup>e</sup> siècle).

The present writer examined a photograph of E.M. 4037 and was able to recover the archon's full name:

ἀγα[θῇ τύχῃ]  
 τὸν [ἐπώνυμον]  
 ἀρχο[ντα Φλάβ(ιον)]  
 Στρα[τόλαον] 4  
 Φ[υλάσιον]  
 [β]ασιλε[ύσαντα καὶ]  
 πολε[μαρχήσαντα]  
 ΝΥ[- - - - -] 8  
 . .  
 [- - - - -]

LINE 5: Enough remains of the original letter as to leave no doubt of the Φ reading.

LINE 8 *ad init.*: An obvious interpretation of the surviving letter strokes appears to be the name Νυ[μφόδοτος], that is, the dedicator's name. Another possible rendering of line 8 may be [. ] ρ[- - - - -].

Graindor observed that epigraphically the above inscription belonged to a later period than that of the archon Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios), who is known from a Delian dodecade inscription and whose archonship dates now from about A.D. 100/1 (see below), according to Mlle Simone Follet's new chronology in *Mélanges ... à Pierre Chantraine* (1972), p. 43. The new archon Flavius Stratolaos (II) Phylasios, since he is to be distinguished from Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios), is to be identified with the ephebe Flavius Stratolaos Phylasios of A. D. 140/1: *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2047, lines 5-7 (γυμνασιαρχοῦντος δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους / Φ[λ.] Στρατολάου Φυλασίου) and 13-16 (Γερμανι/κείων / Φλά. Στρατόλαο[ς] / Φυλάσιος [= ἀγωνοθέτης]), and 2048, lines 10-14 (ἐγυμνασιάρχῃ/χῆσε τὸν ἐνιαυ- / τὸν τοῦς ἐφῆβους / Φλ. Στρατόλαος / Φυλάσιος)<sup>1</sup>. The ephebe Flavius Stra-

1. The Flavii in Attica have been collected by the present writer; see *Agx. 'Eφημ.* 1968, p. 177.

tolaos (II) Phylasios who may be recognized here as a grandson of the archon Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios) [above], would have been forty years of age by the year A.D. 162/3 and his archonship, then, may be dated after this year.

The archon Stratolaos of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2914 and 3798 (= *GRBS* 14, pp. 397-398), who has been equated in the past with the archon Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios), may be instead the above ephebe's father, as a reinterpretation of the evidence suggests. For when considering the Coponii Maximoi from Hagnous<sup>1</sup>, it appears that there were two archons by the name of Coponius Maximos, that is, Coponius Maximos of about A.D. 98/9 [see below] (= Follet) and T. Coponius Maximos of A.D. 118/9 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1072 = *GRBS*, *loc. cit.*, p. 398)<sup>2</sup> [previously these two archons were identified as being the same]. The archon of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1072 was the son of the ἱεροκῆρυξ Coponius Maximos who was epimelete of the city in the archonship of Stratolaos (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3798 [above]) and according to the evidence the *hierokêryx* became epimelete of the city after his son's archonship<sup>3</sup>. In *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2914 (above) [Π]ολύβιος Φάυστου [Φλυε]ύς, who is attested as ephebe in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996, line 55: Πολύ[βι]ος Φάυστου Φλυ(εὺς) [limited to about A.D. 84/5 in *'Aρχ. Δελτίον* 26 (1971) 276 and 303-304, K4 (but see below)], had made a dedication to Apollon Hypoakraios as πολέμαρχος, but it is impossible to establish at what age he served in that office, although the previous equation of the archon Stratolaos (above) with the archon Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios) and the attribution of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 to about A.D. 84/5 [but see below] would have Polybios Phlyeus serving as polemarch at about the age of thirty-two (ca. A.D. 66/7-98/9).

It is interesting to note also here that some ephebes of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996, lines 13 ('Αλκιμος ('Αλκίμου) Βησαιεύς), 21 (...<sup>8</sup>... [= 'Επέρστος] 'Αλκίμου Βησαιεύς), 22 (...<sup>6</sup>... [= 'Ηρακῶν] 'Αλκίμου Βησαιεύς) 33 ('Α[ντιόχο]ς? ('Α[ντιόχο]υ?) 'Αναφλύστιος), 77 (Φιλήμων 'Αμύντου 'Αναφλύστιος) and 146 (Κόρινθος (Κορίνθου) 'Αναφλύστιος = *'Aρχ. Δελτίον* 26, p. 295, No. 59)<sup>4</sup>, appear as prytaneis in *Agora* XV, No. 321, col. I, lines 7,

1. Oliver has discussed the Coponii from Hagnous in *GRBS* 14 (1973) 395-399 = *Historia* 24 (1975) 127 [see note 3 below].

2. For the tribal cycles between 20/19 B.C. and A.D. 118/9, see p. 251, note 3 above [see also note 3 below].

3. This will be discussed later in a follow-up study.

4. At that time I had not noticed the number of ephebes appearing together

12 and 15, and col. II, lines 21, 22 and 23. However, before continuing with this prytany catalogue and others, it would be appropriate to note here that *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 dates from the archonship of the emperor Domitian, which has been attributed to about A.D. 84/5 (above). According to the evidence, the emperor Domitian was archon before Trebellius Rhoupfos Lamptreus (A.D. 85/6-94/5) and the succeeding ἀναρχία (A.D. 86/7-95/6)<sup>1</sup>. In the archonship of Domitian, as we know from an inscription from Delphi (= *FD* III(2), No. 65, line 7), the [αὐλητῆς] was Φιλόμουσος Μαρθώνι[ο]ς. The same αὐλητῆς is attested also in a second inscription from Delphi (= *ibid.*, No. 66, lines 30-31: αὐλητῆς Φιλόμουσος), in which year there was an ἀναρχία, after the archonship of Trebellius Rhoupfos (above). The αὐλητῆς and other persons in these two inscriptions from Delphi confirm that the archonship of Domitian preceded that of Trebellius Rhoupfos and the ἀναρχία and it may not be erroneous to presume that Domitian was archon the year before Trebellius Rhoupfos. Moreover, since the archonship of Philopappos has been attributed lately to A.D. 108/9 (above), it may be possible to assign now the archonship of Domitian to A.D. 91/2, that of Trebellius Rhoupfos to A.D. 92/3, and the ἀναρχία to A.D. 93/4 [then the archon list from Delos would begin = Follet (above)]. The year A.D. 91/2 was a Panathenaic Year and Graindor excluded this year, as well as other such years, from dating Domitian's archonship<sup>2</sup>. However, it may well be that Domitian was archon during a Panathenaic Year and the remark of Apollonios of Tyana with reference to Domitian's archonship at Athens may give support to this contention (= Philostr., *Vit. Apol.* VIII, xvi: ..., ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν ἐπώνυμον Ἀθηναίους ἤρξεν, «εἶθε», ἔφη (= Ἀπολλώνιος), «καὶ ἐν Παναθηναίοις»,...) <sup>3</sup>. Moreover, the remark of Apollonios of Tyana seems to imply that Domitian was archon when he had become a tyrant (after A.D. 88), although his rule was strict before this year.

later as prytaneis and so Korinthos (son of Korinthos) Anaphlystios (= No. 59) was distinguished from the prytanis Korinthos (son of Korinthos) Anaphlystios (= No. 60). It appears now that the ephebe and the prytanis should be considered as being the same.

1. For the dates, see *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 83.

2. *Chronologie* ..., p. 95, under No. 65.

3. Of course, there is no indication in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 that Domitian was archon in a Panathenaic Year, but this may not have any significance, for Domitian served only as archon eponymous and did not preside over the Panathenaia, too. Perhaps the remark of Apollonios of Tyana could be understood in this context.

In any case, let us return once more to *Agora XV*, No. 321 (above). This prytany catalogue has prosopographical affinities with *Agora XV*, No. 330 [= *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 42, No. 11], lines 6: [Δημοχάρ]ης Ἐπικτήτου, 8: [Φιλήμων] Ἀμύντου, 9: [Μᾶρκος] (Μάρκου), and 12: [Εὐ-πορος] Μέμνονος (= [Ἀ]ναφλύστιοι), as the names are restored by this writer<sup>1</sup>. J. A. Notopoulos attributed this prytany catalogue to A.D. 135/6, on the basis of the prytany secretary who belonged to the deme of Gargettos (lines 29-30: [πε]ρὶ τὸ βῆμα / [- - - -]ς Εὐδῆμου Γαργήτιος = [Ἑρμείας] (aut [Γλαῦκος]ς) Εὐδῆμου Γαργήτιος)<sup>2</sup>. *Agora XV*, No. 330 is related prosopographically (lines 7, 10, 11, 12 and 24-26) to *Agora XV*, No. 333 [= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1764A], lines 14, 15, 16, 18 and 19) of A.D. 138/9, while *Agora XV*, No. 321 has only two affinities (lines 7 and 9) with *Agora XV*, No. 333, lines 15 and 20 [compare also lines 11 (= No. 321) and 16 (= No. 333)]. Moreover, *Agora XV*, No. 321 may have a prosopographical affinity with *Agora XV*, No. 334 [= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1764B] of A.D. 141/2 [line 12: Ἀῖλιος Ἡρακῶν περ[εσβύτερος?] (Βησαιεύς)], who may be Ἡρακῶν Ἀλκίμου (Βησαιεύς) of No. 321, col. II, line 21]. This equation would make Herakon Besaieus seventy-five years old when serving as prytanis for the second time (= ephebe in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 [= about A.D. 84/5], but as it has been contended above this ephebic text may date from A.D. 91/2, in which case Herakon would have been then sixty-eight in A.D. 141/2). The possibility that Herakon is mentioned also in *Agora XV*, No. 334 implies that he became a civis (= Aelius) after his attestation as prytanis in *Agora XV*, No. 321. Moreover, Korinthos (son of Korinthos) Anaphlystios, ephebe in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 and attested as prytanis in both *Agora XV*, No. 321, col. I, line 7, and No. 333, line 20<sup>3</sup>, would have been about seventy-two years old when serving for the second time as prytanis in A.D. 138/9 (or sixty-five, if *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 dates from A.D. 91/2 [above]). These two possible longevity cases (Herakon, seventy-five, and Korinthos, seventy-two = ephebes about A.D. 84/5) argue probably for a later date for *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1996 (= A.D. 91/2 above) and this undoubtedly strengthens also the contention that

1. The new readings were made from the photograph in *Hesperia* 11, 41; for line 12, see *Arch. Δελτίον* 26, p. 310.

2. Cf., for example, Ἑρμείας Γλαύκου and Εὐδῆμος Ἑρμείου (Γαργήτιοι) of *Agora XV*, No. 331, lines 9 and 18 (A.D. 138/9). Compare also Εὐφημ[ος] Εὐδῆμ[ου] Γαργήττ[ιος] (= *Hesperia* 28, 1959, 285, No. 13 [s. II p.]).

3. See p. 261, note 4 above.



the archons Flavius Stratolaos (I) (Phylasios) and Stratolaos ought to be distinguished (above).

One final and important observation to be made is that *Agora XV*, No. 330, in contrast to No. 333, has no *civis* listed in the surviving part, with the exception perhaps of line 17: [-----]άτης, where the nominative ending of the fragmentary name and the absence of a patronymic may suggest the listing of a *civis*, although possibly his name (if a *civis*) should have been inscribed first, just below the respective deme lemma (unless line 17 should be rendered as [ἐπιστ]άτης). This apparent absence of a *civis* may be significant in dating the prytany catalogue at least one tribal cycle earlier<sup>1</sup>, but Notopoulos' date (= A.D. 135/6 above) is obviously the correct one, for there are five prosopographical affinities between *Agora XV*, No. 330 and No. 333 (above). Antipatros son of Mousaios from Alopeke, who is attested as prytanis in *Agora XV*, No. 330, line 20: [Ἀντίπατ]ρος Μουσ(α)ίου (the alpha lacks the horizontal bar)<sup>2</sup>, was ephebe at about A.D. 110 (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2020, line 26: Ἀντίπατρος Μουσ. Ἀλω. [= *Aρχ. Δελτίον* 26, p. 314]) and he appears also in a dedication to Antoninus Pius (= *I.G.* 3391, line 3: Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ Μουσάι[ου Ἀλωπεκῆ]θε[ν]), dated A.D. 140-145. At the time Antipatros from Alopeke was ἀγορανόμος. *Agora XV*, No. 321, on the other hand, has two *cives* listed in col. I, line 17: Μᾶ(ρκος) Οὔλ(πιος) Ἀρχέλαος (Σημαχίδης), and col. II, line 19: Αὔ(ήνιος) Πρεῖμος (Βησαιεύς)<sup>3</sup>. The Roman names (= Marcus Ulpius) of the first *civis*<sup>4</sup> place this prytany catalogue securely after A.D. 98, when Trajan became emperor, but it antedates the creation of the tribe Hadrianis, when the deme of Besa was transferred from the tribe Antiochis to the newly created tribe

in honor of Hadrian. Notopoulos has shown that Hadrianis began to function in A.D. 127/8, but Graindor has argued persuasively that it was created in A.D. 124/5<sup>5</sup>.

1. The prytany catalogue is fragmentary (left side) and it is not possible to establish whether the prytaneis of the deme of Besa were listed in the lost part. If not, it would mean that the catalogue dated after the creation of the tribe Hadrianis (see below).

2. From the photograph (see p. 263, note 1 above).

3. Cf. Αὔ(ήνιος) Κερεάλιος Βησ(αιεύς) in *TAPA* 71 (1940) 302, line 17, and 303.

4. The Ulpii in Attica have been collected (see p. 260, note 1 above), but their number is small.

5. Notopoulos, *TAPA* 77, 53-56, and Graindor, *Ath. s. Hadr.*, pp. 18-35 [see pp. 258-9 above].

## C: FLAVIUS EUPHANES

It had been suggested by G. Colin<sup>1</sup> and was recently revived by Mlle Follet (= *op. cit.*, p. 44, note 55), without coming to a definite conclusion, that the archon of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 (III 1106), whose name is partially preserved (line 1: ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φλαβί[ου - -]), may have been the archon Flavius Euphanes of *Inscr. d. Délos*, No. 2536, lines 17-18: ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Φλαουίου Εὐφάνου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῷ. The archon Flavius Euphanes, as we know from the preceding Delian dodecade inscription, preceded the archon G. Julius Kasios Steirius (above), who is known from the same Delian inscription (lines 25-26) and also from an ephebic text, *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2037, line 3<sup>2</sup>.

An examination of the ephebic officials of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 and 2037 has shown that these two ephebic texts belong chronologically together. In both documents, the παιδοτρίβης is Ἀρίστων Παμνούσιος (line 2 and line 29 respectively), while the κεστροφύλαξ is Πυθικὸς (line 4 and line 84 in the same text order), whose office in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 is limited by the phrase διὰ βίου. But what really associates the two texts as belonging chronologically together is the office of the ὅπλομάχος, for in both documents the ὅπλομάχος is Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἀζηγιεύς (line 3 and line 75 respectively). It is true that there are to be observed significant gaps in the ephebic officials of the beginning of the second century after Christ, but the appearance of the same ὅπλομάχος in both *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 and 2037 argues for a close chronological arrangement of the two ephebic texts. Moreover, this is suggested also by the order of the archons in the dodecade inscription from Delos (Flavius Euphanes, G. Julius Kasios Steirius). Therefore, the archon's name of line 1 of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 may be completed with confidence now to read ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φλαβί[ου Εὐφάνου].

From the scanty evidence that we possess about the ephebic officials from about A.D. 90 to A.D. 126/7, it is only Asklepiades Azenieus who is attested to have served as ὅπλομάχος for a second time, though his demotic is restored in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2037, line 75. The other ὅπλομάχοι, known from *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2021, line 20, 2022, line 5, and 2024, line 122 (and 2025, lines 6-7), appear to have been annual. And as Mlle Follet has arranged the archons of this period, Asklepiades Azenieus, who may possibly have been serving as ὅπλομάχος διὰ βίου, precedes the apparent annual ὅπλομά-

1. *BCH* 23 (1899) 89 (= Follet, *op. cit.* [p. 254, note 1 above], p. 35).

2. See p. 254, note 1 above.

χοι of the texts cited above. Before Asklepiades Azenieus, Sostratos son of Nikias Palleneus is known to have served as *ὀπλομάχος* more than once (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 1993, lines 10-13, and 1994, line 4, of about A.D. 80).

In *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032 one of the *γυ(μνασίαρχοι)* was [*Ἀφρο*]δείσιος Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀχαρνέ[ς] (lines 6-7). The gymnasiarch was probably the son of Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀφροδισίου Ἀχαρνέ[ς] who, as *κοσμητής*, set up a dedication to Hadrian Olympios on behalf of the ephebes (= *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2041A, lines 7-8; *ὕπερ / τῶν ἐφήβων*) in the archonship of Κλ. Δομετιανός (=EK No. 776), which has been ascribed to A.D. 128/9 by Graindor<sup>1</sup>. However, in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 3387, dated about A.D. 128/9, Hadrian is not called yet Ὀλύμπιος, as in *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2041A (above). At any rate, the archon Claudius Dometianos belonged to the deme of Besa and he is also attested twice as prytanis (= *Agora XV*, No. 334, line 11 [A.D. 141/2], and No. 355, line 3 [*post med. s. II p.*]). On line 4 of the last document is listed Κλ. Διό[τιμος] (Βησ[αιεύς]) and the reader is referred to *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 429-431.

However, a pertinent question under review here is the age of the *κοσμητής* Apollonios Acharneus (above) when he made the dedication to Hadrian in A.D. 128/9, as previously dated, for his age has a bearing on the date of *I.G.* II<sup>2</sup> 2032. If the *κοσμητής* was sixty years old at the time, his son would have been born at about A.D. 88/9 or 98/9 (father 20 or 30 years old at the time of his son's birth) and the boy's ephebeia would fall at about A.D. 106/7 or 116/7 respectively. If, on the other hand, the *κοσμητής* was fifty, then the son's ephebeia would fall at about A.D. 116/7 or 126/7. However, there is no need of overstressing this point, for the complexity and vagueness of the matter have been illustrated by the above two examples. And as the chronology has been worked out above (p. 262), Flavius Euphanes' archonship should be placed at about A.D. 110/1. This year suggests that the son of the *κοσμητής* was born at about A.D. 92/3 and that the *κοσμητής* himself was about fifty-six / sixty-six years old in A.D. 128/9 (above).

Central Connecticut State College

ELIAS KAPETANOPOULOS

1. *Op. cit.* [p. 264, note 5 above], p. 41, note 1.