

STUDIES IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF ATHENS UNDER THE EMPIRE

Introduction

- I. Ferguson's Law in Athens under the Empire
 1. Tribal cycles from 138/9 to 209/10
 2. The continuity of tribal cycles after Sulla and under the Empire
- II. The secretaries of the tribal cycles
- III. The chronology of archons in the reign of Commodus and in the subsequent period
- IV. The chronology of prytany lists containing ἀείσιτοι, 165/6-209/10
- V. The chronology of other archons
- VI. The chronology of other inscriptions and notes on Athenian prosopography

Chronological Table of Tribal Cycles

Table of chronological changes in inscriptions

Index of new readings and restorations in inscriptions

INTRODUCTION ¹

AFTER discovering that Ferguson's law did not cease its operation in the Empire period ² the writer realized the need for a new and systematic study of this problem. New evidence and a more intimate knowledge of Athenian prosopography derived by the writer in the preparation of a prosopographia Attica for the Empire period have led to a number of changes in the position of secretaries. The question also arose of the continuity of tribal cycles after Sulla and their congruence with tribal cycles in the second century after Christ. It is hoped that sufficient progress has been made on this problem to encourage others who, through glimpses of order in the previously chaotic chronology of the first century before Christ, can make more progress in the chronology of this period. The remaining chapters in this study are concerned with the valuable chronological results derived from the application of Ferguson's law. All the extant prytany secretaries are assigned their proper position in the tribal cycles. The relatively greater number of secretaries in the second half of the second century after Christ enables us now to determine the proper sequence of archons in the reign of Commodus and to date the prytany lists containing ἀείσιτοι from 165/6-209/10.

¹ The writer wishes to acknowledge the *sine qua non* help that he has received from Professors B. D. Meritt, A. E. Raubitschek, S. Dow, and Dr. M. Mitsos.

² Cf. J. A. Notopoulos, "Ferguson's Law in Athens under the Empire," *A.J.P.*, LXIV, 1943, pp. 44-55.

These studies in the chronology of the Empire period besides furnishing us with many accurate dates are an essential preparation for the work on the collaborative project in Athenian prosopography.³ For this project a more accurate chronology must be established for the Athenians in the Empire period. Inscriptions dated accurately by virtue of the presence of prytany secretaries can be used as magnets to attract many other and forthcoming inscriptions from the Agora prosopographically related to them. Because of the presence of many family stemmata in our epigraphical evidence the changes in chronology are often considerable. It is hoped that in addition this will result in many contributions which epigraphy can render toward a more definitive history of Athens under the Romans which yet remains to be written.

I. FERGUSON'S LAW IN ATHENS UNDER THE EMPIRE

1. TRIBAL CYCLES FROM 138/9 TO 209/10

An examination of the epigraphical evidence in the period following 138/9 establishes with absolute certainty the operation of Ferguson's law with respect to secretary tribal cycles. *I.G.*, II², 1765 is dated in 138/9 by the fact that the inscription mentions the fifteenth year of Hadrian's era which commenced with his visit to Athens in 124/5.⁴ The secretary in this inscription is *Χρυσόγονος Φλυεύς* of the tribe Ptolemais (V). If we rotate the prytany secretaryship in the official order forward from this point we should find that in 167/8 through 169/70 Oeneis (VIII), Kekropis (IX), and Hippothontis (X) should hold the secretaryship.

It happens that in the years 167/8-169/70 the sequence of archons is clear and their date certain.⁵ The relevant facts are stated in the following table which contains three secretaries who can be dated consecutively in the Empire Period.

<i>Inscription</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Demotic</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1774	167/8	'Αναρχία (I)	Μουσαῖος	Φυλάσιος	Oeneis VIII
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1775; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, Nos. 18 and 21, pp. 50, 55	168/9	Τιμήριος Ποντικός	Σκρειβώνιος Ταμιακός	'Αλαιεύς	Kekropis IX
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1776; 1781	169/70	'Αναρχία (II)	Κορ. Μενεσθεύς	('Αζηνιεύς) ⁶	Hippothontis X

³ Cf. *T.A.P.A.*, LXXV, 1944, xix.

⁴ P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934), pp. 18 ff.

⁵ Cf. W. Kolbe, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLVI, 1921, pp. 134, 137, 138-9, 149. The *ἀναρχία* mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 1776, 1781, falls in the thirty-fourth year of the paidotribia of Abaskantos (cf. *I.G.*, II², 2097 190). The perfect sequence of a tribal cycle in the secretaries of 167/8-169/70 shows that Kolbe's dating of Abaskantos is now a certainty.

⁶ For the demotic of Κορ. Μενεσθεύς, cf. *A.J.P.*, LXIV, 1943, p. 49.

This tribal sequence gives us indisputable evidence of sequence in the official order from 138/9 to 169/70.

If we begin with 138/9, the year in which the secretary comes from Ptolemais (V), and rotate forward tribal cycles in the official order we find that 209/10 is the year when Aiantis (XI) should hold the secretaryship. This is corroborated by *I.G.*, II², 1077, a decree passed in the archonship of Φλ. Διογένης. This archon has been dated with certainty by Dittenberger in 209/10,⁷ for the decree passed in Posideon (Dec.-Jan.) is in honor of Geta who was elevated by Septimius Severus, after the Caledonian campaign in the closing months of 209, to the rank of Augustus and assumed the title of Britannicus. The secretary for the year in which Φλ. Διογένης was archon is Ῥόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθώνιος of the tribe Aiantis (XI). He establishes beyond doubt Dittenberger's date⁸ and furnishes conclusive evidence for the continuation of Ferguson's law. This coincidence, reached on the basis of two pieces of evidence quite independent of each other, definitely establishes the operation of Ferguson's law in the Empire period, and specifically supplies us with the upper and lower limits of tribal cycles extending from 138/9 to 209/10. A review of the evidence concerning the prytany-secretaries shows that Ferguson's law continued in the Empire period. With this discovery we now have the foundation for a more precise chronology of Athens.

2. THE CONTINUITY OF TRIBAL CYCLES AFTER SULLA AND UNDER THE EMPIRE

The discovery of tribal cycles in Athens from 138/9 to 209/10 raises the question of their continuity and congruence with tribal cycles in Hellenistic Athens. Do the tribal cycles of the prytany-secretaryship, when rotated backward from the second century after Christ, connect satisfactorily with the tribal cycles which terminate with the dictatorship of Medeios in 91/0 and the ensuing anarchy? Several important historical considerations must be kept in mind in testing the validity of this hypothesis.

The first of these is the fundamental tact of the Romans in not interfering with local political machinery unless this interfered with Rome's policies and interest. Our sources give ample testament to this. If furthermore we relate the existence of tribal cycles in Athens under the Romans before Medeios' dictatorship with Appian's testimony that Sulla, after capturing Athens in 86 B.C., "gave to the Athenians substantially the same laws that had been previously established for them by the Romans"⁹ we have no grounds for believing that Sulla made any changes in the

⁷ Dittenberger, *S.I.G.*³, no. 872, note 3; cf. *I.G.*, II², 1077, note to lines 6-7; *I.G.*, III, 10.

⁸ Graindor dates this archon in 208/9 or 209/10; cf. *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* (*Memoires de l'Acad. Roy. de Belgique*, VIII, 2, Brussels, 1922), no. 169.

⁹ Appian, *Mith.*, 39; cf. *S.I.G.*³, 684, lines 15-16; [τ]ῆς ἀποδεδομένης κατὰ [κ]οινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλ[ησιν] ἐλευθερίας; *Cambridge Ancient History*, VIII, 292-5; Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo, 1927), pp. 101 ff., 130 ff.; *I.G.*, II², 4992.

prytany-secretaryship. It is evident from inscriptions that tribal consciousness is still strong after the Hellenistic period. The fact that the Council of 500 after Hadrian's visit to Athens still maintained the tribal mechanism in the prytany-secretaryship shows that the Romans were not disposed to interfere with a political expression of the Athenians' deeply ingrained tribal consciousness. The Romans might for example raise the power of the Areopagos and diminish that of the Assembly; they might elevate the position of the hoplite general and vest the *εὐθύνη* in the Council rather than in the courts of the Assembly, but they would never consider the office of prytany-secretaryship a subject of necessary reform. The reforms of Sulla¹⁰ were of such a nature as not to affect the tribal mechanism.

It might be argued that the Athenians themselves may have discontinued it. This is unlikely, for, as will be shown, the prescripts of the decrees of the Council are with slight variation the same in the Hellenistic period, after Sulla, and in the early and late Empire periods. A decree as late as 209/10 shows the same formulaic diction and listing of details as a Hellenistic decree. A study of the prescripts of the Council in all periods shows the same tendency toward logical elaboration, the same passion for clerical detail. Where bureaucracy has supplanted annual magistracies we have mention of the same officer year after year; the lists of *ἀείσιτοι* in the prytany inscriptions furnish ample testimony as to the extent of bureaucratic intrusion into magistracies and the extent to which some offices like the prytany-secretaryship are annual magistracies. Where the offices are annual we have the same passion for detail manifested in listing the change of personnel from year to year, and it is significant for our purpose that none of the decrees in the period with which we are concerned shows any bureaucratic change in the office of prytany-secretaryship. Surely the Athenian passion for detail would have listed this change, such as we have in the dictatorship of Olympiodoros when the anagrapheus replaced the prytany-secretary for two years.¹¹ The absence of the same secretary for any two years gives us confidence in the possibilities of normal continuation. To Athenians annual offices were integrally connected with tribal consciousness. As Ferguson has aptly pointed out, "Sortition, conjoined with tribal rotation, of administrative offices was fundamental in Athenian government; and oligarchs differed from democrats, not so much as to the principle, as on the practical question of the offices to which it should be applied."¹² The Athenians show a persistent stability in this matter even in the election of archons in the Empire period where it has been shown that there exists considerable tribal consciousness.¹³ The existence of tribal cycles in the prytany-secretaryship at the

¹⁰ W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), pp. 149-152.

¹¹ Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), xvi-xvii, p. 46; Ferguson, *Athenian Secretaries* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1898), p. 41.

¹² Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 49-50.

¹³ J. A. Notopoulos, "The Method of Choosing Archons in Athens under the Empire," *A.J.P.*, LXV, 1944, pp. 149-166.

beginning of the third century after Christ merely illustrates the longevity of the tribal consciousness of Athens and gives us confidence in believing that this must have been the case even earlier.

The third historical consideration which we must bring to this study of tribal cycles is the fact that the *pax Romana* freed Athens from the tempestuous political changes which are reflected in Hellenistic tribal cycles. Aside from 49/8, when Athens sided with Pompey and was captured by Caesar's legate Q. Fufius Calenus only to be forgiven by Caesar in 48 with its democratic institutions restored,¹⁴ the city enjoyed an undisturbed peace which suggests the continuation of tribal cycles.

The final consideration is that if this is the case the cause for the disturbance of cycles is most likely to be found in the creation of a new tribe.

With these factors forming as it were the historical probabilities which enter into the judgment of the evidence we may approach the problem of the continuation of tribal cycles at 138/9, the point where we have absolute evidence for the existence of tribal cycles. If we rotate the cycles backward from 138/9, the date of the inauguration of Hadrianis is 127/8.¹⁵

The creation of a new tribe in honor of a distinguished visitor marks a break in the tribal cycles. The creation of Hadrianis in 127/8 marks precisely the point where the tribal cycles break. The question arises whether 127/8 might mark not the break in the cycles but rather the commencement of tribal cycles in honor of Hadrian. Several considerations may be brought against such a hypothesis. Except for the change in the size of the Council necessitated by the creation of a new tribe we find no change in the inscriptions as to its previous status or function. The language of the prescripts of the decrees of the Council reveals no fundamental change as to procedure or magistrates before or after Hadrian. An examination of the prescripts of *I.G.*, II², 1028 (101/0), 1072 (117/8), and 1077 (209/10) reveals the stability of the Council. The passion for literacy, i. e., for writing down details, shows no change in the mechanics of the Council. Whatever the differences are, which Dow has noted between pre-Sullan and post-Sullan decrees, there is no change in the mention of the prytany-secretary. A comparison of a prytany list in 40-30 B.C. with those in the second half of the second century after Christ shows that the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* is listed among the *ἀείστοι* in both periods.¹⁶ Furthermore we see the same tribal consciousness exhibited in the ephebic decrees before and after Hadrian's visit to Athens. The tribal order exhibited in the dedication of statues to Hadrian in 124/5

¹⁴ J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (New York, 1942), p. 130.

¹⁵ Cf. J. A. Notopoulos, "The Date of the Creation of Hadrianis," *T.A.P.A.*, LXXVII, 1946, pp. 53-56.

¹⁶ S. Dow, *Prytaneis, A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors*, *Hesperia*, Supplement I (Athens, 1937), pp. 24-25, 173.

points to the same.¹⁷ The absence of evidence to the contrary disposes us to believe that the tribal cycles ante-date Hadrian's arrival in Athens, and the proof of this, as will be shown, is the congruence of tribal cycles from a dated secretary just before Hadrian's arrival and the tribal cycles which were broken by Medeios' dictatorship.

This dated secretary in *I.G.*, II², 1072 is Νεικίας Δωρίωνος Φλυεύς (V) who has been accurately dated by Kolbe, Kirchner, and Graindor in 117/8, in the archonship of T. Κωπώνιος Μάξιμος.¹⁸ If we rotate the tribal cycles forward from 117/8 until 127/8, the date of the inauguration of Hadrianis, we determine the break in tribal cycles, as was expected to be the case in the creation of a new tribe.

If we rotate twelve tribal cycles backward from 117/8 through a period sparse in prytany-secretaries we come to the year 21/0, which has as archon Ἀπόληξις and as prytany-secretary Μητροφάνης Διονυσίου Ἀθμονεύς (XII). On the basis of a coördination with a Delian archon Dinsmoor followed by Daux has dated this archon in 20/19.¹⁹ The fact that their dating of this archon is almost identical with that as determined by tribal cycles is marked evidence for the continuation of tribal cycles after Medeios and before Hadrian's arrival in Athens. This is furthermore strengthened by the perfect congruence of eighteen tribal cycles rotated backward from 117/8 until we reach 86/5, the year in which, according to the tribal cycles, the seventh tribe (Oeneis) should hold the office of prytany-secretaryship.

If we commence the tribal cycles from 101/0, where we have definite evidence for tribal cycles, and extend them to 91/0, when Medeios overthrew the constitution and became a dictator for three years followed by the dictatorship of Aristion, we are confronted with the following picture in tribal cycles:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
101/0	Medeios	Φιλίων Φιλίωνος Ἐλευσίνιος	IX
100/99	Theodosios		10
99/8	Prokles		11
98/7	Argeios		12
97/6	Herakleitos		1
96/5	— kratou	[. ^{ca. 11} ἔγ M]υ[ρρινούτ]της	II
95/4	Theodotos	[— — — — — ^{ca. 17} — — — — —]ου Παιανιεύς	III
94/3	Kallias		4
93/2	Kriton		5
92/1	Menedemos		6

¹⁷ *I.G.*, II², 3287.

¹⁸ Graindor now agrees with Kolbe's date, cf. *Athènes sous Hadrien*, p. 29.

¹⁹ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), p. 293; *A.J.A.*, XLIX, 1945, p. 609.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
91/0	Medeios	Probably anagrapheus replaces the prytany-secretary; (cf. dictatorship of	—
90/89	Medeios	Olympiodoros, Pritchett and Meritt, <i>Chronology of Hellenistic Athens</i> , xvi-	—
89/8	Medeios	xvii)	—
88/7	Anarchy		—
87/6	Anarchy until May/June, 86, then Philanthes		—
86/5	Hierophantes	Sulla restores "freedom" to Athens	7
85/4	Pythokritos		8
84/3	Niketes		9
83/2	Pammenes		10
82/1	Demetrios		11
81/0	Ar-		12

From this we observe that the sixth tribe (Akamantis) holds the office when the democratic constitution was overthrown by Medeios, and that according to the backward rotation of cycles from 117/8 it is the seventh tribe which should hold this office in 86/5, when Sulla restored freedom to Athens. This dovetailing of tribal cycles throws light on and is consonant with the historical events of a troubled interval of Athenian history.²⁰

Sulla entered Athens on March 1, 86.²¹ The tyrant Aristion and his followers withdrew into the Acropolis where they were besieged for a long time. While the siege was going on Sulla tried without success to overcome Archelaos who withdrew into Munychia. Sulla then transferred his forces to Boeotia where, after the campaign described in Plutarch, Sulla defeated Archelaos at Chaeronea. He sought to intercept Archelaos at the Euripos but failing to do so returned to Athens where because of thirst Aristion and his followers had surrendered on the Acropolis about the time of the battle of Chaeronea.²² Since Plutarch describes the interval of the siege as long (*καὶ χρόνον ἐγκατερήσας συχνόν*, *Sulla*, XIV, 7) it must have been in the very last month or so of the Attic year 87/6 that Athens was completely free and because of his victory at Chaeronea Sulla and the Athenians could turn their thoughts to the restoration of the constitution. A provisional government of business men was now re-established in Athens and Philanthes was appointed eponymous archon²³ for the last month or two of 87/6. This short interval marks the period when Sulla, in

²⁰ For a more detailed account cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London, 1911), pp. 444 ff.; *Cambridge Ancient History*, IX, pp. 244 ff.

²¹ Plutarch, *Sulla*, XIV, 10.

²² Cf. *Cambridge Ancient History*, IX, p. 251.

²³ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 454, note 6.

Appian's words, "gave to the Athenians substantially the same laws that had been previously established for them by the Romans." This interval was occupied with some of the constitutional changes at the end of the war as noted by Ferguson,²⁴ and they must have been completed just about the time that the new year 86/5 was beginning. Thus we see that practically speaking 87/6 could also be joined to 88/7 as an abnormal year. The restoration of freedom and of the constitution therefore coincides with the opening of 86/5, the year when the seventh tribe should hold the prytany-secretaryship according to the backward rotation of tribal cycles from the Empire period. The picture of the tribal cycles at this point, namely that the seventh tribe dovetails exactly with the sixth tribe in 92/1, the year before the overthrow of the constitution by Medeios, corroborates and gives a specific instance of the truth of Appian's words. Thus the continuation of the tribal cycles reflects the restoration and the continuation of the constitution.

The continuation of a previous cycle rather than the commencement of a new cycle after a period of dictatorship and anarchy is not without precedent or parallel in Athenian history. We find an exact parallel²⁵ in the picture of the tribal cycles before and after the dictatorship of Olympiodoros in 295/4-292/1:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
296/5	Nikias	Ἀ[ν]τι[κρ]άτης Κρατίν[ου Ἀζην]ι[εύς]	X
295/4	Nikostratos	Δωρόθεος Ἀρ[ιστομάχ]ου Φαληρέως	XI
<i>Anagrapheus</i>			
294/3	Olympiodoros	Θρασ[..... ¹⁹ Φυ]λασίου (genitive)	--
293/2	Olympiodoros	Ἐπίκουρος Ἐπιτέλου[ς], Ῥαμνούσιος	—
<i>Secretary</i>			
292/1	Philippos	—	12
291/0	Aristonymos	Κλειγ[ένης ... ⁷]ς Αἰθαλίδης	I
290/89	Charinos	[..... ¹⁸]υς Θορα[ιεύς]	II

Thus the congruence of tribal cycles rotated backward from a fixed point in the Empire period to a fixed point before Medeios' dictatorship gives us confidence in a continuous fixed chronology in Athenian history where we have evidence of archons coupled with prytany-secretaries. That this congruence is not merely an accident but is corroborated by the historical circumstances of the period is apparent from the above.

Before we can be sure of this invaluable key to chronology in a period of Athens' history which is lacking in precise chronology, we must account for the secretaries

²⁴ Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 150 ff.

²⁵ Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, pp. xvi-xvii.

of 52/1 and 49/8 whose known tribes do not follow the official order. Ferguson has shown that the sortition cycle though rare was on occasion used by the Athenians. We do not know the reasons behind the use of a sortition cycle from 56/5 to 45/4, but that we have here a sortition cycle which is not fatal to the continuity of tribal cycles is evident from one important consideration. This sortition cycle, when placed in the context of the entire sweep of cycles rotated backward from a fixed point in the Empire period, connects satisfactorily with the tribal cycles in 92/1 and with the year of Apolexis. The congruence, as we have seen, is not mere accident but reflects accurately the historical events of the period. The continuation of the tribal cycles after the dictatorship and anarchy, with its precedent in Olympiodoros' dictatorship, gives us ground for believing that this sortition cycle harmonizes with rather than disrupts the continuity of tribal cycles. The fact that this cycle fits into the proper place in a sweep of cycles from definite fixed points after Sulla and definite cycles from the Empire period shows that its context in the whole sequence does not disturb the continuity of tribal cycles. Until more definite evidence appears to the contrary the historical considerations stated above and the evidence of tribal cycles dispose us to believe in the continuity of tribal cycles from the Sullan period to the third century after Christ.

These tribal cycles besides furnishing us with a more accurate chronology for post-Sullan and Imperial Athens illustrate the longevity of the tribal mechanism which was the political expression of a deeply ingrained (one might say *αὐτοφύως*²⁶) tribal consciousness among the Athenians, from the beginning of their democracy almost to the end of their history. The tribal cycles illustrate the love which the Athenians had for this democratic device to which they adhered cycle after cycle, century after century.

II. THE SECRETARIES OF THE TRIBAL CYCLES

The history of the office of the prytany-secretary after Sulla differs only in several details from the status of this office in the Hellenistic period.²⁷ Although this officer continues to be called *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, he is more often referred to as *περὶ τὸ βῆμα* in the prytany lists. The presence of this officer around the *βῆμα* in the *βουλευτήριον* may account for this alternate title given by the prytaneis in their listing of the *αἰεῖσιτοι*.²⁸ The fact that the same secretary is called *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* in one prytany list and *περὶ τὸ βῆμα* in another²⁹ shows that even though the latter is more common the former title continues in usage.

In the listing of the *αἰεῖσιτοι* in the prytany lists³⁰ this officer usually follows the *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου* and occasionally the *ἀντιγραφεύς*. In the decrees of the

²⁶ Cf. Plato, *Laws*, 642 c.

²⁷ Cf. Ferguson, *Athenian Secretaries*, pp. 65-6.

²⁸ Meritt, who made this suggestion to me (*per litt.*), now tells me that mention of the bema has been incorporated in the text of D8 in *A.T.L.*, II, p. 52.

²⁹ See pp. 14-15.

³⁰ Cf. Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 22.

Council and the Demos there is no important change in the prescript mentioning the secretary. The occasional omission of the demotic finds parallels in some decrees of the Hellenistic period.³¹

It is apparent from our evidence that this office became elective in the Empire period. We have an instance where the same secretary served in two consecutive cycles.³² The fact that the prytany-secretary seems to have been elected *κατὰ φυλάς* rather than chosen by lot shows that the office reverted to the status it occupied shortly before Aristotle's day. In speaking of this magistracy Aristotle says, "formerly this officer was elected by show of hands, and the most distinguished and trustworthy men used to be elected, for this officer's name is inscribed in *stelae*."³³ The prosopography of some of the secretaries in the Empire period shows that they were people of eminence who also held other offices.³⁴ It may be that this office survived and was distributed *κατὰ φυλάς* because of the fact that the name of the holder appeared along with that of the eponymous archon on all official documents. If so, we have an adaptation of a democratic device to an aristocratic and honorific office.

The decline of democracy is reflected in the comparatively few decrees that we have in the Empire period in contrast to the number of decrees before Sulla. Of the 33 secretaries whose names survive from 86/5-209/10 only 7 come from official decrees of the Council and the Demos, the remainder are found in prytany lists and in particular among the *ἀείσινοι*. The distribution of these secretaries according to centuries is also significant.

first century B.C. (after 86/5):	5
first century A.D.:	1
second century A.D.:	24
third century A.D.:	3

The accident of discovery plays, no doubt, an important part in this distribution but the decline of democratic activity on the part of the Council and the Assembly is a contributory factor which is realized more keenly when the content of the decrees of the Empire period is seen to be mostly honorific in character. The comparatively larger number of secretaries from the second century, and in particular from 166/7-195/6, cannot be intelligently explained, but it shows clearly that the real advance which Ferguson's law can make at present in the chronology of Imperial Athens is in the second half of the second century A.D.

A study of the evidence assigns the secretaries to the following positions in the tribal cycles.

³¹ Cf. *I.G.*, II², Pars IV, p. 47.

³² See pp. 14-15.

³³ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 54, 3.

³⁴ Cf. *I.G.*, II², 1774, line 72 note; 1776, line 42; cf. *I.G.*, II², 1736a, line 11 = Κορνήλιος Μ[ενεσθεύς]; 1798, line 25.

1. FIRST CENTURY B.C.

96/5: *I.G.*, II², 1029.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: [---]της Ἐπ[--- ἐγραμμάτευεν].

Previous date: 94/3.

Dow reports to me that the squeeze reads the end of the secretary's demotic and tentatively suggests [...^{ca. 11}... ἐγ Μ]υ[ρρινού]της ἐγ[ραμμάτευεν] or the only other possible demotic ending in -της, [...^{ca. 11}... Δε]ι[ραδιώ]της. The secretary therefore can come from Aegeis (II) or Leontis (IV). Internal evidence is in favor of Aegeis. This inscription must be dated in the year after Herakleitos' archonship (97/6), for it reads ἐ]πειδὴ οἱ ἔφηβοι οἱ ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείτου [ἄρχον]τος τοῦ μετὰ Ἀργεῖον. Dow has shown⁸⁵ that there is no second year in the archonship for Argeios and that Ἡράκλειτος Ἡρ[^{ca. 54}...] Σφήττιος follows directly after the first year of Argeios. If we rotate the cycles forward from 101/0, when the secretary Φιλίων Φιλίωνος Ἐλευσίνιος (IX) holds office, we find that the year after Argeios should fall to Aegeis (II), a fact which now corroborates Dow's first reading.

95/4: *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, no. 12, p. 25.

Archon: Θεόδοτος.

Secretary: [-----^{ca. 17}-----]ον Παιανιεύς.

For the dating see Meritt's discussion *loc. cit.*

64/3: *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, no. 14, p. 30.

Archon: Οἰνόφιλος.

Secretary: Ταρᾶν[τ]εῖνος Νεικίου Αἰγ[ιλιεύς].

Meritt dates this inscription on the basis of the style of the preamble near the middle of the first century. The secretary's position on the basis of the tribal cycles would accordingly be 64/3.

52/1: *I.G.*, II², 1046.

Archon: Λύσανδρος Ἀπολήξιδος.

Secretary: Γάϊος Γαῖου Ἀλαιεύς.

The date of the archon is fixed by the third column in *I.G.*, II², 1713 which lists the archons for 55/4-48/7. For a discussion of the tribal cycle from 56/5 to 45/4 see above, pp. 8-9.

49/8: *I.G.*, II², 1047.

Archon: Δημοχάρης.

Secretary: [---]στοκλέους Ἀπολλωνιεύς.

The date of this secretary and archon is fixed by the mention of the archon in

⁸⁵ S. Dow, "The First Enneëteric Delian Pythais," *H.S.C.P.*, LI, 1940, pp. 110 ff., year VII.

the third column of *I.G.*, II², 1713 which lists the sequence of archons from 55/4 to 48/7. For the secretary cycle 56/5 to 45/4 see above, pp. 8-9.

21/0: *I.G.*, II², 1040, 2876; *F. Delph.*, III, 2, 61; Dow, *Prytaneis*, no. 115; Ἐλευσινιακά (Athens, 1932), I, p. 225; P. Roussel, *Mélanges Bidez* (Brussels, 1934), II, p. 819; cf. G. Daux, *Chronologie Delphique* (Paris, 1943), p. 75.

Archon: Ἀπόληξις.

Secretary: Μητροφάνης Διονυσίου Ἀθμονεύς.

Previous date: Graindor 25/4-18/7; Dinsmoor and Daux 20/19.

Kolbe, followed by Kirchner,³⁶ dates *I.G.*, II², 1040, between 47/6 and 43/2. Graindor,³⁷ who is tacitly followed by Ferguson and Dinsmoor, thinks that the Ἀπόληξις of *I.G.*, II², 1040 is the same as the Ἀπόληξις whose archonship coincides with the Delphian archon Antigenes. Graindor has dated Ἀπόληξις in 25/4-18/7 but Dinsmoor followed by Daux dates him in 20/19.³⁸ The position of the secretary's tribe, Attalis (XII), now definitely places this archon in 21/0.

20/19: *I.G.*, II², 1040.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Ἀν[---].

If Graindor's contention that we do not possess any evidence for the existence of a homonymous archon Apolexis before the two archons by the name Apolexis in Augustus' period is correct then we must date this secretary in the year after Apolexis.

2. THE FIRST CENTURY AFTER CHRIST

96/7: *I.G.*, II², 1759.

Archon: Φιλόπαππος καὶ Λαιλιανός.

Secretary: Βούλων Μοιραγένους Φυλάσιος.

Previous date: 90-100.

On the basis of the prosopography Graindor dates this inscription *ca.* 90-100. The tribe of the secretary now fixes the position in the cycle in the year 96/7.

3. THE SECOND CENTURY AFTER CHRIST

117/8: *I.G.*, II², 1072.

Archon: Τ. Κωπώνιος Μάξιμος Ἀγνούσιος.

Secretary: Νεικίας Δωρίωνος Φλυεύς.

³⁶ Cf. note on *I.G.*, II², 1040.

³⁷ Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, pp. 101-2; *Chronologie*, no. 6.

³⁸ Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 293; cf. *A.J.A.*, XLIX, 1945, p. 609; Georges Daux, *Chronologie Delphique* (Paris, 1943), p. 75.

T. Κωπώνιος Μάξιμος heads the list of a sequence of archons found in a Delian list. Kolbe fixed the sequence in the year 117/8-121/2. Graindor differed in the date by one year but in his later work, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (p. 29), agreed with Kolbe's dating.

135/6: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 11, p. 40.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: [---]ς Εὐδήμου Γαργήτιος.

Previous date: first half of the second century A.D.

Five persons in this prytany list are also found in *I.G.*, II², 1764, a prytany list dated in 138/9. The tribe of the secretary assigns this inscription to 135/6.

138/9: *I.G.*, II², 1765.

Archon: Πραξαγόρας (Ι) Θορίκιος.

Secretary: Χρυσόγονος ὁ Φλυεύς.

This inscription is dated accurately by virtue of the fact that it mentions the fifteenth year of the era of Hadrian.

148/9: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 14, p. 45.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: [---]άτων Γαργήτι[ος].

Previous date: the middle of the second century after Christ.

The tribe of the secretary assigns this inscription to 148/9, an appropriate position on the basis of the prosopography.

165/6: *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, no. 23, p. 77.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: .τ (or .π) [.ca.4.]πος ὁ Σ[.ca.5.].

Previous date: 165/6?

A study of the ἀείσιτοι in this list (see below, Tab. 1) shows that it must be dated in 165/6 and that the demotic of the secretary is Σφήτι(ος), a conclusion independently reached by A. E. Raubitschek. The new reading of the secretary's name is based on a new reading of the stone by Dr. Mitsos.

166/7: *I.G.*, II², 1773.

Archon: Μ. Βαλέριος Μαμερτίνος Παραθώνιος.

Secretary: Φ[...]ος Ποσειδωνίου[ν].

Kolbe has dated this archon in 166/7.³⁹ By virtue of the sequence of the next two secretaries the tribe of this secretary should be Hadrianis (7).

167/8: *I.G.*, II², 1774.

Archon: ἀναρχία (Ι).

Secretary: Μουσαῖος ὁ Φυλάσιος.

³⁹ *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXXVI, 1921, pp. 134, 137.

This inscription should be dated in this year because of the reference to the year after *Μαμερτεῖνος*.

168/9: *I.G.*, II², 1775; *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 18, p. 50.

Archon: *Τινῆιος Ποντικός Βησεεύς*.

Secretary: *Σκρειβώνιος Ταμιακός Ἀλαιεύς*.

Kolbe has dated this archon in 168/9 by reason of the mention of the thirty-fourth year of the *παιδοτριβία* of Abascantus.⁴⁰ This gives us important evidence for the operation of Ferguson's law in this interval.

169/70: *I.G.*, II², 1776, 1781, 2097.

Archon: *ἀναρχία* (II).

Secretary: *Κορ. Μενεσθεύς* (Ἀζημιεύς).

This inscription mentions the anarchy after *Τινῆιος Ποντικός*. A study of the family stemma of *Κορ. Μενεσθεύς* (cf. *A.J.P.*, LXIV, 1943, p. 49) supplies the demotic.

173/4: *Hesperia*, III, 1934, no. 43, p. 56.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: *Εἰσιδωρος Ὀν*[--- Ἀ] *ναγυράσιος*.

Previous date: *ca.* 180.

The prosopography of the *ἀείσιτοι* dates this inscription between 170 and 180. The tribe of the secretary fixes its position in the year 173/4.

177/8: *I.G.*, II², 1798.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: *Ἰστλή(ιος) Πυθόδω[ρο]ς* (Βερνικείδης).

Previous date: *ca.* 180 A.D.

The demotic of the secretary is inferred from *I.G.*, II², 2128⁴¹; *Hesp.*, XI, 1942, no. 25¹³, p. 60. Cf. Graindor, *Chronologie*, p. 201, note 3, on the rarity of the gentilicium. The tribe of the secretary assigns this inscription to 177/8.

178/9: *I.G.*, II², 1789; *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 6, p. 35.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: *[Εὔκ]αρπος Θεογ[ένους]* (Σφήττιος).

Previous date: *ca.* 175 A.D.

The secretary is probably the same man as *Εὔκαρπος Σφήττιος* in *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34, dated now 191/2. In the first inscription he is referred to as *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* while in the latter as *περὶ τὸ βῆμα*. Since, however, the secretary in *I.G.*, II², 1077 (209/10) is referred to both as *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* and *περὶ τὸ βῆμα* we may consider *Εὔκαρπος* the same man. That he is a *Σφήττιος* is evident from the following prosopographical evidence:

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 138-9, 149.

I.G., II², 1774¹³, Εὐκαρπος Θεοδότου Σφήττιος, prytanis in 167/8.

I.G., II², 1820⁴, [Εὐ]καρπος Ἐρωτος Σφήττιος, ἐπιστάτης of the prytaneis, the beginning of the third century after Christ.

I.G., II², 1775⁶⁸, Ἰκέσιος Θεογένους Σφήττιος, ἐπώνυμος in 168/9.

I.G., II², 2067⁸⁰, Φέρμος Θεογένους Σφήττιος, ephēbos in 154/5.

I.G., II², 1789 and *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5 may not be dated in the same year because the personnel of the ἀείσιτοι differ in the office of γραμματεὺς βουλῆς. We may date these inscriptions one cycle apart, unless there is death in office, and assume that Akamantis chose Εὐκαρπος again whenever its turn in the prytany cycle came.

The date of 178/9 for Εὐκαρπος agrees with the evidence of Dittenberger who is followed by Kirchner. *I.G.*, II², 1789 is a little later than *I.G.*, II², 1774 (167/8) and prior to *I.G.*, II², 1782 (shortly before 180); it is also slightly later than *I.G.*, II², 1775 (168/9). The conclusion therefore is that *I.G.*, II², 1789 is a few years before or after 175 A.D. This is in harmony with the evidence of the tribal cycles which dates the inscription in 178/9.

180/1: *I.G.*, II², 1794.

Archon: Ἀθηνόδωρος Ἀσμένου ὁ καὶ Ἀγρίππας Ἰταῖος.

Secretary: [--- Διο]ν(ν)σίον.

Previous date: ca. 180 A.D.

For this date see below, pp. 19-20.

181/2: *I.G.*, II², 1797; *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 35.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος.

Previous date: ca. 180 A.D.

This inscription has been edited in lines 9-12:

[ἀντιγρα]φε[ὺς?] Ἀθηνόδωρος
[ἱεραύλης] Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος
----- Ἐρμόδωρος Θερμ-
[--- Πρ]ωτογέννης
vac.

It is obvious, as Oliver has pointed out, that Ἐρμόδωρος is the ἱεραύλης who appears in *I.G.*, II², 1806, 1806a; *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34. This necessitates a revision in the assignment of offices to the ἀείσιτοι mentioned in this inscription. A comparison of the listings of offices in *I.G.*, II², 1775, 1776, 1794, 1798 shows that we must re-edit these lines in the following sequence:

[ἀντιγρα]φε[ὺς?] Ἀθηνόδωρος
 [περὶ τὸ βῆμα] Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος
 [ἱεραύλης] Ἑρμόδωρος Θερμ-
 [--- ὑπογραμματεὺς or possibly γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν or πρυτάνεων Πρ]ωτογένης.

For a parallel to lines 7-8 where the ἐπὶ Σκιάδος follows the γραμματεὺς βουλῆς, cf. *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, p. 77. In view of the fact that Μύρων is ὑπογραμματεὺς in *I.G.*, II², 1795 (184/5) we may include the possibilities of γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν (cf. *I.G.*, II², 1796), γραμματεὺς πρυτάνεων (cf. *I.G.*, II², 1806).

For the assignation of the secretary Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος to 181/2 see below, Tab. 1.

182/3: *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, no. 11, p. 48.

Archon: Anarchy after Memmios.

Secretary: Μυστικὸς ὧ Ἑροιάδης.

Previous date: ca. 180/1.

The demotic of the secretary fixes the year as 182/3.

184/5: *I.G.*, II², 1795.

Archon: Δημόστρατος Μα[ραθώνιος].

Secretary: Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου.

Previous date: ca. 180 A.D.

For the date of this archon see below, pp. 20, 22.

185/6: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 36, p. 70.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς.

Previous date: beginning of the third century after Christ.

The reading [γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν ---]δωρος Καλλιστράτου Βερενεϊκίδης must be retracted, for the secretary περὶ τὸ βῆμα = the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν at this period. Therefore Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς is the secretary. The date of this inscription revolves around the prosopography of Μηνόφιλος and Πρωτίων. The undersecretary Μηνόφιλος in line 15 appears also in *I.G.*, II², 1077 (209/10) and in *I.G.*, II², 1799²³, dated ca. 180 A.D. but now dated 183/4. Πρωτίων in line 14 also appears in *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34, dated 191/2. The secretary may therefore be assigned to 185/6 rather than 198/9, the two years available in the tribal cycles for this secretary.

In view of the above correction with respect to the prytany secretary the inscription must be re-edited:

[Ἀίσιε]ῖτοι
 [γραμματεὺς β]ουλῆς καὶ δῆ-
 [---Ἱεροφάντης] | μουν Ὀρφίτιος
 [--- Δαδοῦχος] | Βουρριανὸς Σφή.
 5 [--- Ἱεροκῆρυξ] | [π]ερὶ τὸ βῆμα Θεο
 [----- Ἀθ]μονεύς
 [ἀντιγραφεὺς Ἀπολλό?]δωρος Καλλιστρά-
 [κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δ]ήμιον | του Βερενεί-
 [----- Ἀθ]μονεύς | κίδης
 10 [ιεραύλης Ἀφροδίσιος ἱερε]ὺς Πρωτίων
 [ὑπογραμματεὺς Μη]νόφιλος

186/7: *I.G.*, II², 1796.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Κλώδιος Ἀντίοχος Λαμπτρέυς.

Previous date: *ca.* 180 A.D.

The prosopography of the αἰσίτιοι sets 180-190 as the limits of this inscription which the demotic of the secretary now fixes in 186/7. For the new study of this inscription cf. A. E. Raubitschek, "Commodus in Athens," *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII and below, Tab. 1.

187/8: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 4, p. 32.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Αὐρ(ῆλιος) Ῥάκινθος Γαργήτιος.

Previous date: the end of the second century after Christ.

A new reading of the squeeze shows that the secretary¹ comes from Γαργηττός and his position in the cycle is 187/8. This is further corroborated by the mention of the benefactor Αἴλιος Πυρφόρος among the αἰσίτιοι. He is also listed among the αἰσίτιοι in *I.G.*, II², 1796 dated now in 186/7 by reason of its secretary.

188/9: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, nos. 23-4, pp. 57, 58.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Εἰσίδοτος Φήλεικος Ἀγγελῆθεν.

Previous date: the end of the second century after Christ.

A study of the prosopography of the αἰσίτιοι shows that we must date this secretary in 188/9.

190/1: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 6, p. 35.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Ἀ[φρ]οδείσιος Ὁ Φλυνεύς.

Previous date: *ca.* 200 A.D.

A new study of this inscription shows that the office of Ἀφροδείσιος ὁ Φλυεύς is that of *περὶ τὸ βῆμα*, in which case we must date this inscription in 190/1. The text of the new reading is as follows:

[--- Ἱεροφάντης] Ἐρέν. Ἱερ(ο)κῆρυξ [--- Δαδοῦχος]	
[γρ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου ---]γοδ	κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δ[ήμου]
[----- ^{patronymie} -----]δου	Φλά Σωσιγένης
[-----]	ἀντιγραφεὺς Κλ. Κορινθιανός[ς]
[περὶ τὸ βῆμα]	Ἀ[φρ]οδείσιος ὁ Φλυεύς
[ἐπὶ Σκιάδος Ἀριστείδης Φ]ρεάρριος	
[ἱεραύλης Π. Ἀφρόδιτος ὁ κα]ὶ Ἀφροδείσιος	
	<i>vacat</i>
	<i>vacat</i>
[ὑπογραμματεὺς ----- Μα]ρ	<i>vacat</i>

191/2: *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Εὐκαρπος Σφήττιος.

Previous date: 190-200.

The tribe of the secretary assigns this inscription to 191/2. For this secretary see above, pp. 14-15.

192/3-194/5: *I.G.*, II², 1806.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Ἐπι[---].

Previous date: 190-200.

The prosopography of the ἀείσιτοι, which is closely related to 1806a, suggests a date between 192/3 and 194/5.

195/6: *I.G.*, II², 1806a.

Archon: [---].

Secretary: Φλ. Ἀγάθων.

Previous date: 190-200.

The prosopography of the ἀείσιτοι suggests a date *ca.* 193/4. We can date this inscription accurately because the demotic of the secretary is found in *I.G.*, II², 3656 where our secretary is listed as Τλ. Φλ. Ἀγάθων Πειραιεύς. The demotic assigns this secretary to Hippothontis (X) which held the prytany secretaryship in 195/6.

3. THE THIRD CENTURY AFTER CHRIST

209/10: *I.G.*, II², 1077.

Archon: Φλ. Διογένης.

Secretary: Ῥόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθώνιος.

For the date of this inscription see above, p. 3.

197/8-199/200: *I.G.*, II², 1804.

Archon: Ξενοκλῆς.

Secretary: [...?] Εἰσιδ[του].

Previous date: *ca.* 190 A.D.

For the date of this archon see below, p. 31.

221/2: *I.G.*, II², 1078.

Archon: Ἀραβιανός.

Secretary: Εὐτυχος.

Previous date: *ca.* 220.

For the exact date of this archon see below, pp. 37-39.

III. THE CHRONOLOGY OF ARCHONS IN THE REIGN OF COMMODUS

We are now in a fortunate position to make use of the evidence in determining the chronology of the archons in the reign of Commodus, 180-192. The study of the prytany secretaries in this interval can be used to furnish us with important evidence in assigning the archons to the specific years in this interval. Furthermore A. E. Raubitschek's valuable paper on "Commodus in Athens," *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII, gives us a sequence of three new archons which, in addition to the sequence of archons from 181/2-183/4, now fixed by means of Ferguson's law, enables us to make considerable progress in determining the other archons of the interval, most of whom are dated by the erasure of Commodus' name as part of the *damnatio memoriae* or by mention of the Commodeia instituted in Commodus' reign.

180/1: *I.G.*, II², 1794.

Archon: Ἀθηνόδωρος ὁ καὶ Ἀγρίππας Ἀσμένου Ἰταῖος.

Secretary: [--- Διο]ν(ν)σίον.

Previous date: *ca.* 180 A.D.

Graindor dates Ἀθηνόδωρος in 180/1 or possibly 183/4. The latter date is excluded, for Δούκιος Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας held the archonship in 183/4. This leaves 180/1 as the date of this archon. Evidence not utilized by Graindor corroborates this

date. In the prytany list (also of Attalis) *I.G.*, II², 1791, dated in 181/2, we have mention of the same men in the offices of ἐπώνυμος and ἐξηγητής. In *I.G.*, II², 1774⁶⁰ and 1775⁶⁸, dated 167/8 and 168/9 (both of Akamantis) we have the same ἐπώνυμος. This analogy is important evidence, for the association of the eponymous in this inscription with *I.G.*, II², 1791, dated in 181/2, gives us further grounds for assigning Ἀθηνόδωρος to 180/1. This evidence and that from the study of the αἰεῖσιτοι points to 180/1 as the date of this inscription. The sequence of tribal cycles assigns the secretary [— — Δι]ον(υ)σίον to a deme in the eighth tribe (Oeneis).

181/2-183/4: *I.G.*, II², 1739 gives us the sequence of three archons:

Μέμμιος Φλάκκος, dated *ca.* 180/1-181/2.

Ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμμιον Φλάκκον, dated *ca.* 181/2-182/3.

Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας, dated *ca.* 182/3-183/4.

Since the secretary Μυστικός Ἰεροιάδης (*Hesperia*, IV, 1935, no. 11, p. 48) belongs to the ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμμιον Φλάκκον, we can date precisely this sequence in 181/2-183/4.

184/5: *I.G.*, II², 1795.

Archon: Δημόστρατος Μαραθώνιος.

Secretary: Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου.

Previous date: *ca.* 180 A.D.; Graindor, under Commodus and perhaps toward 179/80.

The date of Δημόστρατος can be determined by the following considerations. The archons whose dates are settled in this interval are:

180/1	Ἀθηνόδωρος
181/2	Μέμμιος Φλάκκος
182/3	Ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμμιον Φλάκκον
183/4	Λούκιος Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας
184/5	
185/6	
186/7	Γ. [Ἰού]λιος Θισβιαν[ὸς] Μαραθώνιος
187/8	Ἰού(λιος) Ἱεροφάντης
188/9	Κόμμοδος.

Δημόστρατος can come before 180/1, in 184-186, but not after 188/9 where we have appropriate room for other archons. He can not come before 180 because the αἰεῖσιτοι in *I.G.*, II², 1795 cannot antedate 180/1. The ἱεραύλης Ἀφροδείσιος and the other αἰεῖσιτοι in this inscription fit only in between 182/3 and 185/6. The evidence from the secretaries in this period leaves only 184/5 open for Δημόστρατος and for the secretary Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου. The secretaries for this period are:

177/8	Ἰστλή(ιος) Πυθοδώρου (Βερνικείδης)	V
178/9	Εὐκαρπος Θεογένους (Σφήττιος)	VI
180/1	[--- Διο]ν(υ)σίου	(8)
182/3	Μυστικὸς Ὁ Ἐροιάδης	X
185/6	Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς	XIII
186/7	Κλώδιος Ἀντίοχος Λαμπρεύς	I
187/8	Αὐρ. Τάκινθος Γαργήττιος	II
188/9	Εἰσίδοτος Φήλεικος Ἀγγελήθευ	III

This leaves Antiochis (12) the only tribe left for the secretary Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου and 184/5 for the date of the secretary and archon of this inscription.

185/6: *I.G.*, II², 2111/2.

Archon: Φιλότειμος Ἀρκεσιδήμου Ἐλεούσιος.

Secretary: [---].

Previous date: 182/3-190/1; Graindor, 185/6-187/8.

The mention in this inscription of the tenth year of the παιδοτριβία of Ἐπίκτητος gives us a definite clue as to the date of this archon. Graindor has shown that the initial date of this παιδοτριβίης is between 176/7 and 178/9. Since 186/7 is occupied by the archon Θισβιανός, and 187/8 by Ἰούλιος Ἱεροφάντης, this leaves 185/6 as the date of Φιλότειμος.

186/7: *I.G.*, II², 1796 + 1800 + E.M. 3152.

In his study of these inscriptions A. E. Raubitschek has shown that the archon for 186/7 is Γ. [Ἰού]λιος Θισβιαν[ός] Μαραθώνιος. See *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII.

187/8: *I.G.*, II², 1792.

In his study of these inscriptions A. E. Raubitschek has shown that the archon for 187/8 is Ἰού(λιος) Ἱεροφάντης. See *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII.

188/9: *I.G.*, II², 1807 + *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, no. 12, p. 49 + XI, 1942, nos. 23 + 27, pp. 57, 62, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, nos. 24, 25, 26, pp. 58, 61.

In his study of these inscriptions A. E. Raubitschek has shown that the archon for 188/9 was the emperor Commodus. See *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII.

189/90: *I.G.*, II², 2115-18.

Archon: Μηνογένης.

Previous date: 180/1-191/2; Graindor 180/1-191/2, and more probably 185/6-190/1.

I.G., II², 2115-18 are in the archonship of *Μηνογένης* who because of the erasure of the name of *Αὐτ. Κόμμοδος* in line 18 of *I.G.*, II², 2116, after the *damnatio memoriae* of the emperor, must be dated in Commodus' reign. Of the years in his reign only 189/90-191/2 are left. These years must be occupied by *Μηνογένης*, *Γ. Πεινάριος Πρόκλος* and *Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδούας*. It will be shown that the date of *Βραδούας* is 190/1 or 191/2 and this leaves the year 189/90-190/1 to be filled by *Μηνογένης* and *Πρόκλος* or possibly *Βραδούας*. Graindor has shown that *Μηνογένης* is prior to *Πρόκλος* (cf. *Chronologie*, pp. 197-8; *I.G.*, II², 2115, note) and therefore we may date *Μηνογένης* in 189/90.

190/1-191/2: *I.G.*, II², 2119.

Archons: *Γ. Πεινάριος Πρόκλος Ἀγνούσιος*.

Previous date: 180/1-191/2; Graindor, under Commodus, from 181/2-191/2 and more probably 186/7-191/2.

I.G., II², 2113-4; 1801.

Archon: *Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδούας Ἀττικὸς Μαραθώνιος*.

Previous date: 183/4-191/2; Graindor, 186/7-191/2.

Because 192/3 is definitely assigned to *Γ. Ἐλβίδιος Σεκοῦνδος* the remaining two years in the reign of Commodus must be assigned to *Πρόκλος* and *Βραδούας* or possibly in the reverse sequence. Kirchner had suggested (*I.G.*, II², p. 794) that *I.G.*, II², 1801 is of the same date as 2113-4. A study of the *αἰεῖσιτοι* (see Tab. 1) corroborates this suggestion. The archon in 1801 whose demotic is *Μαραθώνιος* should be restored as [*Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδούας Ἀττικὸς Μαρα*]θώνιος. This archon, moreover, cannot be identified with *Δημόστρατος Μαραθώνιος* (184/5) or with *Θισβιανὸς Μαραθώνιος* (186/7). In *I.G.*, II², 1801 *Μουνάτιος Οὐσπίσκος* is hoplite general while in *I.G.*, II², 1795 (184/5) he is *κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*. A different hoplite general in the archonship of *Θισβιανός* excludes the possibility of identification with this archon. Thus we are left with the identification of the archon of *I.G.*, II², 1801 with *Βραδούας*.

IV. THE CHRONOLOGY OF PRYTANY LISTS CONTAINING ΑΕΙΣΙΤΟΙ 165/6-209/10

In his study of the prytany lists Dow showed the benefit that can be reaped from a synthetic study of related inscriptions.⁴¹ The study of the *αἰεῖσιτοι* as a group rather than as isolated lists yields valuable chronological results. The *αἰεῖσιτοι*, as Dow has pointed out,⁴² were a group of some six to twelve officials, who took their meals and

⁴¹ Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 1.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 23-4.

worked together in the Tholos with the 50 members of the Boule. They were mainly young clerks, heralds or flutists, gifted with strong lungs and vocal chords, who "were given a food allowance in return for services rendered for a fixed term." They are to be distinguished from the other group of dignitaries who were dined by the state in the city hearth. Some of these *ἀείσιτοι* change annually while a number hold office for an interval of years. It is the latter in particular who furnish valuable evidence in dating. The criterion for dating, however, is not one or two offices but the entire context of offices mentioned among the *ἀείσιτοι*. The inscriptions which contain prytany-secretaries supply the magnetic centers to attract into closer chronology the ancillary list of *ἀείσιτοι*. The results of this, as shown in the table, reveal not only a more accurate chronology but grounds for revising some previously held chronological assumptions.

Kirchner, Oliver, and Raubitschek have pointed out ⁴³ that *Εὐχάριστος*, who was flutist in 166/7-168/9, was reappointed flutist after an interval of at least two years during which period *Ἐπίγονος* held that office. A study of the prytany lists in this period which admit of accurate chronology through the operation of Ferguson's law now shows this is not the exception but the rule. Consequently no absolute uninterrupted limits can be set in the tenure of the offices of *ἱεραύλης*, *ἱεροφάντης*, *ἱεροκῆρυξ*, and *ἐπὶ Σκιᾶδος*. These officeholders occupy their office for an interval of one or more years, then vacate it only to be re-elected to it later. The table shows the flexibility of tenure in these offices. This flexibility, though disturbing to our previous chronological assumptions, shows that the Athenians never quite departed from the limitation of time involved in the word *ἀεὶ* which Dow rightly interprets as "for the term of the office, tenure of the office by a series of persons being continuous." ⁴⁴

Finally this study should give us greater caution about considering the offices in our inscriptions characterized by the words *διὰ βίου* too inflexibly. It is true that officers listed *διὰ βίου* could not come up for re-election but their tenure in some instances could hardly differ from those characterized as *ἀεὶ*. Their tenure *διὰ βίου* would be subject to termination either by retirement, resignation, or refusal to continue office and a study of ephebe lists shows that there are instances where tenure is as limited as in some of the offices among the *ἀείσιτοι*.

⁴³ *I.G.*, II², 1774, note on line 75; *A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, p. 539; *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, no. 23.

⁴⁴ Dow, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

V. THE CHRONOLOGY OF OTHER ARCHONS

The prosopography in the inscriptions which can be dated by means of Ferguson's law is of considerable ancillary value in giving more precise limits to other inscriptions, and these in turn can be used to attract others. Thus Ferguson's law may be said to start a chain-reaction, as it were, in our chronology.

Besides the valuable chronological results yielded by a study of the prytany lists and the archons in the reign of Commodus a new criterion can be used in the dating of many inscriptions of the Imperial period. The synthetic study of the ephebe lists can, as in the case of the prytany lists, furnish valuable chronological results. The ephebe lists have been studied in terms of the entire context of ephebe officials who, like the *αείσιτοι*, furnish chronological sequences and help in restoring the prosopography of some offices. In particular more precise limits have been given to the *παιδογρίβαι* after Abascantus. Because of the mention often of the year in the tenure of this *διὰ βίου* office we get exact dates. These ephebe lists in turn give more precise limits to inscriptions which pertain to the later careers of these youths. Finally the rearrangements necessitated by all these chronological changes are in turn reflected in the dates of archons involved in these changes.

ARCHONS

1. THE ARCHONS Ἀπολλόδωρος, [...^{ca. 7-8}...]ος, Αἰσχραῖος AND Ἡρακλεόδωρος

We know now from Dow's publication of Agora I 2388⁴⁵ the archons who occupy the sequence from 86/5 to 81/0. Of the years 80/79-63/2 Dow remarks they "now constitute the longest unfilled gap in the whole series of Athenian archons from the sixth century down to Augustus. In this gap, only Aeschines of 75/4 is precisely dated."⁴⁶ Some progress can now be made in filling this gap.

A study of the stone of I.G., II², 1039 by Dr. Mitsos reveals that the successor of Ἀπολλόδωρος was surely [...^{ca. 7-8}...]ος, the text of line 1 beginning [Ἐ]πὶ [...^{ca. 7-8}...]ου. The iota splays at the bottom, unlike the corner of epsilon.

Because of the reference to the Sylleia, established for Sulla after his return from Asia in 83 B.C. and celebrated until his death in 78 B.C., the *terminus ante quem* of the sequence of the archons Ἀπολλόδωρος and [...^{ca. 7-8}...]ος is 78 B.C. In view of the sequence of the archons in Agora I 2388 occupying the years 86/5-81/0 this leaves, as Dow points out, 80/79-79/8 or 79/8-78/7 as the date for these archons. In a forthcoming study of the Sylleia Raubitschek will show that the *Συλλεῖα* in Athens are a counterpart performance of the *Ludi victoriae Sullanae* celebrated in Rome for the first time on November 1, 81 B.C. In that case, it would be Apollodorus who did the same in Athens the following or the same Attic year. We must accordingly date the sequence of Ἀπολλόδωρος and [...^{ca. 7-8}...]ος in 80/79 and 79/8.

⁴⁵ S. Dow, "Archons of the Period after Sulla," *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

This leaves a gap of three years between 78/7 and 75/4, the year of the archonship of Aeschines. This gap can now be filled by the sequence of 3 archons, *Αἰσχροῖος*, *Σέλευκος* and *Ἡρακλεόδωρος* (*I.G.*, II², 1338; 3489). Dinsmoor, who has dated them in 84/3, 83/2, and 82/1, has shown that they must be dated after 86 for the following reasons: (1) the phrase *τὴν κοινὴν περίστασιν* (l. 12) is probably a reference to the situation after the capture of Athens by Sulla; (2) there is no vacancy for such a group before 86 and (3) the phrase *ἀνεκτήσατο τὰς πατρίους θυσίας* “would seem to be a question of the restoration of the sacrifices after a period of desuetude and so probably soon after the capture of Athens.”⁴⁷ That these archons must be dated after 86 B.C. is the conclusion of all who have studied this inscription. Since the interval between 86/5 and 79/8 is filled by archons about which there can be no doubt, this leaves the interval 78/7-76/5 or an interval after 75/4, when Aeschines is archon. To venture beyond 75/4, an interval of 10 years, is to disregard the situation implied in the first and third reasons stated above. The gap therefore between 78/7 and 75/4 is, in the present status of the evidence, the most appropriate for the sequence of *Αἰσχροῖος*, *Σέλευκος*, and *Ἡρακλεόδωρος*. In view of Dow’s re-study of *I.G.*, II², 1713 and 1716 the only remaining archons in the interval from 80/79 to 63/2 whose date is not certain are Δ[^{ca. 80} —] (Meritt, *ca.* 80 B.C., *Hesperia*, XVII, 1948, no. 13, p. 29), *Ζηρίων* (Dinsmoor, 78/7?), *Θεόξενος*, and *Μήδειος* (Kirchner, *ca.* 67/6-66/5). These must now be dated in the interval from 74/3 to 63/2, but not in 64/3, which is reserved for *Οἰνόφιλος*. Dinsmoor has suggested that there is a bare possibility that *Μήδειος* may be identified with*ιος*, the archon in 63/2 (*I.G.*, II², 1716¹¹). Mitsos who has examined the stone reports that there is no other letter before *ι* and that there is a possibility that the *ι* is the right stroke of Π or Μ.

2. THE ARCHONS *Μητροδωρος* AND *Καλλικρατίδης*

Μητροδωρος (*I.G.*, II², 1973, 1735) has been dated 40/1-53/4, the era of Claudius who is mentioned in the prescript. A re-examination of the evidence shows that we must date him in the end of Claudius’ reign, probably 50/1-52/3, for *Δεινόφιλος* occupies 49/50 and *Διονυσόδωρος* 53/4. *Θεογένης* & *Κηφισιεύς* who appears as ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 1973¹¹ also appears as prytanis in *I.G.*, II², 1759¹⁰, now dated because of the prytany secretary in 96/7. Since *Αἰολίων Ἀντιπάτρου Φλυεύς*, ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 1973⁸, is archon at the end of the first century (*I.G.*, II², 1998) and his son *Σαλλουστιανός* is archon *ca.* 132 A.D. (*I.G.*, II², 1763), it is likely that *Μητροδωρος* is to be dated in the latter limit of Claudius’ reign. Because *I.G.*, II², 1974 is closely associated with *I.G.*, II², 1973, by virtue of the same *ἡγεμών* and *ὄπλομάχος*, the archon *Καλλικρατίδης* must also be dated in this same period.

⁴⁷ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), p. 291.

The dating of Μητρόδωρος in the latter limit of Claudius' reign, if acceptable, assumes that Αἰολίων Ἀντιπάτρου Φλυεύς, who is restored as hoplite general for the seventh time in *I.G.*, II², 3182 (*ca.* 66 A.D.), entered that office when he was approximately thirty years of age.

3. THE ARCHON ΛΟΥΚΙΟΣ

The archon Λούκιος (*I.G.*, II², 1992) has been dated by Graindor after the middle of the first century A.D. Δαίλιανός, the ephebos in line 4, is probably the archon in 96/7 (*I.G.*, II², 1759). A study of the officers in the ephebe lists of this period suggests that the κοσμητής in *I.G.*, II², 1994, dated *ca.* 80 A.D., A[— —] may be the same as the κοσμητής Ἀντίοχος in *I.G.*, II², 1992. If so the archon Λούκιος may be dated *ca.* 80 A.D. In *I.G.*, II², 3114 and 3543 we have an archon Λούκιος Φλάουιος Φλάμματος Κυδαθηναίεύς whom Graindor assigns to 70/1-110/1, but Kirchner, on the evidence of the form of the letters, to the end of the first century. There is a possibility of an identification of these two archons.

4. THE ARCHON ΠΑΝΤΑΙΝΟΣ

Πάνταινος (*I.G.*, II², 2017) has been dated as archon shortly after 102 A.D. An examination of the evidence shows that he can now be dated in 115/6. This list first mentions foreigners under the lemma ἐπέγγραφοι. Since the lemma πρωτέγγραφοι — ἐπέγγραφοι supplanted the lemma πολεῖται — Μιλήσιοι (cf. *I.G.*, II², 1996, note on line 92), then the inscriptions with the lemma ἐπέγγραφοι must be dated after the inscriptions which list the foreigners under Μιλήσιοι (*I.G.*, II², 1999, dated in 84/5-92/3; 2024, dated in 112/3; 2026, dated in 116/7). Therefore the date of this inscription is *ca.* 116/7.

This agrees with the evidence on the παιδοτρίβης Ἀρίστων who should follow Δημήτριος Ἰσιγένους Ῥαμνούσιος. The latter appears as παιδοτρίβης alone in *I.G.*, II², 2021 (before 112/3); 2022 (*ca.* 112). Then Δημήτριος appears jointly with Ἀρίστων in the παιδοτριβία in *I.G.*, II², 2024 (112/3). In *I.G.*, II², 2025 (112/3) Ἀρίστων first appears alone as παιδοτρίβης and he continues in that office at least until 118/9-125/6 (*I.G.*, II², 2030-2037). It is therefore in this period, 112/3-125, when Ἀρίστων appears alone in the παιδοτριβία, that we must date *I.G.*, II², 2017. The sequence of the archons in this period enables us to date this inscription accurately. The archons are fixed for the sequence 112-114; 116-128. This leaves therefore 115/6 as the year for the archonship of Πάνταινος.

In view of Trajan's Parthian victory in 115-6 it is likely that we should have the title Παρθικόν in the prescript of the inscription. A. E. Raubitschek, who has studied the photograph of this inscription in Graindor's album, reports to me (in a letter)

that the first two lines have been restored incorrectly. He suggests for the required space:

[Θεὸν αὐτο]κράτορα Τρα[ιανὸν] Καίσαρα Σεβαστὸν Γερμανι[κὸν Δακικὸν]
[Παρθικὸν ὁ] κοσμητῆς τῶν [ἐ]φήβων Εἰρηναῖος Λευκίου Κυδα[θηναϊεύς].

THE ARCHONS BETWEEN 170 AND 180 A.D.

The dating of the archons in the reign of Commodus contributes greatly to the chronology of the archons in the preceding decade by giving us a more accurate dating of the *παιδοτρίβαι* Λεύκιος ὁ καὶ Μάρκος and Νικόστρατος. A study of the evidence results in the following changes in the date of these *παιδοτρίβαι*.

I.G., II², 2102.

Archon: ---; *παιδοτρίβης* Μάρκος.

Previous date: shortly after 169/70.

New date: 170/1-172/3 or 174/5-175/6; preferably 171/2.

I.G., II², 2103.

Archon: Βιήσιος Πείσων Μελιτεύς; *παιδοτρίβης* διὰ βίου Λεύκιος ὁ καὶ Μάρκος
Μαραθώνιος ἔτος γ'.

Previous date: 172/3 or shortly after.

New date: 173/4.

I.G., II², 2105.

Archon: Αἰσχίνης; *παιδοτρίβης* Ἐπίκτητος Φιλ[έρωτος Σφήττ.].

Previous date: 173/4-178/9.

New date: 176/7-178/9.

The dating of the archon Φιλότειμος Ἀρκεσιδήμου Ἐλεούσιος in 185/6 (*I.G.*, II², 2111-2112) is of great importance in determining the limits of the *παιδοτρίβης* Ἐπίκτητος Φιλέρωτος. *I.G.*, II², 2111/12 mentions the tenth year of this *παιδοτρίβης* whose initial date must now be 176/7. Graindor has placed his first year between 176/7 and 178/9. Since the last year of Ἀβάσκαντος is 169/70, this leaves the years 170/1-175/6 as the interval for the *παιδοτρίβης* Λεύκιος ὁ καὶ Μάρκος. The lower limit of Ἐπίκτητος is 190/1 or 191/2, for he died in the course of the archonship of Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδούας Ἀττικὸς (*I.G.*, II², 2113, dated now 190/1 or 191/2) and is succeeded by Νεικόστρατος Ἰλάρου (cf. note on *I.G.*, II², 2113) whose *παιδοτριβία* can now be dated from 190/1 or 191/2 to ca. 200 A.D.

We may therefore date *I.G.*, II², 2103, which mentions the third year of Μάρκος, in 173/4. *I.G.*, II², 2102, which mentions Marcus without any specific year of his *παιδοτριβία*, may therefore be dated 170/1-172/3 or 174/5-175/6. A study of the evidence suggests 172/3 as the date of *I.G.*, II², 2102.

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Date	New date	Παιδοτρίβης	Ὑποπαιδοτρίβης	Διδάσκαλος
2097	169/70		Ἀβάσκαντος ἔτος λδ (last year)	Τελεσφόρος Ἀβασκάντου Μιλήσιος	Ἀπελλῆς) Φλυεύς
2100	after 169/70	170/1	Τελε[σφόρος Ἀβασ- κά]ντου Κ[ηφισιεύς]
2144, 2014	s. II p.	171/2	[Ἀπ]ελλῆς) Φλυεύς ⁴⁸
2102	shortly after 169/70	172/3	Μάρκος	Ἡρακλέων Ἔστ	Ἀπελλῆς) Φλυεύς
2103	172/3 or shortly after	173/4	Μάρκος ἔτος γ	Ἡρακλέων Σωτέλους Ἔσταιόθεν
2105	173/4-178/9	176/7-178/9	Ἐπίκτητος	Νείκων Εἰσιδότης	... ⁷ ... ν

It is evident that the ὑποπαιδοτρίβης Τελεσφόρος in *I.G.*, II², 2100 was given Athenian citizenship in the last year of his office, probably as a reward of service in this office from at least 163/4 (*I.G.*, II², 2086-7). His demotic is Κηφισιεύς as may be inferred from Ἀβάσκαντος) Κηφισιεύς who is κοσμητής in *I.G.*, II², 2127 (now dated 194/5). He is followed in this office by Ἡρακλέων. Since *I.G.*, II², 2102 has the same ὑποπαιδοτρίβης as *I.G.*, II², 2103, dated 173/4, and Ἀπελλῆς continues in the office of διδάσκαλος from 169/70 ⁴⁹ we should date *I.G.*, II², 2102 in 172/3, or possibly 171/2. *I.G.*, II², 2144 should be dated in 171/2 because of the ὄπλομάχος¹⁴... ιος Βερνεκίδης as well as the διδάσκαλος Ἀπελλῆς). The ὄπλομάχος in 169/70 is Εὐκράτης) (*I.G.*, II², 2097) ; in 172/3, Δάφνος (*I.G.*, II², 2102) ; in 173/4, Κλ. Φίλητος (*I.G.*, II², 2103) ; in 176/7-178/9, Ζώσιμος (*I.G.*, II², 2105). The demotics in lines 28, 30, 35 of *I.G.*, II², 2100 exclude also the year 170/1. The date of *I.G.*, II², 2144 therefore is likely to be 171/2.

I.G., II², 2105, because of the mention of Ἐπίκτητος as παιδοτρίβης can now be dated 176/7-178/9. The results of the study of the παιδοτρίβαι in this interval thus give us the exact date of the archon Πείσων (173/4) and the precise limits of the archon Αἰσχίνης (176/7-178/9). With this definite information we can get more accurate dates for the remaining archons in this decade. A study of the archons in this interval results in the following changes.

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Previous date	New date	Archon
1351 ; 1786	ca. 170	170/1	Φλά. Ἀρπαλιανὸς Στειριεύς
2103 ; 3640	172/3 or shortly after	173/4	Βιήσιος Πείσων Μελιτεύς
2104	ca. 173/4	171/2	Κλ. Ἡρακλείδης Μελιτεύς
2105	after 173/4	176/7-178/9	Αἰσχίνης
1788	ca. 174/5	174/5	Μ. Μουνάτιος Μαξιμιανὸς Οὐπίσκος (Ἀξηγιεύς)
1368 ; 1787	before 177	175/6	Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος
3687	ca. 180	178/9-179/80	Π. Πομπ. Ἡγίας (Ι) Φαληρεύς

⁴⁸ The reading for the διδάσκαλος in *I.G.*, II², 2144, isΑΛΗC) ΦΛΥΕΥC. The reading, however, of the stone, as reported to me by Mitsos, is .. ΕΛΛΗC) ΦΛΥΕΥC, with the Ε being certain. He can be no other than Ἀπελλῆς) Φλυεύς. Mitsos also reports that *I.G.*, II², 2144 joins with 2014, and consequently it should also be dated in 171/2.

⁴⁹ *I.G.*, II², 2099 (dated 163/4-169/70) should now be dated 163/4-168/9, for the διδάσκαλος

Φλ. Ἀρπαλιανὸς Στειριεύς (*I.G.*, II², 1351; 1786; *Hesperia*, XVI, 1947, no. 81, p. 179)

Kirchner dates this archon *ca.* 170, while Graindor dates him “plus exactement 162/3, 163/4, 169/70, 170/1.” The only place available for him in the previous decade is 164/5 which is too early, for the position of the archon on the same stone as Ἐπαφρόδειτος (*I.G.*, II², 1787) shows a later date. The dating of the other archons in this decade excludes a date later than 170/1 for this archon.

Κλ. Ἡρακλείδης Μελιτεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2104)

Kirchner, following Graindor, dates this archon *ca.* 173 A.D. Since Πείσων is now dated in 173/4 and Μ. Μουνάτιος Μαξιμιανός and Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος follow in 174/5-175/6, while Αἰσχίνης is archon in the interval of 176/7-178/9, it is obvious that Κλ. Ἡρακλείδης must be dated in 171/2-172/3. That this archon cannot be dated after 176/7 is also evident from the fact that the ephebos Πο. Αἴλιος Δεύκιος Παλληγεύς (line 7) is ἐπώνυμος φυλῆς in *I.G.*, II², 1792⁸, a prytany list dated now in 187/8. Furthermore the father of the epheboi Ὀνήσιμος and Τελεσφόρος (lines 9, 11) was himself ephebos in 145/6 (*I.G.*, II², 2052⁴¹; 2055¹⁰). Assuming that he married at the age of 20 his children would be epheboi after 165/6. Since we have definitely dated archons from 165/6 to 170/1 the earlier limit for the date of this archon is 171/2. Since Πείσων is archon in 173/4 and the ephebe list *I.G.*, II², 2102 is dated 172/3 the date of the present list with Ἡρακλείδης as archon is 171/2.

Μ. Μουνάτιος Μαξιμιανός (*I.G.*, II², 1788)

A study of the prytany list in the context of the ἀείσιτοι shows that the limits of this archon are 174/5-176/7 (see Table 1). Since Αἰσχίνης is archon 176/7-178/9 the limits of Μαξιμιανός may well be 174/5-175/6. Since Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος has a better claim for the year 175/6 Μαξιμιανός may be assigned to 174/5 where Graindor and Kirchner assign him.

Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος (*I.G.*, II², 1368, 1787)

This inscription has been dated before 177 A.D. the year when Herodes, who is mentioned in this inscription, died. Since the archon Ἐπαφρόδειτος is cut on the same stone as Φλά. Ἀρπαλιανός and follows him, the upper limit of his archonship is 171/2. Graindor has shown that 175/6 is the most appropriate year for this archon, for in that year Herodes arrived in Athens from Sirmio and his arrival in Athens amid the acclaim of the populace would be the appropriate occasion for the priest Nikomachos to yield his office to Herodes εἰς κόσμον καὶ δόξαν Βακχείου.

Π. Πομπ. Ἡγίας (I) Φαληρεύς (*I.G.*, II², 3687)

From a study of the stemma in this inscription Graindor concludes that this archon should be dated at the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius and accordingly

Στράτων Εὐνόμου Παιανιεύς, who holds this office from 163/4 (*I.G.*, II², 2086), is prior to Ἀπελλῆς Φλυεύς.

Kirchner dates him *ca.* 180. The only place left for him in this decade is 178/9-179/80 to which interval Ἡγίας should now be assigned.

6. THE ARCHON [--- Μαρα]θώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 2110)

This inscription has been dated 179/80-190/1. We now have a clue as to its date in the new date of *I.G.*, II², 1806a, 195/6 (see above). In *I.G.*, II², 2110 the ephebos Νουμήνιος is prytanis in *I.G.*, II², 1806a. He was ephebos therefore in the limits of 180-185. The only archons with the demotic Μαραθώνιος in this interval are Τιβ. Μέμμιος Φλάκκος (181/2) and Δημόστρατος (184/5). This archon may therefore be identified with either of these two archons. The date of this inscription is therefore 181/2, or 184/5.

7. THE ARCHONS FROM 193/4-199/200

The dating of the archons in the reign of Commodus enables us to give more precise limits to the archons in the interval of 193/4-199/200. Since the archon for 192/3 is Γ. Ἐλβίδιος Σεκοῦνδος Παλληνεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2130, 3642), we must fill this interval with the following archons. A study of the evidence results in the following changes in their chronology:

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Previous date	New date	Archon
1804	<i>ca.</i> 190	197/8-199/200	Ξενοκλῆς
2124	190-200	<i>ca.</i> 196/7	Φλάβιος Στράτων
2128-9, 2291a	190-200	197/8-199/200	Τ. Φλάβ Σωσιγένης Παλληνεύς
3120	190-200	197/8-199/200	Διονυσόδωρος Εὐκάρπου
2125	190-200	193/4	Κλ. Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς
2127; 2109	190-200	194/5	Φιλιστείδης ὁ Πειραιεύς
1805	190-200	<i>ca.</i> 195/6	[Κοι.]ντ --- ς Ἐλευσίνιος

Κλ. Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2125)

A comparison of this inscription with *I.G.*, II², 2130 reveals the date of this archon:

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Date	New Date	Ἄρχων	Ὑποπαιδοτρίβης	Γραμματεὺς
2130	192/3		Γ. Ἐλβίδιος Σεκοῦνδος Παλληνεύς	Εὐτυχιανὸς Ὑακίνθου Σφητ.	Στράτων Ἀχαρ.
2125	190-200	193/4	Κλ. Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς	Εὐτυχιανὸς Ὑακίνθου Σφητ.	Στράτων Ἀχαρ.

It is evident from the identity in these offices that the archon Κλ. Δαδοῦχος must be dated immediately following Γ. Ἐλβίδιος Σεκοῦνδος.

Φιλιστείδης ὁ Πειραιεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2127; 2109)

A study of the evidence shows that we can date Φιλιστείδης ὁ Πειραιεύς in 194/5 and that furthermore he must be identified with the archon Αὐρ. Φιλ. ^{ca. 4}.ης ὁ Πιρρεεύς

in *I.G.*, II², 2109, dated after 180 A.D. and by Graindor not before 185/6 or shortly after. The archons in the reign of Commodus show that we must date *Αὐρ. Φιλ. .^{ca.}.^{4.}.ης* > *Πιρρεεύς* in the next decade. A clue as to his date is found in the fact that the kosmetes' brother *ιεροφάντης Κλαύδιος Ἀπολλινάριος Ἀχαρνεύς* is also mentioned as *ιεροφάντης* in *I.G.*, II², 1803, now dated on the evidence of the *αἰεῖσιτοι* in 192/3-193/4. Since Γ. Ἐλβίδιος Σκεοῦνδος Παλληνεύς and Κλ. Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς are archons for 192/3 and 193/4 we may date *Αὐρ. Φιλ. .^{ca.}.^{4.}.ης* > *Πιρρεεύς* in 194/5. Since furthermore *Φιλισσιτίδης* > *Πειραιεύς*, the archon in *I.G.*, II², 2127, is dated 193/4-200, it is apparent that the two archons are the same. Graindor claims that they cannot be identified because of the difference in kosmetai in these inscriptions. The reading, however, in *I.G.*, II², 2109 is [.] *ητης Κλαύδιο[s Πο]λύζηλος* and this may be restored as something other than [ὁ κοσμη] *ητής*. It should be restored as [ὁ ἐξηγ] *ητής* (cf. *I.G.*, II², 3621 n.).

The text of *I.G.*, II², 2109 reads *Αὐρ. Φιλ. . . . ου* > *Πιρρεέως*. Meritt, who measured for me the squeezes of *a* and *b* of *I.G.*, II², 2109 reports (*per litt.*) that the spacing admits the reading of *Φιλ[ισσιτίδ]ου* >. In view of this we may identify the archon of *I.G.*, II², 2109 and 2127 and date him in 194/5.

[Κοι] *ντ* --- *ς* (*I.G.*, II², 1805)

The prosopography in this inscription suggests the earlier limit of 193/4-200/1 in which this archon is dated. *Μυστικὸς* > *Ἐρριάδης* (line 27) is prytany secretary in 182/3 (*Hesp.*, IV, 1935, no. 11, line 59, p. 48). The prytaneis in lines 19, 20, are also found as prytaneis in 169/70 (*I.G.*, II², 1781^{12, 30}). We may therefore date this archon *ca.* 195/6.

Φλάβιος Στράτων (*I.G.*, II², 2124)

A clue as to the date of this archon is found in the *κοσμητής* Τ. Κλαύδιος Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς who is also listed as Δαδοῦχος among the *αἰεῖσιτοι* in *I.G.*, II², 1806 (192/3-194/5). The date of Φλάβιος Στράτων may therefore be *ca.* 196/7.

Ξενοκλῆς (*I.G.*, II², 1804)

If this archon is the same as the prytanis in *I.G.*, II², 1803¹², dated on the basis of the *αἰεῖσιτοι* in 192/3-193/4 then he may be dated, in view of the positions of the above archons, 197/8-199/200.

Τ. Φλάβ. Σωσιγένης Παλληνεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2128, 2129, 2291a)

This archon is ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2103, now dated because of the third year of the *παιδοτρίβης* Δεύκιος ὁ καὶ Μάρκος in 173/4. In view of the above archons and prosopographical data (*I.G.*, II², 2128, line 4 note) his date may be 197/8-199/200.

Διονυσόδωρος Εὐκάρπου (I.G., II², 3120)

This archon is father of Εὐκαρπος Διονυσοδώρου who is *πρύτανις* in *I.G.*, II², 1826²³, dated in 222/3 (see below, pp. 37-39). Graindor dated this archon 190-200. He may now be dated 197/8-199/200. I do not identify this archon with Αε[πίδιος? Διονυσόδ]ωρος; cf. Oliver, *Hesperia*, V; 1936, p. 100; XI, 1942, p. 89, note 46.

8. THE ARCHONS OF THE THIRD CENTURY A.D.

The dating of the archons in the period 193/4-199/200 moves the archons listed in Oliver's table (*Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 88) as *fin. II-init. III* into the beginning of the third century. The archons in the first half of the third century present a very confused and vague chronology. We have definite dates only for the archons of 209/10, 212/3, 220/1. To these may now be added the years 221-224. With these dates as *points d'appui* in the first quarter of the third century a study of the internal evidence results in the following changes in the chronology of the archons of the first half of the third century.

<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , or <i>Hesperia</i>	Previous date	New date	Archon
3680	beg. of third century	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	Φλάβιος Εἰαχ[χαγωγὸς] Ἀγρυλεύς
1785	end of second or beg. of third century	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	Ἀγαθοκλῆς
1814	ca. 200	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	Αὐρήλιος Δημ---
<i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 30, p. 64 + <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1812	end of second or beg. of third century	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	Δομίτιος Ἀρισταῖος Παιονίδης
2193	ca. 200	205/6	Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος Μαραθώνιος
2197	shortly after 200	206/7	Ἀναρχία after Ἰμερτος
2199	ca. 200	207/8	Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος Στειριεύς
2201	shortly after 200	208/9	Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος Μαραθώνιος
2361; 3681	beg. of third century	210/11 or 211/12	Κλ. Φωκᾶς Μαραθώνιος
3815	middle of third century?	210/11 or 211/12 or 213/4-219/20	Πομπήιος Ἀλέξανδρος
2208	212/3 or shortly after	212/3	Αὐρ. Διονύσιος Διονυσίου Ἀχαρνεύς
<i>Hesp.</i> , X, 1941, no. 64, p. 260	beg. of third century	213/4-219/20	Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας νε(ώτερος)
<i>A.J.A.</i> , XLV, 1941, pp. 541-2; <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 3683	beg. of third century	shortly after 212	Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων Γαργήτιος = Καλλίφρων πρεσβύτερος
<i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 33, p. 67	ca. 200-230	213/4-219/20	Τιβ. Κλ. Α --- Μελιτεύς
1817; 1816	shortly after 200	shortly before 220/1	Αὐρ. Διονύσιος Καλλίππου Λαμπρεύς
2223	ca. 218/9	220/1	[Φι]λ[ε]ῖν[ος] = Φιλίνος
1078; 1824; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 32, p. 66	ca. 210	221/2	Δομέτιος Ἀραβιανὸς Μαραθώνιος

<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , or <i>Hesperia</i>	Previous date	New date	Archon
1825, 1826	<i>ca.</i> 210	222/3	Γ. Κύντος Κλέων Μαραθώνιος
2224	<i>ca.</i> 218/9	223/4	ἱερεὺς Ἄν---
1828	<i>ca.</i> 210	224/5	Τιβ. Κλ. Πάτροκλος
<i>Hesp.</i> , V, 1936, p. 101	<i>ca.</i> 220	<i>ca.</i> 225	Δε. Διονυσόδωρος
<i>T.A.P.A.</i> , LXXI, 1940, p. 308; <i>Hesp.</i> , III, 1934, no. 44, p. 57; <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1831	<i>ca.</i> 220	<i>ca.</i> 226	Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 3660	end of sec. or beg. of third	<i>ca.</i> 227/8 or shortly after	Γ. Πινάριος Βάσσος Ἀγνούσιος
3687	beg. of third century	227/8-230/1	Π. Πομπ. Ἠγίας (II) Φαληρεὺς
3697, 3700, 3701	<i>ca.</i> 220	229/30-230/1	Μ. Οὐλπιος Εὐβίωτος Δεῦρος
<i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 10 + XVI, 1947, no. 88, p. 183	end of sec. or beg. of third	227/8-230/1	[--- Μαραθώ]νιος νεώ[τερος]
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1832; 2230	<i>ca.</i> 225/6	231/2	Κασσιανός
3682	230-260	<i>ca.</i> 230	Μάρ. Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Φροντεῖνος Καλλίφρονος Παργήτιος
2235	<i>ca.</i> 226	234/5	Ἐπίκτητος Ἀχαρνεὺς
2241-2	238/9 or 242/3	238/9	Κασσιανός Ἱεροκῆρυξ Στειριεὺς
2239	238/9-243/4	239/40	Ἱερεὺς Φλάβ. Ἀσκληπιάδης [Διο]-μαι[ε]ύς
2243	after 243/4	244/5	Αὐρ. Λαυδικιανός
2245	262/3 or 266/7	262/3	Λ. Φλά. Φιλόστρατος Στειριεὺς
3644; 3682	end of second century	middle of third century	Κορνηλιανός

Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος Μαραθώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 2201)

This archon has been dated shortly after 200 A.D. The lower limit of his date is 208/9, for the first year of Τιβ. Κλ. Λεωσθένους who succeeds Ἀλεξ- as *προστάτης* in *I.G.*, II², 2201 is 209/10 (cf. *I.G.*, II², 2235). On account of the *ἀντικοσμητής* Ἀλέξανδρος who is the same as that in *I.G.*, II², 2208, dated 212/3 or shortly after, Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος was archon *ca.* 208/9. Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος is also listed among the *αἰεῖσιτοι* in *I.G.*, II², 1077 (209/10) and this supports a date closer to 212 A.D. Several other considerations point to the same conclusion. The *ἀντικοσμητής* in *I.G.*, II², 2208 is referred to as Αὐρ. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μαρ. while in *I.G.*, II², 2201 he is referred to as Ἀλέξανδρος Μαραθώνιος. Furthermore the *ἡγεμὼν διὰ βίου Τειμαγένης*, who appears in *I.G.*, II², 2193, 2199, 2201, and 2203, is succeeded by [...]. Ἐπιτυγχάνοντος (*I.G.*, II², 2205) and he in turn is succeeded by Παρράσιος Εὐτυχίδου in 212/3 (*I.G.*, II², 2208) who held this office until after 218/9 (*I.G.*, II², 2228). Thus the study of the office of *ἡγεμὼν* shows that Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος was archon either prior to the sequence Γάϊος Κύντος Ἱμερτος, ἀναρχία, Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 2193, 2197, 2199) or after. Since, however, the *ἀντικοσμητής* in the archonship of Φά. Δαδοῦχος

is the same as that in the year 212 we reach the conclusion that his archonship fell in 208/9, the lower limit of his reign.

THE ARCHONS Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος Μαραθώνιος, Ἀναρχία μετὰ Γ. Κύντον Ἰμερτον, Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος Σπειριεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2193, 2197, 2199)

As was noted in the study of the date of the archon Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος the sequence of men who hold the office of ἡγεμών shows that we must date *I.G.*, II², 2193, 2199, 2201, 2203 before 112/3. A study of the evidence shows (1) that the archons of *I.G.*, II², 2193, 2197, 2199 must be dated in consecutive sequence and in close association with Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος; (2) that since Φλ. Διογένης is archon in 209/10 this group of 3 years, which must precede 212/3, can only be dated in 205/6-207/8. The officers of the ephēboi in the following lists are so coördinated that we must date the archons in the above chronology.

Inscription	Archon	Παιδοτρίβης	Ὑποπαιδοτρίβης	Γραμματεὺς	Ὑπογραμματεὺς
<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 2193	Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος	Τελεσφόρος Μενεκράτους	Εὐτυχιανός	Στράτων	Αἴλιος Εὐχάριστος Σφήττιος ⁵⁰
2197	ἀναρχία μετὰ Γ. Κύντον Ἰμερτον	“	“
2199	Γ. Κάσ. Ἀπολλώνιος	“	“	Αἴλιος Εὐχάριστος Σφήττιος ⁵⁰
2201	Φά. Δαδοῦχος
2208	Αἰρ. Διονύσιος	Τελεσφόρος	Εὐτυχιανός	Στράτων	Ἰούλιος Ἀριστείδης

Inscription	Ἀντικοσμητής	Ἡγεμών	Ὀπλομάχος	Διδάσκαλος
2193	Ἐλευσείνιος Κίττου	Τειμαγένης	Διονύσιος Νεικομάχου Φαλ. ⁵¹	Εὐπορος
2197	ιερεὺς Ἀρχίτειμος Διονυσίου
2199	“	Τειμαγένης
2201	Ἀλέξανδρος	“
2208	Αἰρ. Ἀλέξανδρος	Αἰρ. Παρράσιος	Μάρ. Αἰρ. Διονύσιος Νεικοστράτου Φαλ. ⁵¹	Αἰρ. Εὐπορος

Identity in the offices of παιδοτρίβης, γραμματεὺς, ὑπογραμματεὺς, ἡγεμών shows that Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος follows in the sequence of Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος, ἀναρχία. Further identity in the office of ἡγεμών shows a close connection between Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος and Φά. Δαδοῦχος. In view of the above evidence we may date the archons as follows:

⁵⁰ The demotic of Αἴλιος Εὐχάριστος in *I.G.*, II², 2193 is Σφήττιος while in 2199 it is Φαληρεὺς. Transfer of the same person to another tribe is not uncommon. Cf. Dittenberger's remarks on *I.G.*, III, 1037. Cf. *I.G.*, II², 1824 30n.; 1828 49n.; 1820 8n.; 1784 n.; 2128 39n. In view of these examples, I take the ὀπλομάχος Αἰρ. Διονύσιος Φαληρεὺς in *I.G.*, II², 2208 to be the same ὀπλομάχος as Αἰρ. Διονύσιος Ἀχαρνέως in *I.G.*, II², 2235. We know that he at least held office for 25 years.

⁵¹ See *I.G.*, II², 2193 146n.

205/6	Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος
206/7	Anarchy after Ἰμερτος
207/8	Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος
208/9	Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος
209/10	Φλ. Διογένης
212/13	Αὐρ. Διονύσιος.

Κλ. Φωκάς Μαραθώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 2361, 3681)

This archon has been dated by Graindor in the beginning of the third century but before 212 A.D. Κλ. Φωκάς was an ephebos in 190/1 or 191/2 (*I.G.*, II², 2113). Assuming that he was archon at the earliest around the age of 35 this would, in the light of the above archons, throw his archonship into 210/11 or 211/12.

Φλάβιος Εἰαχ[χαγωγὸ]ς Ἀγρυλεύς (*I.G.*, II², 3680)

The prosopography shows that this archon must be dated early in the first decade of the third century. Two of the men in this list (lines 17, 19) were epheboi in *I.G.*, II², 2113¹¹¹,¹⁰⁸ dated 190/1-191/2, while another (line 15) was a prytanis in 168/9 (*I.G.*, II², 1775¹⁸). In view of this evidence he may be assigned a date from 200/1-204/5, excluding 202/3 when --- μος is archon (cf. *Hesp.*, X, 1941, p. 87⁴).

Ἀγαθοκλῆς (*I.G.*, II², 1785)

Of the date of this archon Kirchner remarks "ex insolita positione tituli 1785 in protome hermae Gr(aindor) *Chronol.* 281 iure conclusit hunc titulum recentiorem quam titulos 1786, 1787." *I.G.*, II², 1786 and 1787 have been dated 170/1 and 175/6. Ἀγαθοκλῆς may therefore be dated in the end of the second century or the beginning of the third. The only years vacant for him in the second century after 175/6 are two years between 176/7 and 179/80 (see above, p. 28), but these dates are too close to 175/6 and the position on the stone argues for a much later date. If Ἀγαθοκλῆς is to be identified with a πρύτανις Ἀγαθοκλῆς Σωτέλους (Ἐστιαιόθεν) in *Hesp.*, IV, 1935, no. 11³⁸, p. 48, dated in 182/3 then Ἀγαθοκλῆς must be dated 200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5.

Αὐρήλιος Δημ --- (*I.G.*, II², 1814)

This archon has been dated *ca.* 200 A.D. The prosopography includes as prytanis Σύμμαχος Ἀριστοβούλου who is an ephebos in 185/6 (*I.G.*, II², 2112²⁴). In *I.G.*, II², 1813, closely related to *I.G.*, II², 1814, the prytanis Ἀγάθων (line 9) is ὑποσωφρονιστής in the archonship of Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος 207/8 (*I.G.*, II², 2199⁵⁹). Αὐρήλιος Δημ --- should be dated 200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5.

Δομίτιος Ἀρισταῖος Παιονίδης (*Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 30, p. 64 + *I.G.*, II², 1812)

On the basis of the lettering in the prescript of this prytany list Graindor dated

this inscription at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. Oliver dates the archon *ca.* 200. He may be placed in the limits 200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5.

Πομπήιος Ἀλέξανδρος (*I.G.*, II², 3815)

This archon appears as ἐπώνυμος in the archonship of Δομίτιος Ἀρισταῖος, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 30⁶, p. 65. The earliest that he can be archon is 210/11-211/12. In view of the archons of the third decade Πομπήιος should be dated in the second decade of the third century.

Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας N (*Hesperia*, X, 1941, no. 64, p. 260)

The father of this archon was the archon Ξεναγόρας in 183/4 (*I.G.*, II², 1739). The prosopography which consists of Αὐρ. [Κα]ῤσιανὸς ὁ κα[ὶ . . .] κρατίων Σφή, and Αὐρ. Ἡλιόδωρος Λαμπρεὺς suggests a date after 212 A.D. In view of the archons in the third decade 213-219 is the most likely date for this archon.

Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων Γαργήτιος = Καλλίφρων πρεσβύτερος
(*A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, pp. 541-2; *I.G.*, II², 3683)

The archon Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων who, as Oliver has shown, is the same as the archon Καλλίφρων πρεσβύτερος, is ephebos in 190/1 or 191/2 (*I.G.*, II², 2119¹⁵, 232-3, 236; cf. Oliver's note 6, *loc. cit.*). This archon would be 40 years old in 210-211. That he was archon after 212 is evident not only from the addition of Αὐρήλιος to his name but also to that of the ὀπλομάχος Αὐρ. Διονύσιος Νεικοστράτου in *I.G.*, II², 3683, who though ὀπλομάχος before 212 (cf. *I.G.*, II², 2207) adds Αὐρήλιος to his name after 212 A.D. (cf. *I.G.*, II², 2208). Since he is referred to simply as Διονύσιος Νεικοστράτου Φαληρεὺς in *I.G.*, II², 2221, 2223 (dated now 219/20; 220/1) it may well be that the archonship of Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων should be placed shortly after 212 A.D.

Μᾶρ. Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Φροντεῖνος Καλλίφρονος Γαργήτιος (*I.G.*, II², 3682)

Oliver takes this archon to be the elder son of Calliphron senior and dates him between 230 and 260 A.D. In view of the date of his father he should be dated in the earlier limit, probably in the fourth decade of the third century.

Κορνηλιανός = Μᾶρ. Ἐρέννιος Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Κορνηλιανός (*I.G.*, II², 3644; 3682)

One of the two sons who honor Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Φροντεῖνος is Μᾶρ. Ἐρέννιος Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Κορνηλιανός (*I.G.*, II², 3682⁸⁻¹⁰). It is very likely that the archon Κορνηλιανός mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 3644 is to be identified with the son of Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Φροντεῖνος. Kirchner dates him in the end of the second century, but the prosopography mentions Αὐρ. Ζώσιμος ὁ καὶ . . . χης and Αὐρ. Εἰρηναῖος Ζωσίμου which would indicate a date after 212. In view of his father's date Κορνηλιανός should be dated in the middle of the third century A.D.

Τιβ. Κλ. Α — — — Μελ(ιτεύς) (*Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 33, p. 67)

The hoplite general Τιβ. Κλ. Πάτροκλος is archon in 224/5 (*I.G.*, II², 1828) and the mention of Ἀνρήλιοι on the right side of the herm gives us the *post quem* and *ante quem* limits of this archon who should now be dated in the second decade of the third century, 213/4-219/20. The archon is probably Τιβ. Κλ. Ἀνσιάδης Μελιτεύς who is mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 2340 which, as Dittenberger showed, is a “catalogus gentis Cerycum.”

Ἀνρ. Διονύσιος Καλλίππου Λαμπτρεύς (*I.G.*, II², 1817, 1816)

As was pointed out by Dittenberger the mention of Πολιάς Ἀθηνᾶ among the *πρυτάνεις* dates this archon shortly before *I.G.*, II², 1824-26. Since these inscriptions are now dated in 221/2-222/3, the date of this archon is shortly before 220/1 when Φιλίνος is archon. The hoplite general Κασσιανὸς Φίλιππος Στειριεύς (*I.G.*, II², 1817¹³) is archon in *I.G.*, II², 2230 (*ca.* 231 A.D.). Εὐτυχίδης Εὐπόρου mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 1816⁵ is, as a result, not the ephebos mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 2067¹⁴³, dated 154/5, but probably his grandson.

..λ.ω — (*I.G.*, II², 2223)

This archon has been dated 218/9 or shortly after. Since we have an archon Φιλίνος accurately dated in 220/1 by virtue of the fact that he held the archonship in the consulship of Sabianus and Seleucus (Syncell., *Chronogr.*, p. 400, Dindorf; cf. Graindor, *Chronologie*, no. 243), it is obvious that the archon ..λ.ω — is the same as Φιλίνος and that the name of the archon in *I.G.*, II², 2223 should be restored as [Φι]λ[ε]ῖν[ος]. This is now corroborated by the reading of the stone by Mitsos who reports the first two letters as Φι.

ἱερεὺς Ἀν — — — (*I.G.*, II², 2224)

Because of the close association of *I.G.*, II², 2224 to *I.G.*, II², 2233 (cf. note on *I.G.*, II², 2224) the archon ἱερεὺς Ἀν — — — must be dated shortly after 220/1. The closest date open is 223/4, the year between Γάϊος Κύντος Κλέων (222/3) and Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Πάτροκλος (224/5). The κοσμητὴς Εὐκαρπίδης Ἐκπάγλου Βερενικίδης is also mentioned as ἱάκορος in the archonship of Μουνάτιος Θεμισών (*T.A.P.A.*, LXXI, 1940, p. 308, line 4) dated *ca.* 226 A.D. (see below).

Δομέτιος Ἀραβιανὸς Μαραθώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 1078; 1824; *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 32, p. 66); Γ. Κύντος Κλέων Μαραθώνιος (*I.G.*, II², 1825, 1826);

Τιβ. Κλ. Πάτροκλος Λαμπτρεύς (*I.G.*, II², 1828)

The date of the archon Γ. Κύντος Ἰμερτος, as Kirchner observed (*I.G.*, II², 1825 n.), determines the upper limit of these archons who, from their position on the stone, form a sequence (cf. Graindor, *Chronologie*, no. 168). The councillors Αἴλιος

Δόγισμος and Πρέμπος in *I.G.*, II², 1824^{9, 27} are epheboi in *I.G.*, II², 2193^{140, 143}, an inscription which is dated in 206/7 (see above). Therefore the earliest year that we can date Ἀραβιανός is 216/7 when these epheboi could have become councillors.

We can get the exact date by observing a hitherto unnoticed piece of evidence in *I.G.*, II², 1824-26. After the prescript *I.G.*, II², 1824 mentions Athena as eponymous, then Πεινάριος Πρόκλος as ἐπώνυμος, and then in line 3, framed by leaves, **Α** ΑΤΡΗΑΙΟΙ **Ι** (see copy in *I.G.*, III, p. 236, b, line 9). *I.G.*, II², 1825 follows identically the same pattern: line 39 mentions Athena as eponymous, then in line 40 Πεινάριος Πρόκλος as ἐπώνυμος, and then in line 70, just about the same position as in *I.G.*, II², 1824, we read ΑΤΡΗΑ — —. This should now be restored as ΑΤΡΗΑ[ΙΟΙ].

Who are these Αὐρήλιοι? They can not belong to the names following, for in *I.G.*, II², 1825, line 72 we have Αὐρ. Ἐπίκτη[τος], while in line 71 just plain Ἑρεσίων. This is the only instance in inscriptions of the empire period where we meet the plural Αὐρήλιοι placed in a position of prominence.⁵² We get the answer to our question in *I.G.*, II², 1832. After the prescript and just before the ἐπώνυμος we get the name of Severus Alexander and the deified Hadrian and Commodus. Αὐρήλιοι therefore can only refer to two Roman emperors who ruled together. These are M. Aurelius Antoninus (Elagabalus) and M. Aurelius Severus Alexandrus (Severus Alexander) who shared the rule in 221 and 222. It needs to be recalled here that Julia Maesa, Elagabalus' grandmother, realizing Elagabalus' unfitness to rule forced him to adopt his cousin Severus Alexander with the title of Caesar on July 10, 221. When Elagabalus sought to get rid of his relative, soldiers, incited by Julia Mamaea, mother of Severus Alexander, killed Elagabalus and Severus Alexander succeeded him on March 11, 222. It now becomes evident why *I.G.*, II², 1826, dated later in the same year as *I.G.*, II², 1825, omits the Αὐρήλιοι. In the course of G. Quintus Kleon's archonship news of the death of Elagabalus reached Athens and the name Αὐρήλιοι was omitted, as was the case in *I.G.*, II², 1828, the fourth archon in the sequence.

This information not only dates accurately Arabianos and his immediate successors but also throws valuable light on the relation of the Athenian to the Roman calendar. The archon Φιλῖνος is equated with the consuls Sabinianus and Seleucus in 221. Φιλῖνος has been dated by Graindor in 220/1 while in Kirchner's table (*I.G.*, II², p. 795) he is dated 221/2. Since the Attic calendar commenced after the time of Hadrian with Boedromion, about September 1, and since furthermore Elagabalus and Severus Alexander ruled jointly from July 10, 221, it is evident that Φιλῖνος was archon from September, 220, to September, 221, and that Arabianos was archon from September, 221, to September, 222; Quintus Kleon from September, 222, to September, 223. Elagabalus was killed on March 11, 222, in the course of Arabianos' archonship. This raises the problem of the meaning of Αὐρηλ — in *I.G.*, II², 1825,

⁵² The only other instances of the plural Αὐρήλιοι are found in *I.G.*, II², 3762, an inscription wherein the κοσμητής is honored by his sons who are listed as Αὐρήλιοι; *A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, p. 541, where also two sons are referred to as Αὐρήλιοι, followed by their names.

a prytany list in the archonship of Quintus Kleon. Kleon began his term fully six months after the death of Elagabalus. It is unreasonable to suppose that Athens had not heard the news of Elagabalus' death during these months. The difficulty may be overcome if we supply *Αὐρήλ[ιος]* in *I.G.*, II², 1825, referring to Severus Alexander alone. It is possible, however, to keep the reading of *Αὐρήλ[ιοι]* and explain it as follows. We have a parallel in the name of the three emperors in *I.G.*, II², 1832, lines 6-8. One of the emperors is alive and the other two dead. If we follow this line of thought, may not even a dead emperor have been included in the title *Αὐρήλιοι*? Consequently we may restore the plural after all, even six months or more after the death of Elagabalus.

Λε. Διονυσόδωρος (*Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 95, 100-101) ; Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων (*T.A.P.A.*, LXXI, 1940, p. 308; *Hesperia*, III, 1934, no. 44, p. 57; *I.G.*, II², 1831)

Διονυσόδωρος is, as Oliver ⁵³ has pointed out, a year or so earlier than Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων who is ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2203 now dated *ca.* 209/10. Therefore the date 224/5 is the *terminus post quem* of these two archons. The hoplite general Πομ. Ἡγίας Φαληρεὺς is also hoplite general in *I.G.*, II², 1831 which is dated shortly after the archonship of Ἀραβιανός. In view of this we must supply Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων as the ἄρχων in *I.G.*, II², 1831 and date him shortly after Ἀραβιανός. Furthermore in the archonship of Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων the ζάκορος is Εὐκαρπίδης Ἐκπάγλου Βερενεϊκίδης (*T.A.P.A.*, LXXI, 1940, p. 308, line 4) ; he is also found as κοσμητὴς in *I.G.*, II², 2224, dated in 223/4 (see above, p. 37). In view of this evidence these two archons may now be dated *ca.* 225 and 226 respectively.

Γ. Πινάριος Βάσσος Ἀγνούσιος (*I.G.*, II², 3660)

This archon has been dated at the end of the second or beginning of the third century after Christ. Γ. Πινάριος Βάσσος is a prytanis in the archonship of Arabianos in 221/2 (*I.G.*, II², 1824) and he is also ἐπώνυμος in the archonship of Κλαύδιος Πάτροκλος Δαμπιτρεὺς, dated now in 224/5 (*I.G.*, II², 1828). The earliest date for him is *ca.* 227 or shortly after.

Π. Πομπ. Ἡγίας (II) Φαλ. (*I.G.*, II², 3687)

This archon was hoplite general in the archonship of Μουνάτιος Θεμίσων (see above, p. 39). The date of his archonship would therefore be after *ca.* 226/7. I suggest a date at the end of the third decade of the third century.

Μ. Οὐλπίος Εὐβίोटος Λεύρος (*I.G.*, II², 3697, 3700, 3701)

The dedicator Πόπλιος Αἴλ. Ζήνων Βερνικίδης was ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2193 ⁶⁹,

⁵³ *T.A.P.A.*, LXXI, 1940, p. 311.

in the archonship of Γ. Κ. Ἰμερτος, 205/6. The date of this archon is given by Kirchner as *ca.* 220, while Graindor dates him in the second quarter of the third century. The earliest that he can be dated is *ca.* 229 A.D.

[Μαραθῶ]νιος νεώ[τερος] (*Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 10, p. 40; XVI, 1947, no. 88, p. 183)

Meritt has joined this fragment with Agora Inv. no. 1881, which mentions Σαραπιακός who is ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2200, dated by Kirchner *ca.* 200 A.D. This inscription should be dated later, for the ephebos Κόντος Βερνεκίδης in *I.G.*, II², 2200¹³ is prytanis in *I.G.*, II², 1828⁴⁷, which is now dated 224/5. In view of this evidence he may be dated in the end of the third decade of the third century.

Κασιανός (*I.G.*, II², 1832; 2230)

This archon has been dated by Graindor *ca.* 226/7 and Kirchner 225/6 or shortly after. The reference to Severus Alexander gives the limits 222/3-234/5. The fact, however, that the prytanis Λαμίσκος Χαιρήμονος was ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2226, dated now *ca.* 221, suggests the date of 231 for the archonship of Κασιανός.

Ἐπίκτητος Ἀχαρνεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2235)

The limits of this inscription are 226/7-234/5. This inscription mentions the twenty-fifth year of Τι. Κλ. Λεωσθένης Μελιτεύς as *προστάτης*. He first appears in this office in 212/3 (*I.G.*, II², 2208). His first year, if we take 234/5 as the lower limit of this inscription, is 209/10. In *I.G.*, II², 2201, dated now 208/9, the *προστάτης* is Ἀλεξ—. This compels us therefore to date this inscription in 234/5.

Κασιανὸς Ἱεροκῆρυξ Σπειριεύς (*I.G.*, II², 2241-2)

This inscription, which has been dated 238/9 or 242/3, mentions the twenty-second year of Σύντροφος as *γραμματεὺς*. Σύντροφος is first mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 2221 dated 217/8 or shortly after. Because *I.G.*, II², 2221 precedes *I.G.*, II², 2223 by virtue of a change in the office of διδάσκαλος while retaining the same men in the offices of ὑπογραμματεὺς, ἡγεμών, and ὀπλομάχος we must date *I.G.*, II², 2221 in 219/20, the year before the archonship of Φιλίνος (for his date see above, p. 37). If we take the lower limit, 242/3, the first year of Σύντροφος would be 220/1. Since Σύντροφος is already in office in 219/20 we must choose the earlier limit of 238/9, which also establishes the year of the Παναθηναίς.

Ἱερεὺς Φλάβ. Ἀσκληπιάδης [Διο]μαι[ε]ύς (*I.G.*, II², 2239)

This inscription has been dated, because of the reference to the Γορδιάνεια, in 238/9-243/4. Since Κασιανός is archon in 238/9, the date of this archon is narrowed

to 239/40-243/4. Because of the identity in the offices of *παιδοτρίβης*, *γραμματεὺς*, *προστάτης*, and most likely in the office of *ὑπογραμματεὺς* in *I.G.*, II², 2239 and 2242, it is very probable that *I.G.*, II², 2239 should be dated shortly following the archon *Κασσιανὸς Ἱεροκῆρυξ Στειριεύς* in *I.G.*, II², 2242, probably in 239/40.

Αὐρ. Λαυδικιανός (*I.G.*, II², 2243); *Λ. Φλά. Φιλόστρατος Στειριεύς* (*I.G.*, II², 2245)

I.G., II², 2243 has been dated after 243/4. Identity in the offices of *παιδοτρίβης*, *ὑπογραμματεὺς*, *ἐπὶ Διογενείου*, *διδάσκαλος* and *λεντιάριος*, associates closely the dates of *I.G.*, II², 2239 and 2243. *Λαυδικιανός* therefore must be dated shortly after 240. We can get closer to the date by noting that *Εὐτυχίδης* is also *ὑποζάκορος* for the eighteenth year in *I.G.*, II², 2245, dated 262/3 or 266/7. The close association of *I.G.*, II², 2239 and 2243 argues for 262/3 as the date of *I.G.*, II², 2245, a conclusion already reached in dating the *Παναθηναίς* in the earlier limit (cf. above, p. 40). If this is the case then the first year of *Εὐτυχίδης* is 244/5 to which we must now assign the archon *Λαυδικιανός*. It follows then that *Φιλόστρατος* is archon in 262/3.

VI. THE CHRONOLOGY OF OTHER INSCRIPTIONS AND NOTES ON ATHENIAN PROSOPOGRAPHY

1. PRYTANY LISTS

I.G., II², 1736a

Previous date: the middle of first century A.D.; Dow: middle of second century A.D. (*Hesperia*, III, 1934, pp. 166, 175).

New date: the end of the second century A.D.

The *ἱεραύλης -ωρος* in line 15 gives us a clue as to the date. The only *ἱεραύλης* in the second century ending in *-ωρος* is *Ἑρμόδωρος* who appears in *I.G.*, II², 1797 (181/2); *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34 (191/2); *I.G.*, II², 1806 (194/5?); *I.G.*, II², 1806a (195/6). We may restore line 11 as *Κορνήλιος Μ[ευσθεύς]* who is the prytany secretary in *I.G.*, II², 1776.

I.G., II², 1768-9

Previous date: the middle of the second century after Christ.

New date: shortly before 165 A.D.

These two inscriptions, which have the same *κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμον*, have been dated in the middle of the second century because *Φούριος Ἡράκλειτος Γαρ.* (1785⁵) was ephebos in 128/9 (*I.G.*, II², 2041¹²).

The *δαδοῦχος* in *I.G.*, II², 1769 is*ιος*. A study of this office in the middle of the century shows that the following men held it, *Πομπήιος*, *Αἴλιος*, *Κλαύδιος* (see

above, Table 1). The latter two come after 175 A.D. and are excluded by reason of lateness as well as the fact that they do not fit the spacing ofιος Δαδούχος. The only one left is Πομπήιος who fits both the spacing and the time. Therefore we may date these inscriptions shortly before 165.

I.G., II², 1769 is, as Kirchner pointed out, closely related in date to *I.G.*, II², 1768. It has the same κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου as *I.G.*, II², 1768: --- ος Παλληνεύς. This should now read [. . . ν]ος Παλληνεύς and likewise the reading of *I.G.*, II², 1768⁹ which reads IPTC should read [ΙΕΡΟΚ]ΗΡΤΞ.

Since the κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου changed annually (cf. *I.G.*, II², 1773-76, dated 166/7-169/70), the two inscriptions must belong to the same year and therefore we may read in line 1 of *I.G.*, II², 1769 γραμματεὺς βουλευ]τῶν Φ[ούριος Ἡράκλειτος Γαρ] for [γραμματεὺς βουλευ]τῶν Ο-----. This makes *I.G.*, II², 1769 a prytany list of Aegeis.

I.G., II², 1781⁵²⁻³

Lines 52-3 read:

[.⁹.] CIOY AZH vac.
----- AP vac.

Since this inscription carries the same ἀείσιτοι as *I.G.*, II², 1776, both dated in 169/70, it is evident that the ἀείσιτοι should be the same. The only two ἀείσιτοι not mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 1781 are the ἐπὶ Σκιάδος and the ὑπογραμματεὺς. The ἐπὶ Σκιάδος in *I.G.*, II², 1776⁴³ is Ἰούλιος Ζηνόβιος. It is obvious that in lines 52-3 the reading, as the squeeze shows, should be:

ΕΠΙ ΣΚΙΑΔΟΣ ΙΟΥΛΑ ΖΗ vac.
[NOBIOC M]AP vac.

I.G., II², 1783

Previous date: the beginning of the third century after Christ.

New date: 221/2.

The earliest limit of this inscription is *ca.* 202 A.D., for the prytanis Εὐλογος Κλεωνύμου is an ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2132⁵⁸, dated *ca.* 192. Αἴλιος Λεύκιος also appears as ἐπώνυμος in *I.G.*, II², 1792, dated in 187/8 but in view of the date to be given to *I.G.*, II², 1783, it is likely that he is the son of Αἴλιος Λεύκιος. The prosopography of *I.G.*, II², 1783 extends into the third century, for Αἴλιος Ἰσόχρυσος (line 10) is hoplite general in 222/3 (*I.G.*, II², 1823, 1825, 1826).

We have a clue as to the date in ἱερεὺς Αὐρ. Μελοπομενός who is hoplite general in the archonship of Arabianos (*I.G.*, II², 1824). His name fits into the prescript of *I.G.*, II², 1783 which may now be reconstructed as follows:

[ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Δομ.]-
 [Ἀραβιανοῦ Μαραθῶ]-
 [νίου στρατηγούντος]
 [ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας ἱ]
 5 ἐρέως [Αὐρ. Μελπομε]
 νοῦ^{vv} οἱ πρυτάνεις

I.G., II², 1784

Previous date: the beginning of the third century.

New date: *ca.* 221.

As Dittenberger has remarked, *I.G.*, II², 1784 is of about the same date as 1783 now dated, because of the restoration of *Μελπομενός* as hoplite general, in the archonship of Arabianos, 221/2. We may therefore date *I.G.*, II², 1784 *ca.* 221.

I.G., II², 1790^{29, 30}; *A.J.A.*, XLV, 1941, p. 539

A study of the order of officials among the *αἰεῖστοι* shows that –ων Διονυσίο[ν] *Μελιτεὺς* is the *ἀντιγραφεὺς*, for he is not one of the officials who continue in the office, while *Εὐχρηστος* [Δ]ειφίλου Σουნიεύς is likely the *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*, for the *κῆρυξ* is given above.

I.G., II², 1799

Lines 19 and 20 read:

κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου Φοῖβος
 γ βουλῆς δήμου Αἴμος(?) Ἀλεξάνδρου

From *I.G.*, II², 2049¹² we know that the name of the *κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου* should read Φοῖβος Ἀλεξάνδρου.

I.G., II², 1811

Previous date: the end of the second or the beginning of the third century.

New date: after 217 A.D.

This list of Hippothontis mentions Δίκαιος ὁ Πειρεεύς (line 4). In an ephebe list in the archonship of Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος (207/8) we find listed under the tribe Hippothontis an ephebos Δίκαιος (*I.G.*, II², 2199¹²⁷). A study of names in the Empire period shows that many names that normally ended in -ιος ended simply in -ις. Cf. Παράσις (*I.G.*, II², 2221⁷⁵) = Παρράσις (*I.G.*, II², 2223³³); Ἀθήναις (*I.G.*, II², 1737¹⁴; 2097⁸⁴) Ἀθήναιος (*I.G.*, II², 2111/12¹⁰²); Τέρτις (*I.G.*, II², 2218⁸) Τέρτιος (*I.G.*, II², 2239¹⁴⁴). In view of the above we may identify the prytanis of *I.G.*, II², 1811⁴ with the ephebos in *I.G.*, II², 2199¹²⁷. This gives us a *terminus post quem* of 217 A.D. for this prytany list. [See now *C.P.*, XLIII, 1948, pp. 243-260.]

I.G., II², 1818

Previous date: shortly after 200.

New date: *ca.* 200 A.D.

I.G., II², 1818 is closely related to *I.G.*, II², 1817 (*ca.* 221 A.D., see above, p. 37) by virtue of the mention of *ἱερὸς γέρων*. The prytaneis in lines 8 and 21 are also mentioned in *I.G.*, II², 1783^{31, 45}, dated now in 221. We should therefore move the date closer to *I.G.*, II², 1817 and 1783. In line 18 the stone reads *ἐπ vac.*; *ἐπ* standing for *ἐπ(ιστάτης)*.

I.G., II², 1819

Mitsos reports (*per litt.*) that the stone reads with respect to the last word in line 1

ΙϚ[^{ca. 4.}]ΙΔΟϚ

He adds that “perhaps the first missing letter is Τ even if it is a little removed from Ϛ, and perhaps the fourth missing letter is Τ.” Meritt reports that in the squeeze between the vertical stroke which ends the middle group and the fourth letter from the end there are about fifteen letters missing.

The prescript may be restored as follows, the second line of which is confirmed by the squeeze.

[στρατηγούντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας Διογέ]ένους τ[οῦ . . .⁷. . .]ν Ϛῆ[^{a3}μᾶχ]ίδου
[οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς — — —
— — — φυλῆς τειμῆ]σα[ντες ἑαυ]τοὺς καὶ τοὺς αἰσείτους [ἀνέ]γρ[αψαν]

2. LISTS OF ΕΡΗΕΒΟΙ

I.G., II², 1988 = 2264

These inscriptions are identical, a fact which escaped Kirchner. Both should be dated 40/1-53/4 because the secretary Μένανδρος is the same as in *I.G.*, II², 1974¹².

I.G., II², 1993

Date: *ca.* 80 A.D.

The *κεστροφύλαξ* is . . .⁵. . . νης . . .⁵. . . εως. His full name can be reconstructed from Σύντροφο[ς Δ]ιογένους Μελιτεύς who is *κεστροφύλαξ* in 116/7 (*I.G.*, II², 2026⁶⁴). If, as is probable, he is the son of the *κεστροφύλαξ* in *I.G.*, II², 1993, then we can read [Διογέ]νης [Μελιτ]εύς in *I.G.*, II², 1993.

Σύντροφος Διογένους Μελιτεύς is the cousin of Σύντροφος Ἡλιοδώρου Μελιτεύς in *I.G.*, II², 2022-3, 2024-5 (*ca.* 112 A.D.). Διονύσιος Μελιτεύς, who is *γραμματεὺς* in *I.G.*, II², 2037 (125/6), is probably the son of [Διογέ]νης [Μελιτ]εύς.

I.G., II², 2046

Line 53 reads Φίλιππος) Μουσαί[ου]. The stone shows ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ) ΜΟΥ-
CAIC with) close on the right of the last letter. This can be read as ΜΟΥCAIC).

I.G., II², 2064³⁷

Mitsos reports that the third letter on the stone is a P, possibly a B.

I.G., II², 2059

A reading of the squeeze shows that lines 23-27 have been read incorrectly. They should read as follows:

- Line 23 *μάρχου Χολαργε[ύς] vac.*
 24 *Ἡρακλείδης Ἀγάθωνο[ς . . .^{ca. 5} . . .] εὖς*
 25 *Φίλων) [Φ]ηγαιεύς < Μην[. . .^{ca. 6} . . .] Στειριεύς*
 26 *Εὐκλείδ[ης] ὁ καὶ Δημοσθέ[νης^{ca. 8} . . .] εἶδον [Ἴ]τέαθεν*
 27 *Ἀγοραν[όμος] Μηνόφιλος Πα[. . .^{ca. 5} . . .] ον Πειραιεύς.*

I.G., II², 2130 ³⁶

The reading for *Κάρπος* > *Ἀ[.]αφ* should be *Κάρπος* > *Ἀ[ρ]αφ(ήνιος)*, a deme of Aegeis.

I.G., II², 2131

Previous date: *ca.* 192/3.

New date: *ca.* 195/6.

I.G., II², 2131 has the same *ὑποπαιδοτρίβης* and *ὑπογραμματεύς* as *I.G.*, II², 2130, which is accurately dated in 192/3. Since the ephebe lists *I.G.*, II², 2125 and 2127, with the archons Κλ. Δαδοῦχος and Φιλιστείδης, have been dated in 193/4 and 194/5, we should assign *I.G.*, II², 2131 to *ca.* 195/6.

I.G., II², 2132

Previous date: *ca.* 192/3.

New date: *ca.* 196/7.

I.G., II², 2132 has the same *παιδοτρίβης* and *γραμματεύς* as *I.G.*, II², 2130 (192/3). In view of the dates of *I.G.*, II², 2125, 2127 and 2131 this inscription should be assigned to *ca.* 196/7.

I.G., II², 2151

Previous date: the second century after Christ.

New date: 219-238.

The *γραμματεύς* reads -- *ος* Εὐκ. He can be no other than [Σύντροφ]ος Εὐκ[αρπίδου] who is secretary in *I.G.*, II², 2221, 2223, 2235, 2239, 2242 (for the dates of these see above, pp. 37, 40-41).

I.G., II², 2200

Previous date: *ca.* 200 A.D.

New date: *ca.* 210 A.D.

For the chronology of this inscription see above, p. 40.

I.G., II², 2202

Previous date: *ca.* 200.

New date: 209/10-211/12.

The *παιδοτρίβης Τελεσφόρος* has as his limits 205/6-212/3. The interval of 205/6-208/9 is filled by *Τελεσφόρος* in *I.G.*, II², 2193, 2197, 2199. This leaves the interval 209/10-211/12 for *Τελεσφόρος* in *I.G.*, II², 2202.

I.G., II², 2203

Previous date: shortly after 200 A.D.

New date: *ca.* 209/10.

I.G., II², 2203 has the same *ὑποπαιδοτρίβης, γραμματεὺς, ἡγεμών, ὀπλομάχος* and *διδάσκαλος* as *I.G.*, II², 2193, dated in 205/6. Since 205/6-208/9 is filled by the sequence of the archons in the ephebe lists of *I.G.*, II², 2193, 2197, 2199 we must assign *I.G.*, II², 2203 to *ca.* 209/10.

I.G., II², 2221

Previous date: 217/8 or shortly after.

New date: 219/20.

I.G., II², 2221 has the same *ὑποπαιδοτρίβης, γραμματεὺς, ὑπογραμματεὺς, ἡγεμών* and *ὀπλομάχος* as *I.G.*, II², 2223 dated now in 220/1. The *διδάσκαλος* *Εὐπορος*, who has been in office since 205/6 (*I.G.*, II², 2193), is now succeeded by his son in *I.G.*, II², 2223. The date of 2221 is therefore 219/20.

I.G., II², 2225

Previous date: *ca.* 218/9 or shortly after.

New date: 222/3.

The *ὑποπαιδοτρίβης, ὑπογραμματεὺς, ἡγεμών*, and *διδάσκαλος* are the same as in *I.G.*, II², 2223, dated in 220/1. Since *I.G.*, II², 2226 is dated in 221/2 and *I.G.*, II², 2224 in 223/4 we may assign *I.G.*, II², 2225 to 222/3.

I.G., II², 2226

Previous date: *ca.* 218/9.

New date: 221/2.

The epheboi in lines 31, 33, 35 also appear in *I.G.*, II², 2223 which is dated because of the archon *Φιλῖνος* in 220/1. This list therefore must be dated in the following year, in the second year of their ephebia.

I.G., II², 2227

Previous date: after 218/9.

New date: *ca.* 224/5.

The *παιδοτρίβης ἱερεὺς* *Αὐρ. Διονύσιος* succeeds *Τελεσφόρος* who appears last in *I.G.*, II², 2224 (223/4). This inscription may therefore be dated in *ca.* 224/5.

I.G., II², 2237

Previous date: *ca.* 230-235.

New date: *ca.* 232.

The ninth year of Αὐρ. Παλαμήδης in the office of διδάσκαλος (*I.G.*, II², 2339, *ca.* 239 A.D., see above, pp. 39-40) determines the last year of Αὐρ. Εὐτυχιανός in this office (*I.G.*, II², 2236) as *ca.* 230 A.D. *I.G.*, II², 2237 is closely related to *I.G.*, II², 2236 by virtue of the fact that they have the same ὑπογραμματεὺς, ὑποζάκορος, ἡγεμών. We may therefore date *I.G.*, II², 2237 in *ca.* 232, for *I.G.*, II², 2230, with Κασσιανός as archon, is dated in 231/2.

I.G., II², 2232-2234

Previous date: *ca.* 230.

New date: 233/4-235/6.

These inscriptions all have the same ἡγεμών and ὀπλομάχος; *I.G.*, II², 2233 and 2234 have the same ὑποπαιδοτρίβης as *I.G.*, II², 2237 (*ca.* 232). *I.G.*, II², 2232-3 have the same ὑπογραμματεὺς as *I.G.*, II², 2237; *I.G.*, II², 2234 has the same ἱατρός as *I.G.*, II², 2237. In view of all this *I.G.*, II², 2232-2234 should be assigned to the interval 233/4-235/6.

I.G., II², 2235 ¹¹⁹

Mitsos reports that the stone reads Εὐγνώμων λ.

I.G., II², 2276

Previous date: date unknown; Dow: second century after Christ (*Hesperia*, III, 1934, p. 175, note 1).

New date: third century A.D.

A more accurate date can be determined for this inscription by observing that the office of Διονύσιος Δημη(τρίου) in line 3, καψᾶρις = καψάριος. The office of λεντιάριος is referred to in several inscriptions as καψάριος (cf. *I.G.*, II², 2130 ²²¹ note). This officer is referred to as καψάριος in *I.G.*, II², 2193 ¹⁵⁰ and in 2245 ⁴¹. Therefore this inscription should be dated in the third century A.D.

I.G., II², 2277

Previous date: no date.

New date: second or third century after Christ.

The earliest appearance of the lemma ἐπέγγραφοι is in *I.G.*, II², 2017, dated now in 115/6. Therefore this inscription must be dated after this *terminus post quem*.

I.G., II², 2993

The παιδοτρίβης in *I.G.*, II², 2993 reads Θεοδώρου του ΙΙΙ — — — ου Μελιτέως. He is the same as Θεοδώρου τοῦ [Διονυσί]ου Μελιτέως who is κοσμητής in *I.G.*, II², 1977.

I.G., II², 3561 = 3542

Previous date: the first or second century after Christ.

New date: after the middle of the first century after Christ.

Upon suspicion that the hoplite general is the same in these inscriptions the writer wrote for a report on the squeezes and received the following note from Meritt (*per litt.*): “*I.G.*, II², 3542 and 3561 are both copies of the same stone. I have a squeeze of 3542. The letters *στρατηγ* have been lost from line 1 (as in 3561) and all of line 2 has been lost (as in 3561). The name *Πόρκιος*, not *Γόργιος*, is clear.”

I.G., II², 3641

Previous date: after 180 A.D.

New date: 193 A.D.

Ἱεροφάντης Ἀπολλινάριος is the same as εἰεροφάντης Κλ. Ἀπολλινάριος Ἀχαρνεύς in *I.G.*, II², 2109, dated now 193/4.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TRIBAL CYCLES

(Only those archons are listed whose names and dates have been affected by the arrangement of the tribal cycles of the secretaries.)

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Year	Archon	Secretary	Tribe of Secretary
1028	101/0	Medeios	~ Φιλίων Φιλίωνος Ἐλευσίνιος	IX
	100/99	Theodosios		10
	99/8	Prokles		11
	98/7	Argeios		12
<i>H.S.C.P.</i> , LI, 1940, p. 110	97/6	Herakleitos		1
1029	96/5	— krates	~ [.... ^{ca. 11} ἐγ Μ]υ[ρρινούτ]της	II
<i>Hesp.</i> , XVII, 1948, no. 12, p. 25	95/4	Theodotos	[--- ^{ca. 17} ---]ov Παιανιεύς	III
	94/3	Kallias		4
	93/2	Kriton		5
	92/1	Menedemos		6
	91/0	Medeios	Probably the anagrapheus replaces	
	90/89	Medeios	the prytany-secretary during this	
	89/8	Medeios	interval; cf. dictatorship of Olym-	
	88/7	Anarchy	piodoros (Pritchett and Meritt, <i>Chronology of Hellenistic Athens</i> , xvi-xviii)	
	87/6	Anarchy until May/June, 86, then Philanthes		

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Year	Archon	Secretary	Tribe of Secretary
	86/5	Hierophantes.	Sulla restores "freedom" to Athens	7
	85/4	Pythokritos		8
	84/3	Niketes		9
	83/2	Pammenes		10
	82/1	Demetrios		11
	81/0	Ar-		12
	80/79 to 69/8			1 to 12
	68/7 to 65/4			1-4
	64/3	Oinophilos	~ Ταρ[α]ν[τ]εῖνος Νεικίου Αἰγ[α]λιεύς	V
	63/2-57/6			6-12
	56/5 to 45/4		Cycle of Allotment Order	
1046	52/1	Lysandros	~ Γάιος Γάιον Ἀλαιοῦς	II or VIII
1047	49/8	Demochares	~ [---]στοκλέους Ἀπολλωνιεύς	XII
	44/3 to 33/2			1 to 12
	32/1 to 22/1			1 to 11
1040; 2876; Ἑλευ- σινιακά I, 1932, 223-236; Roussel, <i>Mélanges Bidez</i> (1934), 819-834	21/0	Apolexis	~ Μητροφάνης Διονυσίου Ἀθμονεύς	XII
1040	20/19		Ἀν[---]	1
	19/8-9/8			2-12
	5/6 to 16/17			1 to 12
	17/8 to 28/9			1 to 12
	29/30 to 40/1			1 to 12
	41/2 to 52/3			1 to 12
	53/4 to 64/5			1 to 12
	65/6 to 76/7			1 to 12
	77/8 to 88/9			1 to 12
	89/90 to 95/6			1 to 7
1759	96/7	Philopappos and Lailianos	~ Βούλων Μοιραγένους Φυλάσιος	VIII
	97/8 to 100/1			9 to 12
	101/2 to 112/3			1 to 12
	113/4 to 116/7			1 to 4
1072	117/8	T. Koponios Maximos	~ Νεικίας Δωρίωνος Φλυεύς	V
	118/9 to 124/5			6 to 12
	125/6			1
	126/7			2

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Year	Archon	Secretary	Tribe of Secretary
	127/8 128/9 to 133/4	Inauguration of Hadrianis		7 8 to 13
<i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 11, p. 40	134/5 135/6		[---]ς Εὐδήμου Γαργήτιος	1 II
1765	136/7 137/8 138/9 139/40 to 146/7	Praxagoras (I) ~ Χρυσόγονος	Φλυεύς	3 4 V 6 to 13
<i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 14, p. 45	147/8 148/9 149/50 to 159/60		[---]άτων Γαργήτιος	1 II 3 to 13
2090; <i>Hesp.</i> , XII, 1943, no. 23, p. 77	160/1-164/5 165/6	Sextos	.τ (or .π)[^{ca. 4} .]πιος Σφήττι(ος)	1 to 5 VI
1773	166/7	M. Valerios Mamertinos	~ Φ[...]ος Ποσειδωνίο[v]	7
1774	167/8	Anarchy (I)	~ Μουσαῖος Φυλάσιος	VIII
1775; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 18, p. 50	168/9	Tineios Pontikos	~ Σκρειβώνιος Ταμιακός Ἀλαιοῦς	IX
1776, 1781, 2097	169/70 170/1 to 172/3	Anarchy (II)	~ Κορ. Μενεσθεὺς Ἀζηγιεύς	X 11 to 13
2103; 3640; <i>Hesp.</i> , III, 1934, no. 42, p. 56	173/4	Biesios Peison	Εἰσίδωρος Ὀν[---] Ἀναγυράσιος	I
1798	174/5 to 176/7 177/8		Ἰσπλή(ιος) Πυθόδω[ρο]ς (Βερνικείδης)	2 to 4 V
1789; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 6, p. 35	178/9		[Εὐκ]αρπος Θεογ[ένους] (Σφήττιος)	VI
1794	179/80 180/1	Athenodoros	~ [--- Διο]ν(υ)σίον	7 8
1739; 1797; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, p. 35	181/2	M. Flakkos	Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος	9
1739; <i>Hesp.</i> , IV, 1935, no. 11, p. 48	182/3	Anarchy after Flakkos	~ Μυστικός Ἐρριάδης	X
1739	183/4	Loukios Gellios Xenagoras		11
1795	184/5	Demostratos	~ Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδης	12
2111/2; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 36, p. 70	185/6	Philoteimos	Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς	XIII
<i>Hesp.</i> Supplement VIII; 1796	186/7	Thisbianos	Κλώδιος Ἀντίοχος Λαμπτρέυς	I

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Year	Archon	Secretary	Tribe of Secretary
<i>Hesp.</i> Supplement VIII; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 4, p. 32	187/8	Ioulios Hierophantes	Αὐρ. Ὑάκινθος Γαργήττιος	II
<i>Hesp.</i> Supplement VIII; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, nos. 23-4, pp. 57-8	188/9	Kommodos	Εἰσίδοτος Φήλεικος Ἀγγελῆθεν	III
2115-18	189/90	Menogenes		4
2119; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 6, p. 35	190/1	G. Peinarios		
2113-4; <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, no. 5, p. 34	191/2	Proklos	Ἀ[φρ]οδείσιος) Φλυεύς	V
	192/3-193/4	Tib. Kl. Bradouas		
		Attikos	Εὐκαρπος Σφήττιος	VI
1806	194/5?		Ἐπι[---]	9
1806a; 3656	195/6		Φλ. Ἀγάθων (Πειραιεύς)	X
	196/7			11
1804	197/8-199/200	Xenokles	[...?...] Εἰσίδος[τον]	12-1
	199/200-208/9			1-10
1077	209/10	Fl. Diogenes	Ἦρόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθώνιος	XI
	210/1-211/2			12-13
	212/3-220/1			1-9
1078	221/2	Arabianos	Εὐτυχος	10

TABLE OF CHRONOLOGICAL CHANGES IN INSCRIPTIONS

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
1029		94/3	96/5	6, 11
1039	Ἀπολλόδωρος	83-73	80/79	24-25
1039	[... ^{ca. 7-8} ...]os	83-73	79/8	24-25
1040	Ἀπόληξις	47/6-43/2	21/0	12
1078	Ἀραβιανός	ca. 220	221/2	37-39
1334	Ζηνίων	end of cent. II B.C.	74/3-63/2	25
1338	Αἰσχυραῖος	after 86 B.C.	78/7	24-25
1338	Σέλευκος	after 86 B.C.	77/6	25
1340	Μήδειος	middle of cent. I B.C.	74/3-63/2	25
1340	Θεόξενος	middle of cent. I B.C.	74/3-63/2	25
1351	Φλά. Ἀρπαλιανός Σπειριεύς	ca. 170 A.D.	170/1	28-29
1368	Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος	before 178/9	175/6	28-29
1735	Μητροδόωρος	40/1-53/4	50/1-52/3	25-26
1736a		middle of cent. I A.D.	end of cent. II A.D.	41

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
1739	Μέμμιος Φλάκκος	180/1-181/2	181/2	20
1739	Ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμ. Φλάκκων	181/2-182/3	182/3	20
1739	Δούκιος Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας	182/3-183/4	183/4	20
1759	Φιλόπαππος καὶ Δαιλιανός	90-100	96/7	12
1768-9		middle of cent. II A.D.	shortly before 165 A.D.	41-42
1782		shortly before 180 A.D.	177/8	Tab. 1
1783		beginning of cent. III A.D.	221/2	42-43
1784		beginning of cent. III A.D.	ca. 221	43
1785	Ἀγαθοκλῆς	end of cent. II or beginning of III	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	35
1786	Φλά. Ἀρπαλιανὸς Στεριεύς	ca. 170 A.D.	170/1	28-29
1787	Ἀρ. Ἐπαφρόδειτος	before 177	175/6	28-29
1788	Μ. Μουνάτιος Μαξιμιανὸς Οὐοπίσκος (Ἀξηνιεύς)	ca. 174/5	174/5	28-29
1789		ca. 175 A.D.	178/9	14-15, Tab. 1
1790 + <i>A.J.A.</i> , 1941, p. 539		ca. 170-180	179/80	Tab. 1
1792		shortly after 180/1	187/8	Tab. 1
1794	Ἀθηνόδωρος ὁ καὶ Ἀγρίππας Ἀσμένον Ἰταῖος	ca. 180 A.D.	180/1	5, 19-20, Tab. 1
1795	Δημόστρατος Μαραθώνιος	ca. 180 A.D.	184/5	16, 20, Tab. 1
1796		ca. 180 A.D.	186/7	17
1797		ca. 180 A.D.	181/2	Tab. 1
1798		ca. 180 A.D.	177/8	14, Tab. 1
1799		ca. 180 A.D.	183/4	Tab. 1
1800		180-192	186/7	21
1801		180-190	190/1-191/2	22, Tab. 1
1802		180-190	191/2-192/3	Tab. 1
1803		ca. 190 A.D.	192/3-193/4	Tab. 1
1804	Ξενοκλῆς	ca. 190 A.D.	197/8-199/200	31
1805	[Κοι]γτ --- ς Ἐλευσίνιος	190-200	ca. 195/6	31
1806		190-200	194/5?	18, Tab. 1
1806a		190-200	195/6	18, Tab. 1
1807		end of cent. II A.D.	188/9	21, Tab. 1
1808-9		end of cent. II A.D.	170-2; or 174- 176; or 187	Tab. 1
1811		end of cent. II or beginning of III	after 217 A.D.	43
1812; cf. <i>Hesp.</i> , XI, 1942, p. 65	Δομίτιος Ἀρισταῖος Παιονίδης	end of cent. II or beginning of III	200/1-201/2; 203/4-204/5	35-36
1814	Αὐρήλιος Δημ ---	ca. 200 A.D.	200/1-201/2; 203/4-204/5	35
1816-7	Αὐρ. Διονύσιος Καλλίππου Λαμπρεύς	shortly after 200 A.D.	shortly before 220/1	37

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
1818		shortly after 200 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 220 A.D.	43-44
1824	[Δομέ] ?τιος Ἀραβιανὸς Μαραθώνιος	<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	221/2	37-39
1825-6	Γάιος Κύντος Κλέων Μαραθώνιος	<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	222/3	37-39
1828	Τιβέ[ριος] Κλαύδιος Πάτροκλος Δαμπτρεύς	<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	224/5	37-39
1831		<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 226 A.D.	39
1832	Κασσιανός	225/6 or shortly after	231/2	40
1973	Μητροδόωρος	40/1-53/4	50/1-52/3	25-26
1974	Καλλικρατίδης	40/1-53/4	50/1-52/3	25-26
1988 = 2264		middle of cent. I A.D., cent. III A.D.	40/1-53/4	44
1992	Λούκιος	after middle of cent. I A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 80 A.D.?	26
2014		First or second century A.D.	171/2	28 n. 48
2017	Πάνταινος Γαργήτιος	shortly after 102 A.D.	115/6	26
2099		163/4-169/70	163/4-168/9	28 n. 49
2100		after 169/70	170/1	28
2102		shortly after 169/70	172/3	27-28
2103	Βήσιος Πείσων Μελιτεύς	172/3 or shortly after	173/4	27-28
2104	Κλ. Ἡρακλείδης Μελιτεύς	<i>ca.</i> 173/4	171/2	28-29
2105	Αἰσχίνης	173/4-178/9	176/7-178/9	27-28
2109	Αὐρ. Φιλ[ιστίδ]ης Πιρρεεύς	after 180 A.D.	194/5	30-31
2110	[--- Μαρα]θώνιος	179/80-190/1	181/2 or 184/5	30
2111/2	Φιλότειμος Ἀρκεσιδήμου Ἐλεούσιος	182/3-190/1	185/6	21, 27-28
2113-4	Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδούας Ἀττικὸς Μαρα- θώνιος	183/4-191/2	190/1-191/2	22
2115-8	Μηνογένης	180/1-191/2	189/90	21-22
2119	Γ. Πεινάριος Πρόκλος Ἀγνούσιος	180/1-191/2	190/1-191/2	22
2124	Φλάβιος Στράτων	190-200	<i>ca.</i> 196/7	31
2125	Κλ. Δαδοῦχος Μελιτεύς	190-200	193/4	30
2127	Φιλιστείδης) Πειραιεύς	190-200	194/5	30-31
2128-9	Τ. Φλάβ. Σωσιγένης Παλληνεύς	190-200	197/8-199/200	31
2230	Κασσιανός	<i>ca.</i> 226/7	231	40
2131		<i>ca.</i> 192/3	<i>ca.</i> 195/6	45
2132		<i>ca.</i> 192/3	<i>ca.</i> 196/7	45
2144		cent. II A.D.	171/2	28
2151		cent. II A.D.	219-238	45
2193	Γ. Κύντος Ἱμερτος Μαραθώνιος	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	205/6	34-35
2197	Ἀναρχία μετὰ Ἱμερτον	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	206/7	34-35
2199	Γ. Κάσιος Ἀπολλώνιος Στειριεύς	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	207/8	34-35
2200		<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	40, 45
2201	Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος Μαραθώνιος	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	208/9	34-35
2202		<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	209/10-211/2	45-46

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
2203		<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 209/10	46
2208	Αὐρ. Διονύσιος Διονυσίου Ἀχαρνεύς	212/3 or shortly after	212/3	34-35
2221		217/8 or shortly after	219/20	46
2223	Φιλ[ε]ίν[ος] = Φιλίνος	<i>ca.</i> 218/9	220/1	37
2224	ἱερεὺς Ἀν---	<i>ca.</i> 218/9	223/4	37
2225		<i>ca.</i> 218/9 or shortly after	222/3	46
2226		<i>ca.</i> 218/9	221/2	46
2227		after 218/9	224/5	46
2230	Κασσιανός	<i>ca.</i> 226/7	231/2	40
2232-4		<i>ca.</i> 230 A.D.	233/4-235/6	47
2235	Ἐπίκτητος Ἀχαρνεύς	after 226/7 (226/7-234/5)	234/5	40
2237		230-235	<i>ca.</i> 232	47
2239	ἱερεὺς Φλάβ. Ἀσκληπιάδης	238/9-243/4	239/40	40-41
2242	Κασσιανός Ἱεροκῆρυξ Στειριεύς	238/9 or 242/3	238/9	40
2243	Αὐρ. Λαυδικιανός	after 243	244/5	41
2245	Λ. Φλά. Φιλόστρατος Στειριεύς	262/3 or 266/7	262/3	41
2264 = 1988		cent. III A.D.	40/1-53/4	44
2276		cent. III A.D.	cent. III A.D.	47
2277		cent. III A.D.	cent. II or III A.D.	47
2291a	Τ. Φλάβ. Σωσιγένης Παλληνεύς	190-200	197/8-199/200	31-32
2361	Κλ. Φωκάς Μαραθώνιος	beginning of cent. III A.D.	210/11 or 211/2	35
2876	Ἀπόληξις	47/6-43/2	20/19	12
3114	Λούκιος Φλάουιος Φλάμμος Κυδα- θηγαιεύς = Λούκιος (<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1992)	end of cent. I A.D.	70/1-110/1	26
3120a	Διονυσόδωρος Εὐκάρπου	190-200	197/8-199/200	32
3489	Σέλευκος	after 86 B.C.	77/6	25
3489	Ἡρακλεόδωρος	after 86 B.C.	76/5	24-25
3542 = 3561		cent. I or II A.D.	after middle cent. I A.D.	48
3543	Λούκιος Φλάουιος Φλάμμος Κυδα- θηγαιεύς = Λούκιος (<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1992)	end of cent. I A.D.	70/1-110/1	26
3561 = 3542		cent. I or II A.D.	after middle cent. I A.D.	48
3640	Πείσων	<i>ca.</i> 172/3	173/4	27, 28
3641		after 180 A.D.	193/4	48
3644	Κορνηλιανός	end of cent. II A.D.	middle of cent. III A.D.	36
3656		cent. II A.D.	beginning of cent. III A.D.	Tab. 1
3660	Γ. Πινάριος Βάσσος Ἀγνούσιος	end of cent. II or beginning of cent. III A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 227/8 or shortly after	39

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
3680	Φλάβιος Εἰαχ[χαγωγὸ]ς Ἀγρυλεύς	beginning of cent. III A.D.	200/1-201/2, 203/4-204/5	35
3681	Κλ. Φωκᾶς Μαραθώνιος	beginning of cent. III A.D.	210/11 or 211/2	35
3682	Μᾶρ. Ἑρένιος Καλλίφρων ὁ καὶ Κορνηλιανός	beginning of cent. III A.D.	middle of cent. III A.D.	36
3683	Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων Γαρ- γήττιος = Καλλίφρων πρεσ- βύτερος	beginning of cent. III A.D.	shortly after 212	36
3687, line 22	Π. Πομ. Ἑγίας (I) Φαληρεύς	<i>ca.</i> 180 A.D.	178/9-179/80	29-30
3687	Π. Πομ. Ἑγίας (II) Φαληρεύς	beginning of cent. III A.D.	227/8-230/1	39
3697	Μ. Οὔλπιος Εὐβίотος Λεύρος Γαρ- γήττιος	before middle of cent. III A.D.	229/30-230/1	39-40
3700	Μᾶρκος Οὔλπιος Εὐβίотος	before middle of cent. III A.D.	229/30-230/1	39-40
3701	Μ. Οὔλπιος Εὐβίотος	before middle of cent. III A.D.	middle of cent. III A.D.	39-40
3705	Φλ. Ἀσκληπιάδης Διομαיעύς	middle of cent. III A.D.	239/40	40-41
3815	Πομπήμιος Ἀλέξανδρος	middle of cent. III A.D.	210/11 or 211/12 or 213/4-219/20	36
<i>A.J.A.</i> , XLV, 1941, pp. 541/2	Αὐρ. Καλλίφρων Προτείμων Γαργήτ- τιος = Καλλίφρων πρεσβύτερος	about 230 A.D.	shortly after 212 A.D.	36
Inscriptions in <i>Hesperia</i> :				
III, 1934, no. 43, p. 56		<i>ca.</i> 180 A.D.	173/4	14, Tab. 1
III, 1934, no. 44, p. 57	Μ[ουνάτιος Θεμισων]	<i>ca.</i> 210 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 226	39
IV, 1935, no. 10, p. 44	Μ. Μουνάτιος Οὐοπίσκος	<i>ca.</i> 174/5	174/5	Tab. 1
IV, 1935, no. 11, p. 48	ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμ. Φλάκκον	<i>ca.</i> 180 A.D.	182/3	16, Tab. 1
IV, 1935, no. 12, p. 50		end of cent. II A.D.	188/9	Tab. 1
V, 1936, pp. 95, 100-1	Λε Διονυσόδωρος	<i>ca.</i> 220 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 225 A.D.	39
X, 1941, no. 64, p. 260	Γέλλιος Ξεναγόρας ν(εώτερος)	beginning of cent. III A.D.	213/4-219/20	36
XI, 1942, no. 4, pp. 32-3		end of cent. II A.D.	187/8	17, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 5, pp. 34-5		190-200	191/2	18, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 6, pp. 35-7		<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	190/1	14, 17

<i>Hesp.</i>	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
XI, 1942, no. 10, pp. 40, 88 + XVI, 1947, no. 88, p. 183	[--- Μαραθώ]νιος νέω[τερος]	end of cent. II A.D.	227/8-230/1	40
XI, 1942, no. 11, pp. 40-3		first half of cent. II A.D.	135/6	13
XI, 1942, no. 14, pp. 45-6		middle of cent. II A.D.	148/9	13
XI, 1942, no. 21, pp. 55-6	M. Μουνάτιος Ουοπίσκος	<i>ca.</i> 174/5	174/5	28-29
XI, 1942, no. 23, pp. 57-8		end of cent. II A.D.	188/9	17, 21, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 24, p. 58		end of cent. II A.D.	188/9	17, 21, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 25, pp. 58-61		180-192	188/9	21, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 26, pp. 61-2		180-190	188/9	21, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 27, pp. 62-3		180-192	188/9	21, Tab. 1
XI, 1942, no. 30, pp. 64-5	Δομίτιος Ἀρισταῖος Παιονίδης	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D.	200/1-201/2; 203/4-204/5	35-36
XI, 1942, no. 32, pp. 66-7	Δομίτιος Ἀραβιανὸς Μαραθώνιος	<i>ca.</i> 210	221/2	37-39
XI, 1942, no. 33, pp. 67-8	Τιβ. Κλ. Α --- Μελιτεύς	<i>ca.</i> 200-230 A.D.	213/4-219/20	37
XI, 1942, no. 36, pp. 70-1		beginning of cent. III A.D.	185/6	17, Tab. 1
XII, 1943, no. 23, p. 77		165/6?	165/6	13, Tab. 1
XVI, 1947, no. 81, p. 179	[Φλά Ἀρπαλιανὸς]ς Στειριεύς	<i>ca.</i> 170 A.D.	170/1	29
XVI, 1947, no. 84, p. 180		<i>ca.</i> 180 A.D.	179/80	Tab. 1
XVI, 1947, no. 87, Face A, p. 182		<i>ca.</i> 190 A.D.	187/8	Tab. 1
XVI, 1947, no. 87, Face B, p. 182		177/8 or 188/9	188/9	Tab. 1
XVI, 1947, no. 88, p. 183	[--- Μαραθώ]νιος νέω[τερος]	<i>ca.</i> 200 A.D. or later	227/8-230/1	40
XVII, 1948, no. 13, p. 29	Δ[- ^{ca. 6} -]	<i>ca.</i> 80 B.C.	74/3-63/2	25
T.A.P.A., LXXI, 1940, p. 308	Μουνάτιος Θεμισίων Ἀξηγιεύς	<i>ca.</i> 220 A.D.	<i>ca.</i> 226 A.D.	39
E.M. 3152			186/7	21

<i>Hesp.</i>	Archon mentioned	Previous Date	New date	Evidence <i>supra</i> , pages
<i>F. Delph.</i> , III, 2, 61	'Απόληξίς		21/0	12
'Ελευσινιακά, I, 1932, pp. 223-236	'Απόληξίς		21/0	12
P. Roussel, <i>Mélanges</i> <i>Bidez</i> (1934), pp. 819-34	'Απόληξίς		21/0	12

NEW READINGS AND RESTORATIONS

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	See <i>supra</i> , pages	<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	See <i>supra</i> , pages	<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	See <i>supra</i> , pages	<i>Hesp.</i>	See <i>supra</i> , pages
1029	6	1819	44	2151	45	<i>Hesp.</i> , XI,	
	11	1824-5	37-39	2223	37	1942, no. 10,	
1039	24	1993	44	2235 ¹¹⁹	47	p. 40	40
1736a ²⁵	41	2017	26-27	2993 ⁶	47	<i>Hesp.</i> , XI,	
1768-9	41-42	2046 ⁵³	44			1942, no. 36,	
1781 ⁵²⁻³	42	2059 ²³⁻⁷	45	<i>Hesp.</i> , XI,		p. 70	16-17
1783	42-43	2064 ³⁷	44	1942, no. 4,			
1790 ^{29, 30}	43	2100	28	p. 32	17	<i>Hesp.</i> , XII,	
1799 ¹⁹⁻²⁰	43	2109	30-31	<i>Hesp.</i> , XI,		1943, no. 23,	
1801	22	2130 ³⁶	45	1942, no. 6,		p. 77	13
1818 ¹⁸	43-44	2144	28 n. 48	p. 36	14		

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE,
HARTFORD

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	<i>Hesperia</i>	Previous Date	New Date	Archon	Position in tribal cycle	Prytany-secretary	ἱερα
	XII (1943), no. 23, p. 77	165/6?	165/6		VI	.τ (or .π) [.ca. 4] πος) Σφήττι(ος)	Εὐχάριος Π[αρ] Ἐπει
1773	XII (1943), p. 78; <i>A.J.A.</i> (1941), p. 539	166/7		Μ. Βαλέριος Μαμερτίνος Μαραθώνιος	7	Φ[. . .]ος Ποσειδωνί[ο]υ	[Εὐχάριος]
1774		167/8		ἀναρχία μετὰ Μαμερτεῖνον	VIII	Μουσαῖος) Φυλάσιος	Εὐχάριος Παρα Ἐπει
	XI (1942), no. 18, p. 50	168/9			IX	Σκρει(βώνιος) Ταμια- κ[ὸς] (Ἄλαιοι)	Εὐχάριος
1775	XI (1942), no. 18, p. 50	168/9		Τινήιο[ς II] οντικός Βησσεύς	IX	Σ[κρειβ.] Ταμιακός (Ἄλαιοι)	Ἐπίγ[ο] Π[ρ]
1776; 1781		169/70		ἀναρχία μετὰ Τινήιον Ποντικόν	X	Κορ. Μενεσθεύς (Ἀζηνεύς)	Ἐπίγον Πρό
	XI (1942), no. 1, p. 31	169/70 or somewhat later					
1808-9		end of second century	170-2; or 174-6; or 187				
	III (1934), no. 43, p. 56	ca. 180	173/4		I	Εἰσίδωρος Ὀν- [Ἀ]ναγνράσιος	Ἀφροδῆ Ἐπα
1788	XI (1942), no. 21, p. 55; IV (1935), no. 10, p. 44	ca. 174/5	174/5	Μ. Μουνάτιος Μαξιμιανός Οὐλοπίσκος (Ἀζηνεύς)			
1798		ca. 180	177/8		V	Ἰστανή(ιος) Πυθό- δω[ρο]ς (Βερν.)	Σπένδω Εὐπρ
1782		shortly before 180	177/8				
1789		ca. 175	178/9		VI	[Εὐκ]αρπος Θεογ[ένους] (Σφήττιος)	
1790	XVI (1947), no. 84, p. 180; <i>A.J.A.</i> , XLV (1941), p. 539	ca. 170- 180	179/80				[Ε]ὐχάριος Π[αρ] Ἐπ[ι]
1794		ca. 180	180/1	Ἀθηνόδωρος Ἀσμένον ὁ καὶ Ἀγρίππας Ἰταῖος	8	-- Διο]ν(υ)σίον	[Ἀ]φρ[ο] Ἐπ[ι]

TABLE 1. CHRONOLOGY OF PRYTANY LISTS CONTAINING

Prytany-cycle	Prytany-secretary	ιεραύλης	ιεροφάντης	δαδούχος	ιεροκῆρυξ
VI	·τ (or ·π) [·εα·4]προς) Σφήττι(ος)	Εὐχάριστος Π[αραμ]ό[νου] Ἐπεικίδης]			
7	Φ[...]ος Ποσειδωνίο[ν]	[Εὐχάριστος]	Φ[λ. Ἰ]εροφάντης	Π[ο]μ. Δαδούχος	[Πει]ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ
III	Μουσαῖος) Φυλάσιος	Εὐχάριστος Παραμόνου Ἐπεικίδης	Φλ. Ἱεροφάντης	Πομ. Δαδούχος	Πεινάρ. Ἱεροκῆρυξ
IX	Σκρεῖ(βώνιος) Ταμια- κ[ός] ('Αλαιοῦς)	Εὐχάριστος	[Ἰού. Ἱεροφάντης]	[Πομ. Δαδούχος]	[Πειν. Ἱεροκῆρ]υξ
IX	Σ[κρεῖβ.] Ταμιακός ('Αλαιοῦς)	Ἐπίγ[ονος] Π[ρόκ]λ[ου]	Ἰού. Ἱεροφάντης	Πομ. Δαδούχος	Πει[ν.] Ἱεροκῆρυξ
X	Κορ. Μενεσθεὺς ('Αξηνειός)	Ἐπίγονος Πρόκλον Πειρ.	Ἰού. Ἱεροφάντης	Πομ. Δαδούχος	Πειν. Ἱερο[κῆρ]υξ
Ἰούλ. Ἱεροφάντης					
I	Εἰσίδωρος Ὀν- [Ἀ]ναγυράσιος	Ἀφροδείσιος Ἐπαφρο[δίτου]			
			Ἰούλ. Ἱεροφάντης	Αἰλ. Δαδούχος	Ἐρέν[ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ]
V	Ἰστλή(ιος) Πυθό- δω[ρο]ς (Βερν.)	Σπένδων Εὐπρα(ξ)ί[δου]	Ἰούλ. Ἱεροφάντ[ης]	Αἰλ. Δαδούχος	Ἐρέν[ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ]
			Ἰούλ. Ἱεροφάντης	Αἰλ. Δαδούχος	... Ἱεροκ[ῆρυξ]
VI	[Εὐκ]αρπος Θεογ[ένους] (Σφήττιος)		[Ἰού]λιος Ἱεροφάντης	[Πομπ]ήσιος Δαδούχος	[Νού]μιος Ἱεροκῆρυξ
		[Ε]ὐχάριστ[ος] Π[αρ]αμόνου Ἐ[π]ικίδ[ης]	Νούμ(μιος) Ἱερο- [φάντης] (Φαληρεὺς)	Πομπήσιος Δαδο[ύχος]	Νούμιος [Ἰ]ε[ρ]ο[κῆρυξ]
8	-- Διο[ν(ν)σίου]	[Ἀ]φροδείσιος Ἐπ[αφ]ρ[οδ]ε[ίτου]	Ἰο[ύ]λ. Ἱεροφάντ[ης]	[Αἰλ. Δ]αδούχος	

OF PRYTANY LISTS CONTAINING ΑΕΙΣΙΤΟΙ, 165/6–209/10

δαδούχος	ιεροκῆρυξ	ιερεὺς Φωσφόρων οἱ ἐπὶ Σκιάδος	ἐπὶ βωμῶ	ὑπογραμματεὺς	γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου
		Ἀφ[ροδίσιος]		Εἰσίδοτος) [Μαρα]θώ[νιος]	[.]εἶα [ca. 3]ης) ---
ο]μ. Δαδούχος	[Πει]ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ	[Ἀφροδίσ]ιος		[Εἰσί]δοτος	Ἀχα[ρ]νος) Λαμπτρεὺς
μ. Δαδούχος	Πεινάρ. Ἱεροκῆρυξ	Ἀφροδίσιος		Εἰσίδοτος	Μάρκος Εὐκαρπίδου Ἀ[ξ]ηνιεύς
ο]μ. Δαδούχος]	[Πειν. Ἱεροκῆρ]νξ	Ἰού. Ζηνόβιος	[Μέμ. ἐπὶ βωμῶ]	Εἰσίδοτος) Μαρα(θώνιος)	Ἀγνος Συμ[φόρου] Ἀκναιεύς]
μ. Δαδούχος	Πει[ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ	Ζ[ηνόβι]ος	Μέ[μ.] ἐπὶ βωμῶ	[Ε]ισίδοτος)	Ἀγνος Συμφόρου Ἀκ[ναιεύς]
μ. Δαδούχος	Πειν. Ἱερο[κῆρ]νξ	Ἰούλ. Ζηνόβιος	Μέμ. ἐπὶ βωμῶν	Μύρων) Λαμ.	Μηνόδωρος)
				Μύρων Λ[αμπτρεὺς]	
					Βασιλείδης . . . νου
		Ἑρμείας) Ἀ[ξηνιεύς]		[Μύρων] Λαμπ[τρεὺς]	
λ. Δαδούχος	Ἑρέν[ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ]		Μέμ. ἐπὶ βωμῶ		
λ. Δαδούχος	Ἑρέν[ν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ]	(Ἑρ)μ(εί)ας) Ἀξηνιεύ[ς]	Μέμμ. ἐπ[ὶ βωμῶ]		Ἀπολλ(ώ)ν[ιος] Εὐκάρπου Σφῆτ[πιος]
λ. Δαδούχος Ἱεροκ[ῆρυξ]				
ο]μπ[ί]ος Δαδούχος	[Νού]μμος Ἱεροκῆρυξ				[Δόνα]ξ Ἑλευθέρου
ο]μπ[ί]ος Δαδο[ύχος]	Νούμμος [Ἰ]ε[ρ]ο[κῆρυξ]	Π[ρω]τ[ί]ων			Εὐχρηστος [Δ]εφί. Σουνιεύς
λ. Δ]αδούχος		Ἑρμείας) Ἀ(ξη)νιεύς	[Μέ]μ. [ἔ]πι [βω]μῶ	Μύρων) Λαμπτρεὺς	Ἀσκληπιάδης ----- εὺς

γραμματεὺς	γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου	ἀντιγραφεὺς	κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου	Πυρφόρος
τος) ρα]θώ[νιος]	[.]εἶ [ca. 3]ης) ---	Δα[ca. 12]αρ ---		
δοτος	*Αχα[ρ]νος) Λαμπτρεὺς	... ⁵ ... ης	[Ἡλιόδωρ]ος Ἀθηνοδώρου	
τος	Μάρκος Εὐκαρπίδου Ἀ[ξ]ηνιεύς	Δημοσθένης) Σουνιεύς	Γοργίας) Ἀχαρνεὺς	
τος) α (θώνιος)	*Αγνος Συμ[φόρου Ἀκαιεύς]	*Ωρά(ριος) Ἀκ[ίμαχος]	[Πάπιος Ἀτ]τικὸς Β[η]σαιε[ύς]	
δοτος)	*Αγνος Συμφόρου Ἀκ[υαιεύς]	*Ω[ρα. Ἀλ]κίμαχος Λαμπτρεὺς	[Π]άπιος Ἀττικὸς Βησαιεύς	
) Λαμ.	Μηρόδωρος)	Πάννυχος Ἐρικαι(εύς)	*Ερως Νικαγόρου Λαμ.	
Δ[αμπτρεὺς]				
	Βασιλείδης ...νου	*Ἡρακλεί[δης ---]		
ν] Λαμπ[τρεὺς]		*Ἀπολλοφάνης ---ου Σφήττιος		
	*Ἀπολλ(ώ)ν[ιος] Εὐκάρπου Σφήτ[τιος]	*Ἰσίδωρος Σωστράτου Μαραθώνιο(ς)	Κ(λ). Διονυσ-	
	[Δόνα]ξ Ἐλευθέρου			
	Εὐχρηστος [Δ]ειφίλου Σουνιεύς	-ων Διονυσίο[ν] Μελιτεύς	Ε[ϛ]δημος Ἐρε	
) Λαμπτρεὺς	*Ἀσκληπιάδης -----εύς	[Ἀθ]ήναιος Ε(ϛ)όδου	Φιλότιμος (Ἀρ)κεσιδήμο(ν)	

<i>I.G.</i> , II ²	<i>Hesperia</i>	Previous Date	New Date	Archon	Position in tribal cycle	Prytany-secretary	ιερ
1797		<i>ca.</i> 180	181/2		9	Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος	Ἐρμόδα
	IV (1935), no. 11, p. 48	<i>ca.</i> 180/1	182/3	ἀναρχία μετὰ Μέμ. Φλάκκων	X	Μυστικός) Ἐρριάδης	Π(όπλ ὁ καὶ
1799		<i>ca.</i> 180	183/4				Ἀφροδ
1795		<i>ca.</i> 180	184/5	Δημόστρατος Μα[ραθώνιος]	12	Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου	Ἀφροδ
	XI (1942), no. 36, p. 70	beginning of third century	185/6		XIII	Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς	[Ἀφρο
1796		<i>ca.</i> 180	186/7		I	Κλώδιος [Ἀντ]ίохος Λαμπτρέύς	Ἀφροδ δείτο
	XI (1942), no. 4, p. 33	end of second century	187/8		II	Αὔρ. Ὑάκινθος Γαργήτιος	
1792		shortly after 180/1	187/8				
	XVI (1947), no. 87, Face A, p. 182	<i>ca.</i> 190	187/8				[....]
1807	IV (1935), no. 12, p. 49 + XI (1942), nos. 23 + 27, pp. 57-8, 62-3; nos. 24-26, pp. 58-62; XVI (1947), no. 87, Face B, p. 182	end of second century	188/9		III	Εἰσίδοτ[ος] Φήλεικος Ἀγγεληθεν	Σπέν[δ
	XI (1942), no. 6, p. 35	190-200	190/1		V	Ἀ[φρ]οδείσιος) Φλνεύς	[Π. Ἀ Ἀφρ
	XI (1942), no. 5, p. 34	190-200	191/2		VI	Εὐκαρπος Σφή(ττιος)	Ἐρμ[ό
1801		180-190	190/1- 191/2	[Τιβ. Κλ. Βραδοῦας Ἀττικὸς Μαρα]θώνιος			
1802		180-190	191/2 or 192/3				
1803	IV (1935), no. 13, p. 51	<i>ca.</i> 190	192/3 or 193/4				
1806		190-200	194/5?			Ἐπι-	Ἐρμόδα
1806a + 3656		190-200	195/6		X	Φλ. Ἀγάθων (Πειραιεύς)	Ἐρ[μό
1077		209/10		Φλ. Διογένης Μαραθώνιος	XI	Ῥόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθ.	Ἀθήναι

ition tribal ycle	Prytany-secretary	ιεραύλης	ιεροφάντης	δαδοῦχος	ιεροκῆρυξ
9	Φλ. Ἀφροδείσιος	Ἐρμόδωρος Θερμ-	[... Ἱεροφά]ντης	[... Δαδο]ῦχος	[... Ἱερο]κῆρυξ
X	Μυστικός) Ἑρσιόδης	Π(όπλιος) Ἀφρόδιτος ὁ καὶ Ἀφροδείσιος Ἀφροδείσιος	Ἰούλ(ιος) Ἱεροφάντης		
12	Ὀνήσιμος Εὐτυχίδου	Ἀφροδείσιος	... Ἱεροφάντης		... Ἱεροκῆρυξ
III	Θεο[--- Ἀθ]μονεύς	[Ἀφροδείσιος]			
I	Κλώδιος [Ἀντ]ίохος Λαμπτρέυς	Ἀφροδείσιος [Ἐπαφρ]ο- δείτου Παι[ανιεύς]	[... Ἱερ]οφάντης	[... Δ]αδοῦχος	[... Ἱ]εροκῆρυξ
II	Ἀρ. Ὑάκινθος Γαργήττιος		Ἰο. Ἱεροφάντης	Ἀλ. Δαδοῦχο[ς]	Ἑρένιος Ἱεροκῆρυ[ξ]
		[...] Ἐπαφρόδε[ιτο]ς			
III	Εἰσίδοτ[ος] Φήλεικος Ἀγγεληθέν	Σπέν[δων]			
V	Ἀ[φρ]οδείσιος) Φλυεύς	[Π. Ἀφρόδιτος ὁ κα]ὶ Ἀφροδείσιος			Ἑρέν. Ἱερ(ο)κῆρυξ
VI	Εὐκαρπος Σφή(ττιος)	Ἐρμ[ό]δ[ωρος]			
			Κλ. Ἱεροφάντης Ἀχαρνεύς		
	Ἐπι-	Ἐρμόδω[ρος]	Νο(ύμμιος) Ἱεροφάντης	Κλ. Δαδοῦχος	Νο(ύμμιος) Ἱεροκῆρυξ
X	Φλ. Ἀγάθων (Πειραιεύς)	Ἐρ[μό]δωρος	Ἱεροφάντης	Δαδοῦχος	Ἱεροκῆρυξ
XI	Ῥόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθ.	Ἀθήναιος Ἀφροδεΐου	Κλ. Ἱεροφάντης) Μαρα.	Φάβ. Δαδοῦχος Μαραθ.	Ἑρέν. Ἱεροκῆρυξ Ἐρμ.

δαδοῦχος	ιεροκῆρνξ	ιερεὺς Φωσφόρων or ἐπὶ Σκιάδος	ἐπὶ βωμῶ	ὑπογραμματεὺς	γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου
. . Δαδο]ύχος	[. . . Ἱερο]κῆρνξ	[Ἱερ]μείας Ἀζηγιεύς			Φλ. Βάχχιος
		Ἱερμείας) Ἀζηγιεύς	Μέμ(μιος) ἐπὶ βωμῶ	Μύρων) Λαμπτρεύς	Ἀλέξανδρος Θεοδοσι Λαμπτ[ρεύς]
				Μηνόφίλος Παραμόνου	Αἶμος?
	. . . Ἱεροκῆρνξ	Ἱερμείας Ἀζηγιεύς	. . . ἐπὶ βωμῶ	Μύρων	Ἀλέξανδρος
		Πρωτίων		[Μη]νόφίλος	Ὀρφίτιος Βουρριανὸς Σφή.
. . Δ]αδοῦχος	[. . . Ἱ]εροκῆρνξ	Ἀριστεί[δης Θεογέν]ους Φρεάρρ[ιος]	[. . . ἐπ]ὶ βωμῶν		[. . .]νος Ἀθηνοδώρ
λ. Δαδοῦχο[ς]	Ἱερέννιος Ἱεροκῆρν[ξ]		Κλ. ἐπὶ βωμῶ		
					[Δη]μήτριος [. . .]είονος [Γαργ]ήττιος (?)
		Ἀριστίδης Θεογ[ένους] [Φρε]ά[ρριος]		Π. or Γ.	
	Ἱερέν. Ἱερ(ο)κῆρνξ	[Ἀριστείδης Φ]ρε<άρ>ριος		----- Μα]ρ	----]νοδ----δου
		Πρωτίων			Ἀπολλώνιος Ση(μαχίδης)
λ. Δαδοῦχος	Νο(ύμμιος) Ἱεροκῆρνξ	Πρωτ[ίων]			
δοῦχος	Ἱεροκῆρνξ	Πρωτίων			Ἱερέννιος . . . σε
β. Δαδοῦχος Μαραθ.	Ἱερέν. Ἱεροκῆρνξ Ἱερμ.	Ἀριστείδης	Κλ. ἐπὶ βωμῶ Μελι.	Μηνόφίλος Παραμόνου	Ἀριστόβουλος Ἀττ Ἀναγυράσιος

αμματεύς	γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου	ἀντιγραφεὺς	κῆρυξ βουλῆς καὶ δήμου	Πυρφόρος
	Φλ. Βάκχιος	Ἀθηνόδωρος		
Δαμπτρεὺς	Ἀλέξανδρος Θεοδοσίου Δαμπτ[ρεύς]	Ἀλέξανδρος [Ἀ]χω- ρίστου Παιονίδης	Φάβιος [Φα]βιανὸς Μαραθώνιος	
λος αμόνου	Αἶμος?	Εὐτυχίδης)	Φοῖβος Ἀλεξάνδρου	
	Ἀλέξανδρος	Εὐπόριστος	Μου. Οὐοπίσκο[ς]	
όφιλος	Ὀρφίτιος Βουρριανὸς Σφή.	--- δωρος Καλλιστράτου Βερενικίδης	--- Ἀθ]μονεύς	
	[...]νος Ἀθηνοδώρου	Βασιλείδ[ης] ... ⁷ ... ητου Κεφαλήθ[εν]		[...] Πυρ]φόρος (among ἀείσιτοι)
		Αὐρ. Ἀπολλων [---]	Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἐ[πιτυν] χάνων Μενάνδρου	Ἄλλ(ιος) Πυρφόρος (among ἀείσιτοι)
	[Δη]μήτριος [...]είονος [Γαργ]ήττιος (?)			
⁵ . or Γ... ⁵ .		Φ[---] Ζ[ή]νωνος Φ[---]		
--- Μα]ρ	---]γοδ--- δου	Κλ. Κορνηλιανό[ς]	Φλά. Σωσιγένης	
	Ἀπολλώνιος Ση(μαχίδης)	Ἀγαθοκλῆς Φα(ληρεύς)		Ἀ[ῖλ(ιος) Πυρφόρος] (among ἀείσιτοι) ἐπώνυμος Ἀῖλ. Πυρφόρος
				ἐπώνυμος Ἀῖλ. Πυρφ[ό]ρ[ος]
				ἐπώνυμος Ἀῖλ. Π[υρ]φόρος
		Νει[κ---]		
	Ἐρένιος ... σε	Τ. Ἰοφ[ῶ]ν	Κ[τή]σιππος	
λος αμόνου	Ἀριστόβουλος Ἀττικοῦ Ἀναγυράσιος	Φλ. Μαρέινος (Παιανιεύς)	Κλ. Ἀττικὸς Μαρα.	Αὐρ. Πυρφόρος Δαμπτρεὺς (among ἀείσιτοι)