EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

I. I.G., II², 1804

This inscription of the late Empire period deserves a closer study because it is a unique prytany list and because its restoration has not been based on an accurate study of the dimensions of the stele. An examination of the squeeze shows that the restoration in the Corpus by Graindor is wrong, particularly with respect to the length of the line. A sufficient arc of the circumference of the circle inscribed within the áétωμα remains so as to determine, in conjunction with the right corner of the áétωμα which is intact, the width of the stone. A projection of the dimensions of the áétωμα results in an isosceles triangle, its base 40.64 cm., its height 20.32 cm. Hence the width of the stele is 40.64 cm., with the length of the line ca. 18 letters.

For the restoration of the text Graindor compares I.G., II¹, 1763 and 1817. The closest parallel to this unique prytany list which begins with the archon in the accusative rather than the customary genitive case is I.G., II², 1791 which has two prescripts, one honoring the archon (in the accusative case) and the other, the traditional one, honoring the áείσυτος. In view of the new measurements, the parallel in I.G., II², 1791, and a more accurate reading of the squeeze the following text is submitted. Lines 9 ff. are restored merely to show the general sense of the document.

\[\text{\textquoteleft} \text{\textacute{A}γαθή \ Τ} \text{\textquoteright} χρη \\
[\text{τόν \ άρχον} \tauα \ \text{Ξενοκλέα} \\
[\text{\textquoteleft} \text{Αχαρνέα επί \ τής Οινεί \ vac.} \\
[\text{δος φυλής} \ \gamma > \ \text{πρυτανεία} [s] \\
[\text{ή \ \text{έγραμμάτενεν} \ Εισίδο[\text{tos}] \\
[\text{οι \ πρυτάνεις \ τής \ Οινεί} \\
[\text{δος φυλής \ έπι \ τή \ εἰς \ εὖν}] \\
[\text{τούς \ εὖνα ἑαυτοῖς} ] \\
[\text{ἐπι \ άρχοντος \ Ξενοκλέους} ]
\]

5

\[\text{\textquoteleft} \text{Αχαρνέως, \ στρατηγοῦντος} \\
[\text{ἐπὶ \ τὰ \ ὑπλα} --- --- --- --- ] \\
[--- \ τώ \ πρυτάνεις \ τῆς \ Οἰ] \\
[\text{νεῖδος \ φυλής \ τιμήσαντες}] \\
[\text{ἐαυτοὺς καὶ \ τοὺς \ ἀστιτσοὺς} ]
\]

10

\[\text{\textquoteleft} \text{ἀνεγραψαν} --- --- --- --- ]

15

The demotic of the archon is supplied from I.G., II², 1803, line 12, the councillor with whom this archon has been identified by Graindor. It is apparent that the archon is being honored by his own tribe, a unique feature in the extant prytany lists. If the secretary could be identified with Εἰσίδοτος Φῆλικος \textquoteleft Αγγελήθεν (Hesperia, XI, 1942, no. 23, p. 57), whose restoration is epigraphically possible, the date of the
archon in accordance with the tribal cycles would be 188/9. However, Raubitschek’s restoration of Commodus for the archon in 188/9, especially with the correct reading of Σεβαστός, leaves no room for the restoration of Xenokles. In view of the fact that the π in line 5 comes where it ought to be restored as part of the demotic and because of the high incidence of the name Ελειδόρος, it is evident that we have a new ptytany secretary.

The δέτομα itself gives us evidence corroborating the date of the archon, 197/8-199/200, as was assigned in Hesperia, XVIII, 1949, p. 31. The inscribed circle, almost completely tangent to the three sides of the δέτομα, seems to be a unique physical characteristic of ephetic catalogues dated 190-200. (I.G., IIa, 2125 and 2127, like I.G., IIa, 1804, containing such an inscribed circle, have been dated independently 190-200 by Kirchner and 193/4 and 194/5 respectively by the writer.

II. THE Αὐρήλιοι in I.G., IIa, 1824

The question as to the identity of the Αὐρήλιοι in I.G., IIa, 1824 is worth settling once and for all, because the four archons mentioned in the sequence I.G., IIa, 1824-1828 furnish the only secure foundation for the chronology of a large number of inscriptions in the first half of the third century after Christ. Because of the position of the Αὐρήλιοι on the stone, framed as the word is by leaves, and the prosopography of the two councillors Άλως Λόγιομος and Πρέιμος Βεύκτήτορο in I.G., IIa 1824, lines 9 and 27, I identified the Αὐρήλιοι with the two Roman emperors M. Aurelius Antoninus (Elagabalus) and M. Aurelius Severus Alexandrus who jointly share the rule from 221 through March 222, when Severus Alexander succeeded Elagabalus. Oliver challenges this identification and suggests that the Αὐρήλιοι are Septimius Severus and Caracalla and hence would date I.G., IIa, 1824 between 196 and 211.

I wish to reopen this question first because of an important piece of evidence which makes impossible the identification of the Αὐρήλιοι with Septimius Severus and Caracalla and secondly because of new evidence which has appeared since our earlier discussions. Though Septimius Severus had himself adopted as the son of Marcus and the brother of Commodus in 196, nowhere in Latin or in Greek, either in his-
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3 I am indebted to Meritt for this suggestion.
4 Cf. I.G., IIa, 2124. For a similar one flanked by vases in a later period cf. Hesperia, XI, 1942, p. 73.
8 Dio Cassius 75.7.4; Vit. Sev. 10.6. The only indication of Septimius’ self-adoption into the family of the Antonines is the word pius on coins celebrating the occasion. Cf. M. Platnauer, The Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus (Oxford, 1918), p. 34.
torical, epigraphic or numismatic evidence, does the *nomen gentilicum* Aurelius appear in his official title which is Imp. Caesar L. Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus. Likewise in Attic inscriptions, dated during his reign, he never appears as *Ἄυρήλιος* but as *Αὐτοκράτωρ Δούκιος Σεπτίμιος Σεβήρος Σεβαστός Περτίναξ Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς Παρθικὸς μέγιστος*. On the other hand Elagabalus and Severus Alexander always appear in both Latin and Attic inscriptions with the *nomen gentilicum* Aurelius. If this is the case, the burden of the proof rests with anyone who claims that the *Ἄυρήλιος* in *I.G.*, II², 1824 include an emperor who, as all our evidence shows, never used the *nomen gentilicum*.

In addition to the prosopography of the two councillors in *I.G.*, II², 1824, who appear as ephes in *I.G.*, II², 2193 (A.D. 206), I.G., II², 2149, which has been recently joined with *I.G.*, II², 2145 + E. M. 4204 + 3568 by Mitsos in Athens, corroborates the above conclusion. This newly joined inscription results in a new archon, Αὐρ. Μελπομενός who is hoplite general in the *Ἄυρηλιος* inscription. The new text ⁷ of *I.G.*, II², 2149 + 2145 + E. M. 4204 + 3568 mentions in the prescript τοῖς περὶ τὸ [Διώγενειον], a phrase which appears only in the prescripts of *I.G.*, II², 2239 and 2243 dated 238/9-243/4 by Kirchner and 239/40 and 244/5 by myself. The archons-ship of Αὐρ. Μελπομενός therefore must be placed in the context of the third decade of the third century. This necessitates Αὐρ. Μελπομενός being hoplite general much later than 196-211, and this can only be in 221/2 when the *Ἄυρηλιος* mentioned in the same inscription are Elagabalus and Severus Alexander who ruled jointly until March 222.⁸
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⁷ Mitsos, Ἀρχ. Ἑφ., 1950-1951, pp. 21-23.
⁸ As to the difficulty which Oliver finds with the restoration of Αὐρήλ[ιος] in *I.G.*, II², 1825 (222/3), my alternative restoration of Αὐρή[λιος], referring to Severus Alexander only, does away with the difficulty.

For the sake of the record of Athenian prosopography, several identifications brought up in Oliver’s discussion must be re-examined in the light of the date of *I.G.*, II², 1824. Raubitschek identified (*Hesperia*, Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 280) Παινίριος Πρόκλ[ιος] (‘Ἀγνώστος), who appears as eponymous in *I.G.*, II², 1824, line 8, with [ἐγγραφὴς? Τίτος Παινίριος] Πρόκλος Ἀγ(νώστος) in *I.G.*, II², 1796, line 11 (186/7). I think that we are dealing with father and son, as Raubitschek himself now suggests (per litt.). A question arises as to the identity of the eponymous Ἁλ Δαῖκος in *I.G.*, II², 1783, line 8, dated in 221 by myself (*Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 42-43), with the eponymous ΑΙΛΕΥ [ΠΑ]ΑΛΗΝΗΕΥΣ in *I.G.*, II², 1792 (187/8). I claimed that they were different persons, probably father and son, while Oliver maintains that they are identical. In his table of eponymoi Oliver gives an alternate reading for the eponymous of *I.G.*, II², 1792 as Ἁλ. Ἐβ[φρόσυνος] Πα[ληνείς]. This identification is difficult for Ἁλ. Ἐβφρόσυνος Πάληνείς εἰσιστάτης in *I.G.*, II², 1817, dated shortly before 220/1 (*Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, p. 37). The squeeze of *I.G.*, II², 1792 at the Institute for Advanced Study shows a small fracture in the stone after ΝΥΜΟΣ and consequently no further light can be thrown on the reading of line 8. At the time Skias read this stone he reported an uninscribed space of one letter between ΜΟΣ and ΑΙΛΕΥ.