

## EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

I. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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 *ἀέτωμα* remains so as to determine, in conjunction with the right corner of the *ἀέτωμα* which is intact, the width of the stone. A projection of the dimensions of the *ἀέτωμα* 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.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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.*, II,<sup>2</sup> 1791 which has two prescripts, one honoring the archon (in the accusative case) and the other, the traditional one, honoring the *ἀείσιτοι*. In view of the new measurements, the parallel in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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.

[Ἄγαθῆ Τ]ύχη  
 [τὸν ἄρχον]τα Ξενοκλέα  
 [Ἄχαρνέα ἐ]πὶ τῆς Οἰνεί νας.  
 [δος φυλῆς] γ > πρυτανεία[ς]  
 [ἧ ἐγραμμάτευεν] Εἰσίδο[τος]  
 5 [- patronymic demo -]π[- -tic -]  
 [οὶ πρυτάνεις τῆς Οἰνεί]  
 [δος φυλῆς ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς ἕαν]  
 [τοὺς εὐνοία ]  
 [ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Ξενοκλέους]  
 10 [Ἄχαρνέως, στρατηγούντος]  
 [ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα - - - - -]  
 [- - - οὶ πρυτάνεις τῆς Οἰ]  
 [νείδος φυλῆς τιμήσαντες]  
 [ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀσίτους]  
 15 [ἀνέγραψαν - - - - -]

The demotic of the archon is supplied from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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 Εἰσίδωτος Φήλικος Ἀγγελῆθεν (*Hesperia*, XI, 1942, no. 23, p. 57), whose restoration is epigraphically possible, the date of the

archon in accordance with the tribal cycles <sup>1</sup> would be 188/9. However, Raubitschek's restoration of Commodus for the archon in 188/9,<sup>2</sup> especially with the correct reading of Σ[εβα]στῶ[υ], 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 <sup>3</sup> and because of the high incidence of the name Εἰσίδωτος, it is evident that we have a new prytany secretary.

The ἀέτωμα 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 ἀέτωμα, seems to be a unique physical characteristic of ephebic catalogues dated 190-200.<sup>4</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2125 and 2127, like *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1804, containing such an inscribed circle, have been dated independently 190-200 by Kirchner and 193/4 and 194/5 respectively by the writer.<sup>5</sup>

## II. THE Αὐρήλιοι IN *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824

The question as to the identity of the Αὐρήλιοι in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824 is worth settling once and for all, because the four archons mentioned in the sequence *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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 Ἀἴλιος Δόγισμος and Πρέμπος Ἐπικτήτο[υ] in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup> 1824, lines 9 and 27, I identified <sup>1</sup> 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.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824 between 196 and 211.<sup>2</sup>

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,<sup>3</sup> nowhere in Latin or in Greek, either in his-

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Notopoulos, "Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire," *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> A. E. Raubitschek, "Commodus and Athens," *Hesperia*, Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 282.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Meritt for this suggestion.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2124. For a similar one flanked by vases in a later period cf. *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 30-31.

<sup>1</sup> *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 37-39.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Oliver, "Patrons Providing Financial Aid to the Tribes of Roman Athens," *A.J.P.*, LXX, 1949, pp. 305-307 n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> does the *nomen gentilicium* Aurelius appear in his official title which is Imp. Caesar L. Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus. Likewise in Attic inscriptions,<sup>5</sup> dated during his reign, he never appears as *Αὐρήλιος* but as *Αὐτοκράτωρ Δούκιος Σεπτίμιος Σεβήρος Σεβαστὸς Περίναξ Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς Παρθικὸς μέγιστος*. On the other hand Elagabalus and Severus Alexander always appear in both Latin and Attic inscriptions with the *nomen gentilicium* Aurelius. If this is the case, the burden of the proof rests with anyone who claims that the *Αὐρήλιοι* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824 include an emperor who, as all our evidence shows, never used the *nomen gentilicium*.

In addition to the prosopography of the two councillors in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824, who appear as ephebes in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2193 (A.D. 206),<sup>6</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2149, which has been recently joined with *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2145 + E. M. 4204 + 3568 by Mitsos in Athens, corroborates the above conclusion. This newly joined inscription results in a new archon, *Ἀρχ. Μελοπομενός* who is hoplite general in the *Αὐρήλιοι* inscription. The new text<sup>7</sup> of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2149 + 2145 + E. M. 4204 + 3568 mentions in the prescript *τοὺς περὶ τὸ [Διογένειον]*, a phrase which appears only in the prescripts of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2239 and 2243 dated 238/9-243/4 by Kirchner and 239/40 and 244/5 by myself. The archonship of *Ἀρχ. Μελοπομενός* therefore must be placed in the context of the third decade of the third century. This necessitates *Ἀρχ. Μελοπομενός* being hoplite general much later than 196-211, and this can only be in 221/2 when the *Αὐρήλιοι* mentioned in the same inscription are Elagabalus and Severus Alexander who ruled jointly until March 222.<sup>8</sup>

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

<sup>4</sup> Platnauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-37; *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, III, pp. 213-215.

<sup>5</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1077, 3413-3415, 4216; *Hesperia*, X, 1941, p. 251, no. 53, lines 1-2; cf. *I.G.*, III, Indices, p. 310.

<sup>6</sup> *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 34-35.

<sup>7</sup> Mitsos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1950-1951, pp. 21-23.

<sup>8</sup> As to the difficulty which Oliver finds with the restoration of *Αὐρήλ[ιοι]* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1825 (222/3), my alternative restoration of *Αὐρήλ[ιος]*, 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.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824. Raubitschek identified (*Hesperia*, Supplement VIII, 1949, p. 280) *Πενάριος Πρόκλος* [*ος*] (*Ἀγνούσιος*), who appears as eponymous in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1824, line 8, with [*ἐξηγητῆς? Γάιος Πενάριος*] *Πρόκλος Ἀγ(νούσιος)* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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 *Ἀἴλ Λεύκιος* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1783, line 8, dated in 221 by myself (*Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 42-43), with the eponymous *ΑΙΑΕΥ [ΠΑ]ΛΛΗΝΕΥΣ* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1792 as *Ἀἴλ. Εὐφρόσυνος Παλληνεύς*. This identification is difficult for *Ἀἴλ. Εὐφρόσυνος Παλληνεύς* is *ἐπιστάτης* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1817, dated shortly before 220/1 (*Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, p. 37). The squeeze of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 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 unscripted space of one letter between *ΜΟΣ* and *ΑΙΑΕΥ*