

ADDENDUM TO "A ROMAN MONUMENT IN THE ATHENIAN AGORA"

A presentation of various components of a Roman monument which included two inscribed orthostates (*I.G.*, II², 2776) appeared in *Hesperia*, XLI, 1972, pp. 50-95. It was argued in the course of that presentation that the inscription should belong in the late Hadrianic or early Antonine period. A part of the argumentation for that date rested on the appearance of one Flavius Euphanes in lines 212-213 of the text. This Euphanes is known to have been an archon of Athens¹ and his archonship is usually dated to the year A.D. 124/5.² Since the text of *I.G.*, II², 2776, relates that Euphanes is dead and that at least some of his property has been sold by his heirs, the date of the inscription must be later than Euphanes' archonship and, of course, his death.

Very recently, however, the date of Euphanes' archonship has been questioned. Simone Follet³ has revived an old but not universally accepted theory that our Flavius Euphanes should be identified with the Euphanes to whom Plutarch dedicated his treatise *An seni respublica gerenda sit*.⁴ This identification is not, however, possible if the old chronology for the archonship of Flavius Euphanes is correct. Plutarch mentions (794B) that his friend is, among other things, the president of the Council of the Areopagus. This means that the following relative chronology would be true if the Euphanes of Plutarch, the archon Flavius Euphanes, and the Flavius Euphanes of *I.G.*, II², 2776 were all the same man:

- 1) archonship of Euphanes
- 2) membership of Euphanes in the Areopagus
- 3) presidency of the Areopagus by Euphanes
- 4) Plutarch's *An seni respublica gerenda sit*
- 5) death of Euphanes
- 6) *I.G.*, II², 2776.

¹ *Insc. Délos*, 2536, line 17.

² J. Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 85. The year 123/4 is also possible; cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, Cairo, 1934, pp. 28-29.

³ S. Follet, "Flavius Euphanès d'Athènes, ami de Plutarque," *Études et Commentaires (Mélanges à P. Chantraine)*, LXXIX, Paris, 1972, pp. 35-50. I would thank John Traill for pointing out Follet's article to me.

⁴ First proposed by G. Colin, *B.C.H.*, XXIII, 1899, p. 89. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford, 1971, p. 110, note 5, says, with admirable caution, that Plutarch's Euphanes was "probably connected with" the Euphanes of our inscription. The more general view, however, is that expressed by P. Graindor, *Chronologie de archontes athéniens sous l'empire*, Brussels, 1922, p. 126, that it is unlikely that the Euphanes of Plutarch and the archon Flavius Euphanes were the same man.

If, however, Euphanes' archonship is dated to A.D. 123/4 or 124/5, this relative chronology is impossible. The treatise by Plutarch is usually dated to the period A.D. 110-116,⁵ and Plutarch's own death to the period A.D. 117-125.⁶ Thus Plutarch's treatise and probably his death were too early for the same Euphanes to have been mentioned by him and to have been archon in the mid-120's.

In order to preserve the identity of the three men named Euphanes, and thus the relative chronology outlined above, it is necessary either to change the dates of Plutarch's works and of his lifetime or to change the date of Euphanes' archonship. It is the latter change which Follet has suggested. This change necessitates the change of the dates of more than a dozen other archons in the first quarter of the second century after Christ. Such a change obviously has wide implications, and the suggestions of Follet will have to be studied carefully and in more detail than space permits here. If the new chronology is correct, and I can see no *prima facie* reason for it to be wrong, then there are consequences for the dating of *I.G.*, II², 2776.

Firstly, the *terminus post quem* for *I.G.*, II², 2776 which had been suggested as 124/5 will have to be moved back to the period of A.D. 110-116 (the period of Plutarch's treatise). The actual *terminus* is obviously the death of Euphanes, but we know only that he was still alive when Plutarch was writing.

Secondly, the Nymphodotos of line 73 of the inscription will have been an ephebe in the period A.D. 110/1 or later, not 125/6 as previously stated.

Thirdly, the Φ[. . .]ουιος Μητ[— of line 193 can be identified with the Fulvius Metrodoros of *I.G.*, II², 2021 whose archonship will fall into the period A.D. 116/7-124/5 according to Follet's proposed chronology.

These considerations mean that, if Follet's chronology is correct, the date of *I.G.*, II², 2776 cannot be limited to the late Hadrianic or early Antonine period, but could fall within a larger span of time from late Trajanic to early Antonine times. It will be noted that the date suggested for the monument upon which *I.G.*, II², 2776 is inscribed was late Trajanic. The inscription and the monument could, therefore, be contemporary and their purposes closely related.

Follet has made one other suggestion for a restoration in the text of *I.G.*, II², 2776 which seems to me quite likely.⁷ In lines 206-207 we should read $\chi\omega\rho\ \gamma[\nu\alpha]/\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\lambda\omega\nu$ ". . . land and fullers' shops and cattle stalls. . . ."

STEPHEN G. MILLER

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, PRINCETON

⁵ C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *J.R.S.*, LVI, 1966, p. 73.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁷ Follet, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Also suggested to me by S. N. Koumanoudes.