

HADRIANIS AND THE BOULE OF FIVE HUNDRED

When the Athenian constitution underwent reform in the first half of Hadrian's reign (117/8-137/8)¹, the Boule of 600 was reduced to 500. However, it is not certain at what exact year this reform was affected, but Simone Follet has suggested 121/2 or 124/5². The same uncertainty is observed also in the creation of the new tribe Hadrianis whose year of inception remains speculative³. However, there is evidence to suggest that the Boule of 500 preceded Hadrianis, as it will be shown below.

The Boule of 500 is traceable to at least 131/2 when the Olympieum was dedicated⁴, and when Hadrian was given the appellation ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΣ in Athens, as the accusative ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ in the *clipeum* of the pediment of 1102⁵ indicates. For this appears to be the probable explanation of the accusative there, and a formula, such as ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ (ποιοῦμεν), is to be understood⁶. The existence of Hadrianis can also be traced to the vicinity of 131/2 (below). Previously the impression was given that Hadrianis may have been created at the beginning of Antoninus Pius' reign (137/8-160/1), because it was securely attested for the first time in 141/2⁷, but this is no longer the case (below). However, some reform involving at least the calendar may have taken place in 138/9, as it may be deduced from Nos 331 and 333⁸, where a sixth prytany is recorded in both documents, although the numerical

1. All dates are A.D.

2. *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques* (1976) 116 [hereafter: Simone Follet, S. Follet, or Simone Follet, *Athènes* (1976)].

3. The evidence on Hadrianis' early years is presented in full below, even if it is contradictory at times.

4. James H. Oliver, *Hesp.*, Suppl. 13 (1970) 120, No. 38.

5. *IG II²*, and hereafter without this designation. Possibly 3960 may be also an early attestation of the Boule of 500; cf. Benjamin D. Meritt and John S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora*, vol. XV: *Inscriptions, the Athenian Councillors* (1974) [hereafter: No. ..., or *Agora XV*, No. ...], Nos 321 (below), line 9, 330 (below), line 12, 333, line 15 (138/9), [and 380, line 32], and 2018 (below), line 18.

6. S. Follet, 122, note 11, has questioned the numerical symbol in 1102, but it is clearly ις (XVI).

7. *Agora XV*, No. 334, line 8. Cf. also S. Follet, 122.

8. Cf. Walther Kolbe, *Ath. Mitt.* 46 (1921) 129-131, for the numerical symbols. If the symbol in No. 333 is to be retained as Γ (III), then it should be parenthesized (γ'), and No. 333 should precede No. 331.

symbol of No. 331 is only partially visible⁹. Moreover, there is Ianaris son of Eraseinos Besaieus of No. 321 (below), line 26, who reappears, it seems, in No. 333, line 53: Ἰανουᾶρις Ἐρασ[είνου] (= Ἐράτ[ωνος]) (Παλληνεύς). If the patronymic is correctly emended here, it may be inferred that Ianaris Besaieus chose to remain in his original tribe Antiochis by changing demes, when the deme Besa was transferred to Hadrianis.

There is the indication that the Boule of 500 may have been created in the priesthood of Flavia Phainarete¹⁰, but this rests on a manipulative restoration of the beginning of line 2 (preserved lines) of 3582. In line 2 the word [ἐξακοσ]ίων has been incorporated, but one could easily supply [Ἀθηνα]ίων (= [ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηνα]ίων) and rearrange the text accordingly¹¹. It appears that Flavia Phainarete may have been a priestess of Athena¹², but it is not definite whether she preceded the priestess Athenion of 3596 (dated about 134/5) and 2810 of about the same time apparently¹³. Flavia Phainarete is associated with Aemilius Iuncus, πρεσβευτής Σεβαστοῦ καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος (4210), and an Aemilius Iuncus, the διορθωτής (3194), dates from the archonship of Syllas (below), but perhaps two persons by the name of Aemilius Iuncus are to be distinguished here¹⁴.

In any case, at least when Hadrian became emperor in 117/8, the Boule numbered 600, as supported by 1072 which has been attributed to 118/9¹⁵. This may be confirmed also by the complex of 3286 and 3287, in which ar-

9. From a photograph and squeeze (sent by the Ephor of the Epigraphical Museum, Madame Dina Peppas-Delmouzou).

10. S. Follet, 122, and especially note 8.

11. [ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ καὶ ἡ βουλῇ [τῶν/Φῶ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηνα]ίων τὴν ἱέρει[αν] τῆς Ἀθηναίης? Φλαβία]ν Φαιναρέτη[ν] (from *Annuario* 4/5 [1921-1922] 67, No. 173).

12. The inscriptions which mention Fl. Phainarete (3582, 3583, 4061(?), 4210, 4345) come from the Acropolis. See David M. Lewis, *ABSA* 50 (1955) 11, No. 21.

13. Previously dated "*med. s. II p.*". L. Aemilius Karos (= Carus) and his sons (L. Aemilii) Apollonides and Oueibianos (= Vibianus) Zenodotos are mentioned, and perhaps they are related to L. Aemilius Iuncus (see note 14 below). See also No. 406, under lines 5-8 (171/2). The priestess Athenion lacks a *nomen*, and it is not certain whether she should be identified with Arria Athenion of 2776 = *Hesp.* 41 (1972) 68, line 11 (after 127/8, below), or with Vipsania Athenion in *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 256, under H4 (179/80-192/3; cf. S. Follet, 25, note 6). See also D. M. Lewis (note 12 above), No. 22.

14. This is suggested also by the *testimonia* that S. Follet, 32-34, has appended under one Aemilius Iuncus.

15. *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 259. 3545 (*fin. s. I p.*) is to be dated around the beginning of Hadrian's reign; the honorand appears in No. 322, line 58 (below). Cf. also 4208 = S. Follet, 32 and 122 (—125 [124: 3594, 3595]).

range the twelve Attic tribes honored Hadrian as emperor (3287)¹⁶, but the center was occupied by Hadrian, the archon, whose statue had been erected in 111/2 or 112/3 (3286)¹⁷. If this complex had been set up in 124/5, as previously thought¹⁸, perhaps the center should have been occupied by Hadrian, the emperor. Moreover, it would have been most appropriate to honor Hadrian upon his accession, and particularly because he had been *archon eponymos* at Athens. There are also more obvious reasons why the complex of 3286 and 3287 is to be assigned to 117/8 or thereabout. Hadrian's name Traianus is missing from 3287, but probably this does not carry too much weight here, because it does not appear either in an inscription from Epidauros, which dates from 124/5¹⁹. It should be noted also that the beginning of the Epidaurian inscription resembles the beginnings of the inscriptions of 3287. However, what argues persuasively, it seems, for a date of the complex of 3286 and 3287 to the accession of Hadrian is the complete absence of any titles after Σεβαστόν, whereas the inscription from Epidauros records his tribunician power (VIIIth), etc. Moreover, the complex of 3286 and 3287, although incomplete, does not attest to the existence of Hadrianis, as the middle (VIIth position) is occupied by Hadrian, the archon (above). However, this arrangement may have suggested the creation of Hadrianis, or at least it may have established Hadrianis' tribal order as VII, although there is the precedent of Ptolemais²⁰.

There is also 2021 which mentions the Boule of 600²¹, but this ephebic text belongs to the period when the *lemma* παιδευταί (lines 14, 15) was still in use. However, the year of the abandonment of the collective title παιδευταί cannot be pinpointed, but it was no longer in use by the time of Antoninus

16. Only four texts (3 complete, 1 partial) have survived.

17. Probably 112/3, as determined from the chronological arrangement in 'Ελληνικά 29 (1976) 262 (*ad med.*).

18. Paul Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrian* (1934) 18-35 = 'Ελληνικά 29 (1976) 258, under H6. Cf. also W. Kolbe (note 8 above) 123 (on Hadrianis' creation); below, before note 20.

19. *IG* IV², No. 606. No. 88 (*ibid.*), which dates from 163 = 162/3 (lines 20-21), equates the month Dekatos (apparently) in line 23 with [πρό...δεκα Καλ. Αὔ]γούστων (line 20), but the number of the Hadrianic Era has been lost. However, [τριακοστοῦ ἐννάτου] is to be restored in place of [τεσσαρακοστοῦ] in line 22. Moreover, No. 88 seems to show that the Epidaurian year began about the time that the Attic did, that is, in Boedromion. Evidently Hadrian visited Epidauros in the fall of 124 (=124/5). M. Th. Mitsos sent me a squeeze of No. 88.

20. *TAPA* 77 (1946) 55, note 5.

21. S. Follet, 122.

Pius, and by 131/2 the Boule of 500 was already functioning (above). On the other hand, the ephebe Cheilon son of Eukarpos (2021, line 22) is to be identified as the father of Eukarpos son of Cheilon Mar(athonios) of Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ. 1977 (1979), after p. 16, text “A”, Col. I, line 18. This last text dates from about 140 or shortly after, and this would attribute 2021 to the years 110-120 or shortly after²². Moreover, since the paidotribe in 2021 is Demetrios son of Isigenes Rhamnousios (line 18), the range of years can be constricted to 114-120 or shortly after. There is also the ἡγεμών Zosimos (son of Zosimos) Besaieus (line 17) who reappears, it seems, as prytanis in No. 321 (below), line 20: Ζώσιμος (Ζωσίμου) (Βησαιεύς). As for the *paideutes* Platon (son of Platon) Aithalides (line 16), he may not be the prytanis of Nos 421, line 26: [Π]λάτων ([Π]λάτωνος) (Αἰθαλίδης), and 426, line 3: Πλάτων (Πλάτωνος) (Αἰθαλίδης), but rather a son of his, since the two prytany catalogues date from about 136-150²³. Finally, the ephebe Λέων . . .Ιου[ς] (line 44) may be the prytanis Λέων [ν] Ἰσιγένους ([Μαραθώνιος]) of No. 340, line 8, of before the middle of the second century. If this is correct, then line 44 of 2021 is to be emended to Λέων [Ἰσι]γ[έν]ου[ς]. If by the above 2021 could be assigned a compromised date of around 120/1, then the reduction of the Boule to 500 could have been affected by 121/2 (above), or by 124/5 when Hadrian visited Athens.

It was mentioned above that the title *παιδευταί* was abandoned sometime under Hadrian, and it appears that the ephebate was undergoing changes from the latter half of the first century to 145/6. Undoubtedly the reform of the ephebate was influenced by the constitutional changes that were taking place under Hadrian²⁴. About the beginning of Hadrian's reign, the ephebes were being listed as *πρωτένγραφοι* and *ἐπένγραφοι*, or at least in this order: “with demotic-without demotic”. This mode of inscribing the ephebes' names had already been used earlier, as it can be seen from 1996 of 91/2²⁵ and 2017 of about 103/4-106/7²⁶. These two ephebic documents have also ephebes with demotics listed by tribe, though the name of the tribe does not appear²⁷.

22. This is dependent upon the father's age at the birth of the ephebe. That is, whether the father was 30 or 20 years at the time. See note 70 below. S. Follet, 468.

23. No. 421, *med. s. II p.* = this writer; and No. 426 = *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 330.

24. The Athenians may have wanted to reform their constitution, and the opportunity came when Hadrian became emperor, as imperial approval must have been required. Cf. also *Hesp.* 49 (1980) 52.

25. *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 262.

26. *Ibid.*, 256, under H4.

27. 1996, lines 35-67, and 125-147; 2017, lines 13-43, 49, 54.

This would be instituted later at about 142/3 (below). At any rate, the new method of inscribing the ephebes' names, begun at about the accession of Hadrian, can contribute to the dating of ephebic texts of this period. Already Simore Follet has attributed 2018 and 2020 to about 120/1, for example²⁸. However, the consequences of this will be discussed below in greater detail.

As it was said earlier, the Boule of 500 preceded the creation of Hadrianis, and this contention is based on No. 321, line 18 (*ad. init.*), where there is inscribed the chiffre Φ before the demotic ΒΗΣΑΙΕΙΣ. This numerical symbol²⁹ does not belong to the category of a casual of later addition, as determined from the photograph³⁰. Since No. 321 is a prytany catalogue of Antiochis, it follows that Hadrianis had not yet been created, because the deme Besa is still listed under Antiochis. Later Besa, which was also Hadrian's deme³¹, was transferred to the newly created tribe Hadrianis. However, No. 321 seems to date from the 130's, since it has prosopographical affinities with Nos 330 of 135/6 (but see below), 333 of 138/9, and possibly one with 334 of 141/2, as previously pointed out³². On the other hand, it may not be out of order if No. 321 was to be moved to the early 120's^{32a}. In any case, the attestation of Hadrianis by 132/3-134/5 (below) requires a reattribution of No. 321.

As remarked above, No. 321 is related prosopographically to No. 330, which is a prytany catalogue of Antiochis. It is possible that No. 330 may also date from the time when the Boule numbered 600, if the N inscribed next to the *lemma* [Αλ]ωπεκῆθεν (line 14)³³ is to be interpreted as "οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ν"³⁴. Of course, this N lacks a horizontal abbreviation bar, and it could be a later or casual addition, as it may be deduced from its form. On the other hand, the mere appearance of the N there may point to the period of the Boule of 600. At any rate, James A. Notopoulos assigned *Hesperia* XI (1942), No.

28. S. Follet, 205.

29. Cf. S. Follet, 73. However, see *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 264.

30. *Hesp.* 30 (1961) Plate 45, No. 52.

31. *Agora XV*, No. 334, lines 9-10; cf. also P. Graindor (note 18 above) 14, note 1. When Hadrian was archon (2024, line 5), apparently he $\overline{\text{had}}$ not yet become Besaieus; no demotic is given.

32. *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 263.

32a. *Ibid.*, 261-262: ephebes of 1996 of 91/2 (note 25 above) appear as prytaneis in No. 321.

33. *Hesp.* 11 (1942) 41, No. 11.

34. *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 300, No. 24, lines 25-26. Cf. the Π in No. 17 (*ibid.*, 288); however, this Π clearly differentiates itself from the rest of the inscription.

11 = No. 330, to 135/6³⁵, because of the prytany secretary who hailed from Gargettos (line 30: [-----]ς Εὐδήμου Γαργήτιος)³⁶, and from the deduction that Hadrianis was already functioning in 127/8³⁷. He was also led to that date by the prosopographical affinities between No. 330 and No. 333 of 138/9 (above). Naturally No. 330 lacks the left side, and this makes it impossible to establish whether the *lemma* ΒΗΣΑΙΕΙΣ was inscribed in the lost portion. However, it should be pointed out here that in No. 321 (above) the ΒΗΣΑΙΕΙΣ *lemma* is inscribed on the second column of the left side, as the inscription's size has been indicated. Moreover, as observed in the 'Ελληνικά'³⁸, No. 330 has no *civis* (at least in the preserved part), and this may suggest an earlier date than 135/6³⁹. It appears that the *cives* came into prominence in the prytany catalogues after the reform (or at least partial reform) of the constitution. A good example of this is No. 322.

No. 322 has been dated to about 120, but it must be later. Simone Follet would like to date it to 118/9 or 131/2⁴⁰. However, Pheidias (son of Pheidias) (Rhamnousios) of line 1 could not have been, it seems, the prytany secretary of lines 25-26⁴¹, as he leads his deme's prytaneis (line 58). Moreover, there is no evidence to show that the prytany secretary could serve simultaneously as prytanis, too, unless we have here a father and son recorded⁴². There is also the fact that the prytany secretary would be from the same tribe as No. 322, a catalogue of Aiantis in whose heading were honored Claudius Attikos, the elder⁴³, and his wife Vibullia Alkia.

In any event, No. 322 appears to date from the period when the Boule numbered 500, for the catalogue, though broken at the bottom, preserves

35. *Hesp.* 18 (1949) 13.

36. 'Ελληνικά' 29 (1976) 263.

37. Of course, it is not known how the new tribe was introduced into the tribal order, and what this was before 138/9. However, for the period before 119/20, see 'Ελληνικά' 29 (1976) 258-259, H6.

38. 29 (1976) 264.

39. Cf. S. Follet, 304.

40. *Ibid.*, 303.

41. The prytany secretary is not named.

42. The prytany secretary may be the son (line 1), and the prytanis the father (line 58). See note 15 above (=3545).

43. Elias Kapetanopoulos, *The Early Expansion of Roman Citizenship into Attica during the First Part of the Empire, 200 B.C.-A.D. 70* (dissertation, Yale University, 1963=*Historia* 19 [1970] 562, note 10) 390-391, No. 785 (hereafter: dissertation, No. 000). It should be noted also that the inscription's heading needs to be restored again because of the new observations.

the names of thirty-eight prytaneis⁴⁴. With Hadrianis the prytaneis usually numbered forty⁴⁵, but it is not certain whether No. 322 was inscribed when Hadrianis was in existence. If not, the prytaneis could have numbered forty-two, with four names lost below line 47 of Col. I⁴⁶. If Hadrianis was in existence, then the assumption would be that two names have been lost. But be as it may, in line 74 of Col. II there must be read the *lemma* αἰ[σειτοι], as determined from a photograph and a squeeze⁴⁷. The *lemma*'s A is cut almost directly below the Φ of the *lemma* Φα[ληρεῖς] (line 65). Moreover, the deep, triangular incision before the *lemma*'s A may be recognized as belonging to a decorative motif, such as a *hedera*. Furthermore, the *lemma* αἰ[σειτοι] is inscribed parallel to the last preserved name from Marathon in line 47 of Col. I. Now whether the names of the *aiseitai* extended under Col. I, it is impossible to say with certainty, but the continuation of the names from Marathon (as previously identified) at the top of Col. II would indicate that the names of the *aiseitai* extended to the left and under Col. I at some point, perhaps four or two names below line 47 (above). In any case, the restoration of the *lemma aiseitai* in line 74 of Col. II eliminates the deme Trikorynthos⁴⁸, which was transferred to Hadrianis at its creation. However, the elimination of Trikorynthos does not necessarily support the deduction that Hadrianis existed when No. 322 was inscribed.

No. 322 has three prosopographical affinities with 2776 = *Hesperia* XLI (1972) 68-74⁴⁹, which mentions an Aelius in lines 42-43: Πόπλιος Αἴλιος Ἀττα[λο]ς Παλληνεύς νεώτερος⁵⁰. This latter fact seems to imply that 2776 = *Hesperia* (above) dates from the latter years of Hadrian's reign, as the first securely dated Aelius in Attica is P. Aelius Hermias Hagnousios who honored Sabina Sebaste sometime between 127/8 and 131/2⁵¹. In other

44. Cf. *Hesp.*, Suppl. I (1937) 196 (minus line 74).

45. No. 331 of 138/9, for example, has 40 prytaneis ($13 \times 40 = 520$ prytaneis in the Boule of 500). See also *Hesp.*, Suppl. 14 (1975) xvi, and note 46 below. Cf. No. 406: $40 - 2 = 38$ prytaneis (171/2).

46. That is, $42 \times 12 = 504$ prytaneis in the Boule of 500. When 500 is divided by 12, we have 41.7 prytaneis/tribe; by 13, the ratio is 38.5 prytaneis/tribe. See note 45 above.

47. Both Markellos Th. Mitsos and the Ephor D. Peppas-Delmouzou provided them.

48. See reference in note 44 above.

49. P. 70, line 69: Φλ. Δωρόθεος, Φλ. Φιλότειμος (No. 322, lines 29-30); and 71, line 104: Φλώρος Καλάμιδος (No. 322, line 40).

50. *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976) 256, H4, where 2776 = *Hesp.* has been attributed provisionally "at least after A.D. 112". The significance of the appearance of an Aelius in this document had been communicated to S. Follet (in 7-IX-73). See note 54 below.

51. 3387; from a workable prosopography of the Aelii = *Αρχ. Δελτίον* 26 (1971 = 1972) 280, note 13. See also *ibid.* 30 (1975 = 1978) 132, under No. 4.

words, all Aelii in Attica are to be dated after 127/8-131/2, where appropriate⁵², even though Hadrian had connections with Athens since 111/2 or 112/3 (above). On the other hand, among the thirty eight surviving prytaneis of No. 322, there is no Aelius, but this may not have any significance, although because of the above observation the document is to be attributed perhaps before 127/8-131/2. In any event, No. 322 has fifteen *cives* prytaneis: eight Claudii, five Flavii, and a Nummius and Pomponius respectively. With the exception of the two *cives* from Rhamnous who are not listed directly under their respective deme *lemma*⁵³, the *cives* prytaneis from Marathon and Phalerum, with two exceptions in lines 45 and 73, lead the lists of their demes. Such a listing of the *cives* prytaneis has its parallel in No. 333, lines 36-39, of 138/9⁵⁴. This observable affinity may suggest that the two prytany catalogues are to be placed chronologically close, with No. 322 dating before 138⁵⁵.

As observed above, the existence of Hadrianis cannot be argued persuasively from No. 322, which appears to date from the time when the Boule had been reduced to 500, and particularly because the tribe's creation appears to have followed the Boule's reform (above). However, an attempt will be made to trace the tribe's existence through the ephebic texts of Hadrian's time and of the beginning of Antoninus Pius' reign, even though the mode of inscribing the ephebes' names makes this venture somewhat difficult. As already commented, the Athenians began about the accession of Hadrian to list the ephebes as *πρωτένγραφοι* - *ἐπένγραφοι*, or "with demotic-without demotic". This continued to about 141/2, since in 142/3 a new method of listing the ephebes' names is attested, that is, "by tribe-*ἐπένγραφοι*", as shown by 2049 and 2042⁵⁶ which also belongs to about 142/3⁵⁷. However, the previous method of inscribing the ephebes' names was not abandoned altogether by 142/3, as testified by 2059 of about 147/8 or shortly before and 2068 of 155/6. There is also, for example, 2087, a *σύστρεμμα* inscription of 163/4.

52. No. 299, line 5: [-----]ν Αἴλιος (*fin. s. I a.*).

53. Dissertation (note 43 above), Nos 791 [Cl. Philoni(des)] and 792 [Cl. Charope(inos)]. These two prytaneis are brothers or father and son. This writer completed the patronymic (line 60), attributed differently in *Agora XV*, under No. 322.

54. All Aelii from Pallene who are undoubtedly related. One of them is Aelius Attalos (Palleneus) [line 39], but it is not certain whether he should be identified with Aelius Attalos Palleneus *neoterus* (above, where note 50).

55. Cl. Attikos, the elder, died by 138. Cf. P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique. Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (1830) 74; *Agora XV*, No. 324; and under 3296.

56. S. Follet, 246.

57. Eisdoros son of (Th)eophilos Paianieus (lines 9-10) was *hypos(ophr)onistes* in 155/6 (2068, line 71). Thus, 2042 must date from about 142/3.

Simone Follet has suggested that 2051, where the ephebes are listed by tribe, may date from Hadrian's reign, because the archon Syllas is associated with Aemilius Iuncus, the διορθωτής (above)⁵⁸. However, in view of the above, both the archon Syllas⁵⁹ and Aemilius Iuncus, the διορθωτής, must be dated under Antoninus Pius, and tentatively to 144/5⁶⁰. This has the support of the father of the ephebe Παλλίων Ὀκταίου Εὐρυ(ρίδης) of 2051, line 28, who is attested as ephebe in 2020, line 43: Ὀκτάτος Δωρ. Εὐρυ(ρίδης). This last document has been attributed by Simone Follet to about 120/1 (above). Moreover, as observed above, the mode of inscribing the ephebes' names in 2020 places this ephebic text securely in the reign of Hadrian. If 2051 dates from about 144/5 (above), then 2020 cannot be later than 124/5, because of the prosopographical association made above. In addition, there is also the ephebe Antipatros son of Mou(saios) Alo(pekethen) of 2020, line 26, who would ascribe 2020 to no later than 123/4⁶¹, but it appears uncertain whether he is attested as prytanis in No. 330, line 20, attributed to 135/6 (but see above). The photograph in *Hesperia* XI (1942) 41, No. 11, seems to favor a reading of the prytanis' name as [----]τος Μουσ(α)ίου ([Ἀλ]ωπεκῆθεν) rather than as [Ἀντίπατ]ρος Μουσ(α)ίου ([Ἀλ]ωπεκῆθεν). In any event, Antipatros son of Mousaios Alopekethen flourished under Antoninus Pius⁶², and his *ephebeia* in the earlier years of Hadrian's reign may be assured.

Already it has been mentioned above that Simone Follet has attributed also 2018 to about 120/1. This ephebic text, dated in the archonship of (Z)opyros son of Dionysios Agrylethen, must certainly be attributed to Hadrian's reign, as the mode of inscribing the ephebes' names testifies (above). Moreover, it seems that 2018 should be assigned to the latter years of Hadrian's reign⁶³, for this document is the first to mention the officer in charge of the

58. Syllas is mentioned as archon in 3194. Line 3 reads: APXON (=APXΩN) (*rasura*) ΣΥΛΛΑΣ [from a photograph; see note 9 above].

59. This archon has been given the *nomen* Aelius (*cf.*, for example, W. Kolbe (note 8 above) 117, and S. Follet, 511), but there is no evidence to support this.

60. Or possibly shortly after (see note 61 below).

61. If 2051 were to be dated to 147/8-149/50 (see note 60 above), then the *ephebeia* in 2020 could not be later than 128/9-130/1. However, this later date would conflict with the creation of Hadrianis and the date of No. 330, especially if Antipatros Alopekethen is a prytanis there (but see before note 62).

62. *Ελληνικά* 29 (1976) 264. See note 61 above.

63. The archon Zapyros Agrylethen could be the father of the ephebes Dionysios and Onesimos sons of Zop(yros) Agry(lethen) of 2020, lines 78-79, even if he dates from Hadrian's latter years. *Cf.* also S. Follet, 205.

Diogeneion (line 142)⁶⁴. This officer is undoubtedly the result of the changes that the ephebate was undergoing at the time (above). There are also other reasons for possibly assigning this ephebic text to the end of Hadrian's reign. Apparently the brother of Sozon son of Theodosios Lam(pteus) [line 22] is attested as ephebe in 2049, line 37: Γραφικός Θεοδοσίου Λαμ., of 142/3⁶⁵. The ephebe Philippos (son of Philippos) Besa(ieus) of line 6 could be the prytanis in No. 409 [=line 10: Φίλιππος []] (Βησαιεύς) of about 188/9, but perhaps the prytanis should be recognized as his grandson, Φίλιππος [Μάρκου] (Βησαιεύς)⁶⁶. Neikomachos son of Aphrodeisi(os) Phly(eus) of lines 11-12 reappears, probably as prytanis, in a prytany catalogue of 156/7-157/8⁶⁷. Lastly, an Aelius is mentioned, which presumably would date 2018 after 127/8-131/2 (above). The Aelius is Aelius Amein(ias) of line 4 who figures in *Hesperia*, Suppl. XIII (1970) 6, line 49, of about 174/5⁶⁸. However, 2018 does not seem to definitely confirm the existence of Hadrianis, as it will be seen below.

As it was stated above, the tracing of Hadrianis' existence in the ephebic documents before 142/3, with the exception of 2041 and 2046 (below), is not an easy task, because the ephebes were listed as πρωτένγραφοι-ἐπένγραφοι or "with demotic-without demotic" (above). Moreover, the ephebes with demotics, who concern us here, are listed in a disorderly manner, and this renders the tracing of Hadrianis difficult. However, here are the results, beginning with 2020 (above). This ephebic text dates undoubtedly before the creation of Hadrianis, for the arrangement of the ephebes with demotics does not hint to the tribe's existence, although elsewhere some existence of

64. Cf. also *TAPA* 90 (1959) 217. It is also the first to mention the ὑποπαιδοτρίβης (note 102 below).

65. Other family members: 2033 + 2064 = Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ. 1971, 62, No. 5 (below), line 41; 2059, lines 60 (Σ[ώζοντος Λαμπρεύς?] = this writer) and 63-64 (Θ[εοδοσί]/ου = this writer); and *Agora XV*, No. 406, line 58 (cf. also Nos 167, lines 1-2, and 168, line 26).

66. This writer's suggestions (cf. *Agora XV*, p. 460). Μάρκος Φιλ[ίππου] (this writer) (Βησαιεύς) of line 9 should be recognized, then, as the father of the prytanis in line 10. Μάρκος' name should be restored in 3963, lines 12-13: Μαρ[κου τοῦ Φιλίππου]/ Βησαιέως, and in 3964, lines 8-9. These two texts should be dated now to about 188/9, or shortly after the Great Catalogue from the Eleusinion, as Fl. Glaukias Acharneus is undoubtedly the ἀφ' ἑστίας there (*ZEP* 33 [1979] 112 and 114, line 6). See Ἀρχ. Δελτίον 30 (1975=1978) 131-132, Nos 4-6 and note. A son of Markos is ephebe in 2111/2, lines 22-23 (185/6).

67. J. S. Traill, *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 306 and 308, No. 30, lines 10-11. Neikomachos Phlyeus could not have been eponymos, because Vipsanius Aiolion is the eponymos (lines 28-29).

68. S. Follet, *Rev. de Phil.* 53 (1979) [31], line 49: Αἰ[λ] Ἀμεινίαν. See also J. S. Traill, *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 387-388, No. 9.

Hadrianis is suggested before Hadrian's accession in 117/8 (below). At any rate, 2020 denies the existence of Hadrianis. Two brothers from the deme Trikorynthos (lines 49, 50) are listed with an ephebe from Marathon (line 51), and this would suggest that Trikorynthos belonged still to the tribe Aiantis, unless old habits were followed⁶⁹. There is also 2019 + 2072 + 2252 = 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1972, p. 69, No. 12, which dates from about 115/6-126-7, and more precisely from about 120/1-126/7⁷⁰, as the listing of the ephebes with demotics indicates (above). This document seems to confirm also a deduction that Hadrianis had not been yet created, as a Besaieus (of Antiochis apparently) is listed before a Marathonios (of Aiantis) in lines 1-2. The order of the tribes is reserved here, but it is not an unusual practice, as it is observed elsewhere, too.

On the other hand, 2018 could have been inscribed in a year when Hadrianis was in existence, as lines 5-6 may record a tribal sequence (Sphettios = Akamantis VI / Besaieus = Hadrianis VII). However, this may be negated by the ephebe in line 8 (of Antiochis), although the ephebe's tribe of line 7 cannot be determined. There are also lines 41-42 which complicate matters a little, since both ephebes in those lines are to be assigned apparently to the tribe Ptolemais. The ephebe in line 41 hailed from Aphidna which was transferred to Hadrianis at its creation, while the one in line 42 is a Φ(λυεύς), as identified by this writer⁷¹. The appearance of the Aphidnaios and Phlyeus

69. Trikorynthos was located near Marathon, and perhaps the listing was influenced at times by this fact. See *Hesp.*, Suppl. 14 (1975) Map 3 (*ad fin.*).

70. Pythokritos son of Kalliteles Phe(gaieus) [line 23; his brother in 5] is undoubtedly the father of Kalliteles son of Pythok(ritos) Phe(gaieus) of 2052, line 77, of 145/6, as identified in *IG II*². The latter's brother is attested in 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1977 (1979), after 16, text "A", Col. I, line 19, which is to be dated now to about 140 (above). Previously it had been assigned to 164/5 (*Clas. Phil.* 65 [1970] 97), with text "B" (=this writer) of 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. (above). However, "B" dates from the archonship of Cl. Herakleides Meliteus (dissertation [note 43 above], No. 987) of 175/6 (see *Clas. Phil.* [above] 96-97 and 'Αρχ. *Δελτίον* 30 [1975=1978] 120, No. 1, for the restorations in 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1977).

The κοσμητής Athenaios son of Alexandros Rhamnousios of 145/6 (2052, line 5) is apparently mentioned in 2072, line 2 (*cf.* also 'Αρχ. *Δελτίον* [above] 121, No. (γ), and 124, lines 8-9; and S. Follet, 212). Moreover, the prytanis Agathon son of Asklepiades (Anaphlystios) of No. 333, line 16 (father in 14=AAA 6 [1973] 138), of 138/9 is apparently mentioned also in 2072, line 3: [Ἄγαθων Ἀσκληπιάδου Ἀναφλύς]=this writer. The prytanis' name has been restored in No. 330, line 10, but this is questionable for chronological reasons (see the comment on the date of No. 330 above). In any case, these examples place 2019 + 2072 + 2252 to the years attributed; other Hadrianic texts: 2027, 2034 and 2035.

71. Ἡρακλέων Φ *vac.* *Cf.* J. S. Traill, *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 306, No. 30, line 33 (prytanis in 156/7-157/8), and 308-309, line 33. Probably the prytanis in *Hesp.* is the ephebe of 2018.

ephebes together suggests that Aphidna was still in Ptolemais. In line 40 there is an Itai(os) ephebe who could imply that Hadrianis existed, as the deme of Eitea became part of this tribe, but there are limitations in this, too. The ephebe in line 40 is probably of the tribe Antiochis, as there is a sequence of tribes from line 21, and the ephebes of lines 38-39 belong to Aiantis, the tribe that preceded Antiochis. There is also the possibility that the Itai(os) of line 40 may belong to Akamantis (VI), from which tribe the deme Eitea was transferred to Hadrianis (above). If this is true, then the tribal order would be Akamantis VI (line 40) / Ptolemais V (line 41) / Ptolemais V (line 42) in reverse, as previously noted. It should be observed also that the absence of an Antinoeus ephebe in the surviving parts of 2018 may or may not have any significance; the deme Antinoeis was created after 130/1 (below).

Moreover, 2033 + 2064 = 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1971, pp. 61ff., No. 5, which dates from about 126/7 or shortly before⁷², seems to imply that Hadrianis had not yet begun to function, as inferred from lines 33-34: Aiantis X (Marathonios) / Antiochis XI (Besaieus) rather than Aiantis XI / Hadrianis VII, unless the new tribal order was confused at times with the old (above). On the other hand, 2041 of 132/3 (as attributed in this study)⁷³ may attest the existence of Hadrianis, if there is a tribal order in lines 21-22: Oineis VIII ('Οἷθεν) / Hadrianis VII (Βησαεύς) in reverse (rather than Oineis VII / Antiochis XI). However, 2044 of 139/40 seems to negate the existence of Hadrianis, as indicated by lines 60-63: Ptolemais V / Ptolemais V (or Hadrianis VII?) / Akamantis VI / Oineis VII (rather than Oineis VIII). The coupling of Akamantis and Oineis here gives the impression that Hadrianis was not yet functioning by 139/40, but a partially similar order is observed in 2068 of 155/6 (below). Moreover, 2046 attests the tribe's existence before 139/40 (below). There is also the ephebic text "A" in 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1977 (1979), after p. 16. This text dates from about 140 (above), and it also appears to deny the existence of Hadrianis, for in lines 8-9 of Col. I the tribal order seems to be Oineis VII / Akamantis VI in reverse (rather than Oineis VIII / Akamantis VI)⁷⁴. In addition, lines 50-51 seem to imply that Trikorynthos

72. This document cannot be later than 126/7, as Zopyros son of Eraseinos Garget(tios) [line 29] is the same as the prytanis of No. 331, line 14, of 138/9.

73. Since Hadrian is called Olympios (above), the document must date from 132/3 (*cf.* *Ἑλληνικά* 29 [1976] 266), but apparently before he became Panhellenios. Moreover, the reading in E. Mary Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (1966) 181, No. 494, line 5, as (ι)γ' could be easily changed to (ις') [=XVI]. That is, the symbol fi (VI) was perhaps misread as Γ (III) by Cyriacus of Ancona (= *Syll.*³, No. 839).

74. However, 2068, lines 88-90, of 155/6 has Oineis VIII/ Akamantis VI/ Oineis VIII.

belonged still to Aiantis: Aiantis X / Aiantis X (rather than Hadrianis VII / Aiantis XI), unless there is tribal confusion (above) or the demes were transferred to Hadrianis at different intervals (below).

This seeming contradiction about Hadrianis' early attestation may not be important at times, because it is observed also in 2068 of 155/6, which lists the ephebes with demotics in a disorderly manner and makes the detection of Hadrianis just as precarious. Lines 31-33 probably attest the existence of Hadrianis (as it now existed): Hadrianis VII / Hadrianis VII / Oineis VIII, as may do lines 95-96: Hadrianis VII / Oineis VIII⁷⁵. On the other hand, lines 88-90 would have led to a deduction that Hadrianis was not yet functioning: Oineis VII / Akamantis VI / Oineis VII, rather than the true order Oineis VIII / Akamantis VI / Oineis VIII⁷⁶. However, 2059 of about 147/8 or shortly before, where again the ephebes with demotics are listed in a mixed order, attests Hadrianis (as it existed), not only by the Antinoeus ephebe (=Simone Follet, p. 375, No. 3, line 24), but also by a tribal sequence in lines 53-56: Akamantis VI / (lost) / Akamantis VI / (lost) / Hadrianis VII / (lost) / Oineis VIII. The *systemma* inscription (2087) of 163/4 confirms Hadrianis in lines 13-14 [Hadrianis VII (Itai.) / Oineis VIII (Achar.)] and 47-48 [Oineis VIII (Achar.) / Hadrianis VII (Besaieus), in reverse]. These examples may give strength to the view that Hadrianis is traceable through the ephebic texts, but there are recognizable limitations as well (however, see 2046 below).

There is also evidence to suggest that Hadrianis may have existed in some form before Hadrian's accession (above), or at least it may have been conceived before his reign. In 2024 of 111/2 or 112/3, when Hadrian was archon, the ephebes listed in lines 27-28 seem to imply an existence of Hadrianis [Hadrianis VII (Aphidnaios) / Hadrianis VII (Eleousios)], in place of Ptolemais V (Aphidnaios) / Hippothontis IX (Eleousios). There is in addition 2022 (= *Agχ. Δελτίον* XXV [1970] 190, No. 9) of about 114/5 which seems also to confirm some existence of Hadrianis in lines 14-15, where the order may be Akamantis VI / Hadrianis VII (Sphettios/Besaieus) rather than Akamantis VI / Antiochis XI. However, this last example may be invalidated by a parallel one in 2018, lines 5-6: Akamantis VI / Antiochis XI (Sphettios/Besaieus), it seems, rather than Akamantis VI / Hadrianis VII, as it has been

Therefore, lines 8-9 of Col. I should be Oineis VIII / Akamantis VI. See below, where note 76.

75. The ephebes of lines 95-96 are ΕΙΤ'(εἰτος) and Ὠῆ(θεν) respectively.

76. An almost similar tribal order appears also in *Agχ. Ἐφημ.* 1977 (1979), text "A", Col. I, lines 8-9 (above).

observed above⁷⁷. Nevertheless, it may be possible to infer from the above that the creation of Hadrianis may have been conceived as early as Hadrian's archonship, but the complex of 3286 and 3287 (above) would argue against such an eventuality. It would mean also that the demes were transferred periodically to the new tribe, as Besa is still found in the tribe Antiochis in No. 321 (above). It should be remembered that Besa was Hadrian's deme (above), and perhaps it should have been transferred first to Hadrianis (however, see note 31 above).

In tracing Hadrianis before its actual attestation in 141/2 (above), there is one more document to be discussed here which confirms beyond any doubt, it seems, the existence of Hadrianis by 134/5, although a counter argument could be offered (below). The document concerned is 2046 which dates after the institution of the ephebic festivals in honor of Antinoos who died on the 30th of September 130^{77a} (Attic year: 130/1). Presumably at this time the deme Antinoeis (Hadrianis) was also created, but it is attested for the first time in 2049, lines 2 and 84, of 142/3. In any case, the Ἀντινόεια ἐν ἄστει and ἐν Ἐλευσίνι are mentioned in lines 14-15 of 2046, and there is no indication that they were being celebrated here for the first time. Therefore, 2046 dates after their creation, presumably in 130/1 or 131/2, but it cannot be later than 135/6, if the two ephebes Mem(mius) Protogenes Trikor(ysios) and Mem(mius) Philargyros Triko(rysios)⁷⁸ of lines 18-19 are identical with Mem. Protogenes Trik. and Mem. Philargyros Trik., σωφρονιστής and ὑποσωφρονιστής respectively, of 2067, lines 10 and 109, of 154/5. The *sophronistes* or the *hyposophronistes* had undoubtedly a son who is attested as ephebe in the same text, line 94: Μέμ. Ἀφέλης Τρικο.⁷⁹ This would date 2046 to no later than 135/6, after an interval of twenty years between the father's and son's *ephebeia*, and the Panathenaea assign this ephebic text to 134/5 (above).

As mentioned, 2046 shows that Hadrianis can be traced to 134/5, even though the ephebic texts discussed above have presented a somewhat contradictory view about the early attestation of Hadrianis. However, there is also 2041 which supports the existence of Hadrianis by 132/3 (above). At any rate, 2046 has a tribal sequence in lines 21-29: Oineis / Oineis / Kekropis /

77. There are also lines 16-17 of 2022 where a tribal order of Aigeis II/ Pandionis III is to be recognized, indicating that Oa had not yet been transferred from Pandionis to Hadrianis (see above, for the transference of demes).

^{77a} S. Follet, 322, note 4 (and 5).

78. Dissertation (note 43 above), Nos 836 and 837. The Panathenaea (S. Follet, 341) would attribute 2046 to 134/5.

79. *Ibid.*, No. 927.

Kekropis / Kekropis / Kekropis / Hippothontis / Hippothontis / Hippothontis. Before Oineis (lines 21-22) are recorded the two ephebes from Trikorynthos mentioned above (lines 18-19) and an additional Memmius (Mem. Alexandros) in line 20, but without a demotic⁸⁰. However, since all three ephebes carry the *nomen* Memmius, it is safe to conclude that Mem. Alexandros of line 20 is also a Trikorysios and that his demotic was omitted because of the previous two ephebes. At times a demotic could be omitted when the ephebe was from the same deme as the preceding ephebe(s), and this is true where relations are involved, as is the case with the three ephebes from Trikorynthos (above)⁸¹. This deme belonged originally to Aiantis, but it was later transferred to Hadrianis (above).

The tribal sequence of lines 21-29 (above) can be extended, then, to lines 18-20, and the following order emerges: Hadrianis VII / Hadrianis VII/ (Hadrianis VII) / Oineis VIII / Oineis VIII / Kekropis IX (*quater*) / Hippothontis X (*ter*). However, as alluded above, there is a catch in this neat order, because in line 17, which is the first line of the *πρωτέγγραφοι*, the ephebe belongs to Hippothontis which occupied the IXth position in the old tribal order and the Xth when Hadrianis was created. Now the question arises whether a tribal order commenced with line 17, that is, Hippothontis IX / Aiantis X / Aiantis X / (Aiantis X) /, Oineis VII (*bis*)/ Kekropis VIII (*quater*)/ Hippothontis IX (*ter*). However, although this sequence is possible, the order Hippothontis X/, Hadrianis VII (*ter*)/ Oineis VIII (*bis*)/ Kekropis IX (*quater*)/ Hippothontis X (*ter*) appears to be the more convincing one (as also below). It should be also mentioned here that there is an attempt in 2046 to group the ephebes by tribe. Ephebes of Aiantis appear in lines 34-37, and of Erechtheis in 38-40, although there are also irregularities. An ephebe of Aiantis is listed in line 32 between two ephebes of Antiochis and Attalis (lines 31 and 33 respectively), where tribal order was almost achieved (Antiochis/ Aiantis/ Attalis=Aiantis/ Antiochis/ Attalis). Other scattered about ephebes are those of Hadrianis (line 30)⁸², Oineis (line 44), Hippo-

80. *Ibid.*, No. 845. In line 19 (*ad fin.*) the demotic ΦΛΥ(εύς) is inscribed after Τρικο- (ρύσιος), but it does not appear to go with line 20. It is probably a casual addition, especially since the ΦΛΥ letters are larger than the preceding IKO. Moreover, they are not too deeply cut, as established from a partial squeeze (sent by M. Th. Mitsos).

81. For example, 2128, lines 101-102 (184/5), and 2207, lines 27-28 (210/1-211/2 = this writer). Cf. also 2068, lines 102-104 (155/6), with 2097, line 223, and *Agora XV*, No. 380, lines 50-51 (169/70). However, in 2086, lines 86-87 (163/4), the Antonii are from different demes (dissertation [note 43 above], Nos 972 and 977). See also 2041 (above), lines 14-15.

82. The ephebe is an *Οα(θεν).

thontis (line 17, mentioned above) and Attalis (line 43). Furthermore, Markellos Th. Mitsos has established that 2046 is part of $2248 + 2001 = \text{'A}\rho\chi. \text{'E}\varphi\eta\mu. 1950/1, \text{p. 28, No. 13, and } per litteras. This means that 2046, occupying the left side, is anterior to 2248 + 2001 which probably dates from shortly before 140. Finally, the recognition that Hadrianis was in existence when 2046 was inscribed facilitates the attribution of No. 321 (above) to the period before that ephebic document.$

Before summarizing some of the preceding discussion, there are six other documents which bear on Hadrianis and should also be considered here. The first one is *Agora XV*, No. 456, which this writer had attributed to about 134/5-144/5⁸³. However, later developments calling for a reconsideration of the family's stemma would place the prytany catalogue to about 187⁸⁴. There are also 3116-3119⁸⁵ which are probably later than 130/1. At least 3117 = *TAPA LXVIII* (1937) 80⁸⁶ dates after 130/1, as it alludes to the Antinoeia ([ἄθλοισ θε]οειδέος Ἀ[ντινό]ο[το])⁸⁷ in line 3. Moreover, in 3117 and 3118 the name Tryphon appears (lines 6 and 8 respectively), and this suggests that the two documents are apparently from the same period. On the other hand, 3118 dates from a year in which the archon's name consisted of five letters (line 7 *ad init.*). This brings to mind (Aelius) Ardys of 150/1⁸⁸, and his name would fit metrically. Of course, the name of some other archon could have been there, but the suggestion is in harmony with chronology, as 3117 has been attributed above. There is a possibility that 3119 may also date from the same period as 3117 and 3118, but this is contingent upon the correct reading of line 5⁸⁹. The last document to be considered here is *Agora XV*, No. 428, whose Face A dates from 137/8-159/60⁹⁰, but what concerns us here is Face B and to what tribe it belongs. Face B

83. *'Aρχ. 'Eφημ.* 1968, 208: Dositheos (III), Heraklides (II).

84. *Τάλαντα* 6 (1975) 28-29; (Herakleid)es and (Thales) Pambotadai were ephebes about 173 (= *'Aρχ. 'Eφημ.* 1968, 203-204, lines 6, 8). See note 83 above.

85. S. Follet, 125.

86. Re-edited by Malcolm MacLaren, Jr., with a translation, commentary and photograph (78-83).

87. The reading Ἀ[ντινό]ο[το] is favored. For the Antinoeia, see the discussion about 2046 above.

88. *'Aρχ. Δελτίον* 26 (1971=1972) 285, No. 7; and also Nos 26 and 27.

89. From a reading in B. D. Meritt's *IG II²* copy at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (copied in August 1970): [η]ϋλει TO. Perhaps [η]ϋλει Τρ[ύφων]; or [η]ϋλει τό [---]? Line 1: [θε]οῖν ἐξηγ[ητής]. (S)ertorio(s) [line 4] may be the ephebe in 2022, line 14 (M. Th. Mitsos: [Ὀν]ώριος in *'Aρχ. Δελτίον* 25 [1970] 190, No. 9).

90. Or before 160/1. Cf. *Hesp.* 47 (1978) 330.

could have perhaps a bearing on the creation of Hadrianis, as the restoration of the *lemma* Πα[μβωτάδαι] in line 14 would indicate that the deme Pambotadai was still in the tribe Erechtheis. However, the restoration Πα[λληνηεῖς] was adopted in *Agora XV*, but it does not seem to be a satisfactory solution. An examination of the photograph in *Hesperia*⁹¹ has shown that the second letter of the fragmentary demotic is probably Λ rather than Α, as the surviving upper part resembles the lambda of line 9 and bears no resemblance to the alphas therein. Moreover, the preserved part of the left stroke does not seem to support the existence of a horizontal bar. Consequently, if this is correct, the demotic to be restored in line 14 is Πα[ωθεῖς] and the catalogue is to be assigned to the tribe Aigeis. The demotic Ἀν[---] (line 3) may be read, then, as Ἀν[κυλεῖς]. In any case, Face B dates from at least the latter years of Hadrian's reign, as there is an Aelius in line 8 (above) and the *cives* are grouped together under their respective deme *lemma*⁹². This method of listing the *cives* in the prytany catalogues appears to have been a Hadrianic adoption, as observed above about No. 322.

Such then is the evidence and in reviewing some of the arguments, it can be said that there is evidence to suggest that the creation of the Boule of 500 preceded that of Hadrianis, as indicated by No. 321 (above). The reform of the Boule may have been affected by 124/5, if not by 121/2 (above)⁹³. Moreover, Hadrianis' existence can be traced, it appears, to the years 132/3-134/5 through 2041 and 2046, even though other ephebic texts confuse matters at times, as illustrated above. The ephebate, on the other hand, may not have undergone a thorough reform under Hadrian, as things don't settle down until 145/6 (below). However, some procedures became standard under Hadrian, such as the adoption of listing the ephebes as πρωτένγραφοι-ἐπένγραφοι or "with demotic-without demotic". This method has its precedents in 1996 of 91/2 ([π]ολεῖται, Μειλήσιοι in line 23, 92) and 2017 of about 103/4-106/7 (πρωτένγραφοι, [ἐπέν]νγραφοι in lines 11, 44). By 142/3 the ephebes were being listed "by tribe-ἐπένγραφοι", although the previous method was not abandoned immediately (above).

The ephebate underwent also other changes under Hadrian and the early years of Antoninus Pius, or before 145/6. In 2018 of the early or latter part of Hadrian's reign (above) the officer in charge of the Diogeneion made

91. 16 (1947) 180, No. 84 (Plate 35). B is later than A; their scripts differ.

92. Line 9 may read Ἀπολ[ήτιος---], a very rare *nomen* in Attica.

93. The Boule must have been reformed first to carry out the reforms. Cf. J. A. Notoopoulos, *TAPA* 77 (1946) 56, note 9; and P. Graindor (note 18 above) 83. See also S. Follet, 119.

his appearance (line 142). Then in 2047 of 140/1 there is the evidence that the ephebes were being divided into *systemmata* (line 7)⁹⁴. Moreover, previously those in charge of the ephebes were listed under the *lemma* παιδευταί. However, this designation was abandoned (above), and in 139/40 we have the first attestation of six σωφρονισταί in 2044, lines 2-9. The ὑποσωφρονισταί are not attested until 142/3, but they number only two, as found in 2049, lines 150-153⁹⁵. This would imply that the office of the *hyposophronistai* was a fresh creation, but 2102 = Simone Follet, *Athènes* (1976) 384-385, No. 5, lines 50-54, of about 171/2-175/6 has only four [ὑποσω]φρονισταί listed, and presumably four [σωφρονισταί], too (names lost). Four *sophronistai* and four *hyposophronistai* may possibly be recorded in 2248 + 2001 = 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1950/1, p. 27, No. 13, lines 6-9 and 10-12⁹⁶, of shortly before 140 (above). If this is possible, then the *hyposophronistai* must have been created together with the *sophronistai*, that is, before 142/3 (above). At any rate, by 145/6 the *hyposophronistai* numbered six, as testified by 2054, lines 12-18 (one name lost)⁹⁷.

The ἀντικοσμητεία deserves also some comment here within the context of the ephebate's reform. The title ἀντικοσμήτης is attested from 145/6 and on⁹⁸, but before this twice the title ὑποκοσμήτης is found in 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ. 1977 (1979), after p. 16, text "A", Col. II, line 101, of about 140 or shortly after (above)⁹⁹, and 2047, line 10, of 140/1. It is also attested still earlier in 2037, line 6 (two *hypokosmetai*), of about 111/2¹⁰⁰. The same title is to be restored undoubtedly in 2022, line 3 (*ad init.*): [ὑποκοσμή]της, in place of the old restoration [ἀντικοσμή]της (of about 114/5). The title ἀντικ[οσμήτης] has been restored also in 2046 (above), line 82, but an examination of a squeeze favors the reading 'Αντ(ώνιος) Η(or K)[---]¹⁰¹. Between the T and H (or K) there is a vertical abbreviation mark which is short and can be misread as an iota.

94. Cf. *AJA* 79 (1975) 370.

95. Cf. also Oscar W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (1971) 120; and Chrysis Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (1962) 107.

96. From a photograph (see note 9 above).

97. Lines 2-3 have been corrected in 'Αρχ. Δελτίον 30 (1975=1978) 124. The title *pai-deutai* was no longer in use (see above); 2036, line 2: [παιδευ]ταί = [σωφρονισ]ταί.

98. 2054, line 4: ἀντικοσμή[της --- ---].

99. Perhaps this document lists two *hypokosmetai* (lines 102-103), even though the title is singular (line 101; the *upsilon* is partially visible).

100. As determined by this writer; see 'Ελληνικά 29 (1976) 262.

101. See note 9 above.

Finally, the systematization of the ephebate in the first half of the second century (before 145/6) can be observed also in the παιδοτριβία, which came to be occupied by “tenured” paidotribes¹⁰². Demetrios son of Isigenes Rhamnousios was paidotribe from 111/2 or 112/3 to probably 135/6¹⁰³, having succeeded Ariston son of Aphrodeisios Rhamnousios who was in office from about 99/100 to 112/3¹⁰⁴. Then Abaskantos son of Eumolpos Kephisieus followed from 136/7 to 170/1¹⁰⁵.

102. Moreover, the first ὑποπαιδοτρίβης in this period is attested in 2018, lines 145-146 (see note 64 above).

103. Cf. S. Follet, 206.

104. *Ἑλληνικά* note 100 above; cf. also S. Follet, 466 and 468.

105. *Clas. Phil.* 65 (1970) 97-98.