

## V.—The Date of the Creation of Hadrianis

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

The discovery that Ferguson's law is operative in Athens also under the Roman Empire<sup>1</sup> furnishes us with a new approach and provides new evidence as to the precise date of the creation of Hadrianis. If we rotate the tribal cycles backward from 167/8, in which Oeneis (VIII) holds the prytany secretaryship, then Ptolemais (v) should hold that office in 138/9. This is corroborated by the secretary *Χρυσόγονος Φλυεύς* (Ptolemais v) in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1765, an inscription dated independently in 138/9 by the fact that *Πραξαγόρας* (I) *Θορίκιος* is archon in the fifteenth year of the era of Hadrian (124/5). This coincidence not only validates the tribal cycle but also furnishes us with the date of the creation of Hadrianis. For if we rotate the tribal cycles backward from 138/9 the position for Hadrianis (VII) is 127/8, which year marks the inauguration of Hadrianis in the tribal cycle.

We must not, however, assume that Hadrianis was conceived and created almost simultaneously. We have valuable light on this in Pritchett's and Meritt's study of the creation of Antigonis and Demetrias. They have shown that there was an interval between the planning of the tribes and their actual functioning. Antigonis and Demetrias were projected in 308/7 but did not begin to function until the middle of 307/6.

In determining the date of the creation of Hadrianis and the change in the Council from 600 to 500 we find valuable help in examining the problems involved in the creation of the Macedonian tribes. The problems become clear in the following discussion of the creation of Antigonis and Demetrias by Pritchett and Meritt. "Not until then [Maimakterion, 307/6] was the allocation of demes completed and not until then could the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias, newly constituted, take their place in a 12-fold instead of a 10-fold division of the Council, which itself was increased in membership from five to six hundred. This fact that these tribes began to function relatively late in the year does not prove a

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Notopoulos, "Ferguson's Law in Athens under the Empire," *AJPh* 64 (1943) 44-65.

similarly late date for the decision which led to their formation. Rather, with the decision already reached in 308/7, it gives some indication of the amount of time and effort necessary to carry through the separation of the demes from their old allegiances and to bring about the first selection of councillors in the new order. The wishes of all demes and of the old tribes must have been consulted and their differences of opinion harmonized. Some kind of survey and balancing of populations must have been undertaken so that the Macedonian tribes might be approximately of the same strength as the others. Perhaps it is more remarkable that so little, and not so much, time elapsed before the new order began to function in the composition of the Council. This could have been brought about only after all demes were assigned and necessary supplementary appointments made to bring the total representation up to six hundred."<sup>2</sup>

This shows plainly the necessity of positing the interval of one year between the creation of a tribe and its functioning, and especially in the case of the Athenians in Hadrian's time who had no experience in the creation of a new tribe. We must therefore put the date of the creation of Hadrianis in 126/7. That it cannot be placed earlier is evident from the following consideration.

Neubauer, followed by Kolbe and Kirchner,<sup>3</sup> has contended that the new tribe could not have been created prior to the time when the intercalated month *Ποσειδεῶν β'* was changed to *Ἀδριανίων*. Since *Ποσειδεῶν β'* is last mentioned in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.2037, dated 125/6, in the archonship of Julius Cassius, the creation of Hadrianis must be dated after 125/6.<sup>4</sup> This leaves 126/7 as the year of its creation.

<sup>2</sup> W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940) 10; cf. *AJPh* 58 (1937) 220-222; cf. also Dinsmoor's exception in *AJA* 49 (1945) 614-615.

<sup>3</sup> F. Neubauer, *Comment. epigr.* 19; W. Kolbe, "Studien zur Attischen Chronologie der Kaiserzeit," *Ath. Mitt.* 46 (1921) 121; *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.2037, note. In a definitive study of Greek and Roman honorific months K. Scott has shown that we have a precedent in Athens for the creation of a new tribe, of an honorific month and of the creation of games, all in honor of a visiting celebrity. "The honorific month," says Scott, "seems to have been of Athenian origin. It is not surprising that Athens, which was noted for its flatterers, should have devised this means of granting Demetrius divine honor, and in connection with the month we find games decreed him as well as a new tribe of which he was made eponymous hero." (K. Scott, "Greek and Roman Honorific Months," *Yale Classical Studies* 2 [1931] 273.) Scott dates the creation of Demetrium in 307/6; cf. Scott, *op. cit.* 201.

<sup>4</sup> Graindor has now agreed to Kolbe's date of this archon; cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934) 29.

We are now in a position to reconstruct the chronology of the creation of Hadrianis.

The inception of the idea to create a new tribe must be connected with Hadrian's visit to Athens in the fall of 124 and the spring of 125. Because the Athenians were inexperienced with the creation of a new tribe, the year 125/6 must have been devoted to discussion and planning the new tribe, to the relation of the new tribe to the size of the Council, to the position of the new tribe in the official order.<sup>5</sup> In particular we get a glimpse of the difficulties involved in considering the relation of the 13 tribes to the size of the Council. The size of the new Council was 500, a number no doubt determined by the archaizing tendencies of this period which went back to Kleisthenes for its model. The previous number of 600 was determined by 50 councillors from each of the 12 tribes. With 13 tribes and the reduction of the Council to 500 what was to be the policy in determining the number of councillors from each of the tribes?<sup>6</sup> Such a problem gives us an inkling into the complexities involved in the creation of Hadrianis. We may assume then that 125/6 was devoted to discussion and 126/7 to the creation of the new tribe. This year was occupied not only with the problems pointed out in the case of the Macedonian tribes but also with determining the calendar for the next year; how many days were to be allotted to each of the thirteen prytanies; the election of the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* a month before the end of the year. In 127/8 Hadrianis began to function, and by coincidence Hadrian, when he arrived for the second time in Athens at the close of the year (August 128),<sup>7</sup> witnessed in operation an honor conceived on the occasion of his first visit.

Thus the creation of Hadrianis and the changes in the size of the Council can no longer be dated in 125 A.D. with Graindor or 128/9 with Kolbe and Kirchner.<sup>8</sup> We may therefore assign 126/7

<sup>5</sup> For the position of Hadrianis in the tribal order, cf. W. K. Pritchett, *The Five Attic Tribes After Kleisthenes* (Baltimore, 1943) 13, note 1. The fact that Ptolemais was made seventh in the order of thirteen tribes is of importance as a precedent in seeking the reason for the seventh position of Hadrianis.

<sup>6</sup> For Graindor's explanation of the number of councillors after the creation of the thirteenth tribe, cf. Graindor, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 83 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Graindor, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 37. The evidence shows the error in assuming that the creation of the tribe must be connected specifically with the first or second visit of Hadrian. Changes in Athens may owe their impulse to his visit but they did not appear full-blown. Rather they show development over a period of time.

<sup>8</sup> Graindor, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 18 ff.; Kolbe, *l.c.* (see note 3) 121-123; notes on *IG* 2<sup>3</sup>.2021, 2037, 3287, 4210.

as the date of the creation of Hadrianis and the Council of 500<sup>9</sup> and 127/8 as the year when they began to function. Thus the touchstone of Ferguson's law enables us to determine accurately the date of Hadrianis and the constitutional changes associated with it.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The reduction of the Council and the creation of a new tribe are not necessarily connected. The archaizing tendency may have led the Athenians to reduce the Council to 500, the size in Kleisthenes' time. The fact that 500 is not perfectly divisible by 13 tribes leads us to infer that the creation of a new tribe and the change in the Council were not thought of together. They may be conceived of as distinct in origin yet as overlapping in the carrying out. The two had to be worked out together in practice as the Macedonian tribes show, and to all intents and purposes the date of the change of the size of the Council must be related to the date of the creation of Hadrianis.

<sup>10</sup> The creation of Hadrianis in 126/7 and its inauguration in the tribal cycle in 127/8 shows that we must associate with these dates *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.4210, which first mentions the Council of 500. This inscription honors L. Aemilius Juncus, consul suffectus in 127 A.D., who went on a mission to Achaia as *πρεσβευτὴς Σεβαστοῦ καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος*. The evidence as to the date of the creation of Hadrianis and the change in the size of the Council shows that we cannot agree with Graindor who puts Juncus' mission to Greece prior to 127 and connects it with his praetorship. We can now interpret his mission as consular and suppose with Mommsen, Dittenberger, Kolbe and Kirchner that this mission was extraordinary (for references cf. Graindor, *op. cit.* [see note 4] 22, notes 6-8; *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.2021, 4210, notes). The date of this inscription therefore should be 127/8 or after, as should be the case with all other inscriptions which mention the Council of 500.