

NICHOLAS V. SEKUNDA

THE KYLLOI AND EUBIOTOI OF HYPATA DURING THE IMPERIAL PERIOD

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 207–226

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE KYLLOI AND EUBIOTOI OF HYPATA DURING THE IMPERIAL PERIOD

Introduction

The aristocratic families of Thessaly during the Roman Period have generally been studied only in the context of attempts to work out the sequence in which the office of *strategos* of the Thessalian League was held. The first important work devoted to this subject was that of Kroog. An exception is an article of Larsen, published in 1953, which brings together the evidence concerning a Hypatan family which used the names Eubiotos and Kyllos. Since the appearance of Larsen's work, however, much work has been done, especially by Helly and Kramolisch, to achieve a more accurate dating of individual Thessalian *strategoí*, and hence of individual Thessalian inscriptions in which the names Kyllos and Eubiotos appear. In addition, Larsen's article omits some material which might usefully be discussed.

In the context of my work for the forthcoming volume III of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, which will include the Thessalian material, I have been able to re-examine the evidence for this family. I believe that the picture which emerges of an important Thessalian family increasingly involved in the cultural and liturgical life of Roman Greece, is worth studying. The *stemma* (opposite) which has been worked out for this family is reasonably secure for the later members of the family, but future work on the first centuries before and after Christ may well necessitate revision. In particular, work on the federal coinage of the Thessalian League, which is as yet uncompletely understood, may lead to significant revision of the picture outlined here. It should be stressed that several of the relationships suggested in this article are hypothetical and unsupported by any firm evidence and consequently do not appear in the *Lexicon*, which only records attested relationships¹.

The abbreviations used in this article are those used in the *LGPN*, with the following additions:

- Helly, *Gonnoi* Bruno Helly, *Gonnoi I & II* (Amsterdam 1973)
 Kramolisch Herwig Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des Thessalischen Bundes vom Jahr 196 v. Chr. bis zum Ausgang der Römischen Republik = Demetrias II (Die Deutschen Archäologischen Forschungen in Thessalien* (Bonn 1978)
 Kroog Wilhelm Kroog, *De foederis Thessalorum praetoribus* (Diss. Hall. 1908)
 Larsen J. A. O. Larsen, A Thessalian family under the Principate, *Classical Philology* 48 (1953) 86–95.
 Rogers E. Rogers, *The Copper Coinage of Thessaly* (1932).

The personal name Kyllos, meaning 'Bandy-legs', is a very rare personal name, which is seemingly almost entirely confined to Thessaly and to this family (cf. Kramolisch p. 109 n. 17, p. 126 n. 19). Apart from within the context of this family the personal name is rare. A *Κύλος* is mentioned as hipparch in an inscription from Lamia dating to *circa* 218/7 BC (*Syll.*³ 532, 14). Another *Κύλλος*, son of Aristonikos, a citizen of Phthiotic Thebes, is mentioned in a register of emancipations dating to ?47/6 BC (*IG IX (2)* 109 a 7). A female version of the name, *Κύλλα* occurs on a third century BC tomb on Corcyra (*SEG XXV* 614). These examples are, however, sporadic, and all could in any case have some connection with the family under study. The name Eubiotos, however, whilst it seems to be a name with particularly Thessalian associations, is less rare, and one should avoid the temptation of including all individuals of this name within a family tree. It would be legitimate to believe, however, that all individuals of this name holding high office in Thessaly may well be related to this distinguished Hypataian family.

¹ I would like to thank Mr. P.M. Fraser and Dr. A.J.S. Spawforth for reading through the manuscript of this article for me. I nevertheless claim responsibility for all mistakes and misinterpretations present. I would also like to thank Richard Catling for his patience in answering queries in relation to this article after my departure from Oxford.

The family came from the Aineanian city of Hypata, which increasingly became the most important Thessalian city during the Imperial period, eventually displacing even Larissa, as we are informed by both literary texts (Apuleius, *The Golden Ass* 1.5; 1.24; 2.19) and by the archaeological remains (cf. Stavroula Rozaki in *AAA* 16 (1983) pp. 132-142). Augustus gave a number of Thessalian cities, including Meliteia, Hypata, Lamia and Larissa (*SEG* III 466 b; *FD* III (4) p. 96; *BCH* 99 (1975) p. 125–127), the right to designate themselves “Augusta”, which they continued to do during the first century AD and possibly beyond. The leading families of Hypata came to play an increasingly significant role in the social and cultural life of Thessaly and of Greece as a whole. Titos Flavios Alexandros, a sophist and *strategos* of the Thessalian *koinon* in the Hadrianic period, and the slightly earlier figure of Petraios, are but two other examples².

The Aineanian League

Ainis was a member of the Aetolian League down till 168 BC, at which date it was constituted as an independent *koinon*, and it seems to have preserved its independence until it was incorporated into the Thessalian League. Pausanias (10.8.3) tells us that Augustus included the Magnesians, Malians, Ainianes and Phthioties with the Thessalians on the Delphic Amphictyony, and transferred their votes, together with the votes of the Dolopians, to the city of Nikopolis, which he had founded after Actium. It is generally thought, consequently, that the incorporation of Ainis within the Thessalian *koinon* took place shortly after Actium (Kramolisch, p. 14).

Two considerations, however, demonstrate that Actium should be regarded as a *terminus ante quem* only. First an inscription has been recovered from Hypata (*IG* IX (2) 12) which is dated to the *strategia* of one Ital[os]. An Italos son of Philiskos of Gortyn is known to have held the *strategia* around 46/5 BC (Kramolisch, p. 114–115, G4). Kramolisch disassociates this Italos from the Italos of the Hypata inscription, precisely on the grounds that Ainis was not incorporated into the Thessalian League after Actium. He accepts that Italos is of the same family, however, and this causes difficulty in the family tree presented on page 34. I suggest that the inscription from Hypata does, in fact, mention the same individual, and that it therefore dates to circa 46/5 BC. Furthermore the names Eubiotos and Eukolos, presumably belonging to members of the important family from Hypata under discussion in this article, appear on coins of the Thessalian League issued earlier than 31 BC. Consequently it might be more plausible to suggest that the incorporation of Ainis within the Thessalian League took place either after the Battle of Pharsalus in 48 BC, or at an even earlier date. The latest surviving inscription attesting the Ainianian League was dated to circa 62 BC by Pomtow, and the date of incorporation could fall at any time between 62 and 30 BC³.

[1] (?)Kyllos (Κύλλος)

It shall be suggested in the text below that, if Eubiotos [No. 2] and Eukolos [No. 3] are brothers, their father, in the family tradition, may have been called Kyllos. This Kyllos should date to the middle of the first century BC.

[1a] Coins of the Thessalian League have been recovered bearing the dual names Κύλλου (gen.) and Πετραῖος (nom.) on them. It is generally assumed that Kyllos, whose name appears in the genitive, must be the *strategos*. Issues appear both in bronze (Münsterberg p. 33; *SNG EVELPIDIS* 1659; *SNG AARHUS* 515) and as silver double victoriatas (E.S.G. Robinson, *NC* 1936, p. 177 no. 18; *SNG COP* 282; *SNG*

² Cf. J. Pouilloux, Une famille de sophistes thessaliens à Delphes au IIe s. ap. J.-C., *RÉG* 80 (1967) p. 379–84; *FD* III (4) 474, 3; *SEG* XXXVI 545 c.

³ Pomtow, *Klio* 17 (1921) 186; Georg Busolt & H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* II (1926) p. 1496 n. 1. See also *Syll.*³ 743 n. 1 where the *koinon* of the Ainianes honours Lucullus with a statue circa 88–80 BC.

Lockett 1623). Rogers (p. 21 no. 27) thought that these coins might be Hellenistic in date, and one example has been found in a coin hoard together with Roman *denarii* which date the issue to after 49 BC, and, in all probability, around the year 44 BC (Helly, *Rev. Num.* NS 8 (1966) p. 8 no. 5). Franke (*Schweizer Münzblätter* 35 (1959) p. 63 no. 3 & p. 66) identified Petraios with the supporter of Caesar executed with the approval of Antony in 44 BC (Kramolisch G5). Consequently Helly, with reference to the same coin (*loc. cit.* p. 12) identified the *strategos* Kyllos recorded on the coin with the Kyllos later dated by Kramolisch (H¹ 1) to after c. 30, but pointed out that the *strategia* of Kyllos must be earlier. He placed it in the middle of the first century.

It should be noted that no Kyllos is attested to have held the *strategia* from epigraphic sources before the end of the first century [No.5]. This coin and its magistrate-name must, therefore, be considered to some degree “unassignable” to any individual according to the current state of our knowledge. I tentatively assign it to the putative father of Eubiotos and Eukolos, but we could equally easily postulate an individual from a collateral branch of the family using the name Kyllos.

[1b] The name Κύλλου (gen.), together with Πετραῖος (nom.) appears on the reverse of coins bearing the name Νικοκράτους (gen.) on the obverse (Münsterberg p. 33). Nikokrates is presumably the *strategos*, and can presumably be identified with Nikokrates (?of Scotussa), who, according to Kramolisch (G7), perhaps held the *strategia* after 44 BC. If this association is correct, given that the name Petraios also appears on these coins, the *strategia* of Nikokrates should perhaps be dated earlier.

[2] Eubiotos [Larsen p. 87 no. 1] (Εὐβίωτος)

[2a] An individual called Eubiotos appears as a *strategos* in a manumission document from Hypata (*IG IX (2) 19, 3*). In a second section of this inscription one Polykritos is named as *strategos*. Starting with Kroog (p. 41; Larsen p. 89 no. 5;) scholars have identified this Polykritos with the Flavios Polykritos named as *strategos* for the second time in *IG IX (2) 256 b, 1*. However Arvanitopoulos (*AE 1910, col. 363*) noted that the letter-forms of the Hypataian inscription indicated a date very much earlier than the Flavian period.

In fact it seems probable that the Polykritos mentioned as *strategos* in the Hypataian inscription is to be identified with Polykritos son of Menandros of Larissa, who is shown as Polykritos III in the *stemma* of the family given by Kramolisch (p. 26). This Polykritos is named as a victor in a bull-fighting competition in a Larissaian inscription (*IG IX (2) 536, 16*) dating to the first half of the first century BC (cf. Kramolisch p. 116 nt. 74). It would be reasonable to suppose that Polykritos was rather young when he participated in the bullfight, and therefore that he held the post of *strategos* some time around the middle of the first century BC. The *strategia* of Eubiotos, therefore, will have fallen around the same time.

[2b] A bronze coin of the Thessalian *koinon* has been recovered bearing the *strategos*-name Εὐβιώτου (in the genitive) together with the name Πετραῖος (nom.). Rogers (p. 27 no. 58) dated this coin to 48-27 BC, and therefore Petraios can safely be identified with the *strategos* Petraios son of Themistogenes of Gyrton (Kramolisch G5). Petraios, when a young man, had energetically supported Caesar in the years 49 and 48 BC (Caes., *BC* 3. 35). Given that Petraios was executed by Brutus in 44 BC with the approval of M. Antonius (Cic., *Phil.* 13. 33), this coin cannot have been issued any later, and so Eubiotos must have held the Thessalian *strategia* in 44 BC or before. (*Coll. Hunter* I 458; Münsterberg p. 33; *NC* 1898, pl. xix, 1; *HN²* p. 312; *Coll. McClean* 4991; *SNG Cop.* 330; *SNG Evelpidis* 1663).

[2c] A bronze coin of the Thessalian *koinon*, thought to be hellenistic in date, bears the names Νικοκράτ[ης?] and Εὐβιώτου (gen.) on the reverse. Eubiotos is presumably the *strategos* name, and can perhaps be identified with our No. 2, while Nikokrates can perhaps be identified with an individual of the same name who held the *strategia* around the 40s (Kramolisch G7). For the date cf. Head (*HN²* p. 312, 196-

146 BC) and Rogers (56, Imperial times?). (Münsterberg p. 33; *Col. McClean* 4988; p. 312; *SNG Cop* 329 *SNG Evelpidis* 1662).

[2d] Another bronze issue of the Thessalian *koinon* is inscribed with the names Φιλοξένου (gen.) and Εὐβί[οτος?]. The issue is dated to ?48-27 BC by Rogers (p. 27 no. 57), and the *strategos*-name Philoxenos appears to be new (not to be identified with *AE* 1917 p. 21 no. 312, 10). Consequently, if the second name has been restored correctly, this Eubiotos can perhaps be associated with the individual whose name appears as *strategos* on other coins of this period.

[2e] Coins bearing the *strategos*-name Εὐβιότου (gen.) and the name Σ[ώ]πατρος (nom.) are mentioned by Münsterberg (p. 33), who gives them no date and tells us nothing further about the coins. Eubiotos could, therefore, be identified with our No. 1, or perhaps with No. 4. Sopatros is perhaps a moneyer, and it might be possible to identify him with the Sopatros who had held the *strategia* of the Thessalian League at a slightly earlier date (Kramolisch F2).

[2f] Eubiotos also appears as a legend on a coin of the Ainiianian Federal League (*NC* 1936, p. 181-2 no. 28), presumably holding the office of Ainiarch. Two possible ways of interpreting this Ainiianian issue seem to emerge. Firstly it is possible that this Ainiianian issue could have been struck by the Eubiotos under discussion here, when holding the office of Ainiarch, at some date before the incorporation of Ainis into the Thessalian League. The chronology of the federal coinage of the Ainiianian League has not been established yet, but it may have continued well into the first century BC (*NC* 1936, p.181-2 no. 28). Eubiotos' Thessalian issues would have been struck soon after the incorporation of Ainis, when he would have held the office of *strategos* of the Thessalian League, so his Ainiianian issues would be slightly earlier in date. A second possibility, however, is that the Ainiianian issues were struck well before, by an earlier generation of the same family, and indeed a possible date in the early first century BC has also been put forward for these coins (Jennifer A. W. Warren, *NC* 1961, p. 8 n. 1).

We need have no doubt that this Eubiotos came from Hypata. Helly (*Rev. Num.* NS 8 (1966) p. 20 n.1) has suggested that he is the father of Eukolos [No. 3], father of Eubiotos [No. 4]. However this is somewhat speculative, and would require our Eubiotos, his son Eukolos, his grandson Eubiotos, and his great-grandson Kyllos all to have held the *strategia* of the League between the middle and end of the first century BC. In order to accommodate all these members of the family within a credible time-scale, I propose that we should consider Eubiotos to be an elder brother of Eukolos, rather than his father. The father of the two may have been called Kyllos (see No. 1 above), but this is highly speculative. If these speculations are correct, it may well be that Eubiotos died without issue, and that his younger brother Eukolos and his son Eubiotos carried on the line.

[3] Eukolos father of Eubiotos (Εὐκόλος)

Eukolos is named as the natural father of Eubiotos in three inscriptions [No. 4a, c, d].

[3a] A number of coins of the Thessalian League have been recovered linking the names Πολυξένου (gen.) and Εὐκόλος (nom.) (*BMC Thessaly to Aetolia* p.2 no.21). One presumes that in this case it is Polyxenos who is *strategos*, his name being in the genitive, while Eukolos, whose name is in the nominative, will have been a magistrate of lesser status, such as a *tamias*, who was responsible for the issue of the coinage. This is, however, uncertain. As in the circumstances outlined in [1a] above, an example of this issue has been found in a hoard with Roman *denarii*, indicating a date of after 49 and around 44 BC for the issue.

[3b] Other coins have been found bearing the names Εὐκόλος (nom.) and Ἀντίγονος (nom.) (*NC* 1936, p. 176 no. 15; *SNG Copenhagen* 272). These are more difficult to interpret, but one assumes that it is

Eukolos who is the *strategos*. This issue has been dated to around the middle of the first century BC (Helly, *Rev. Num.* 1966, p. 19 no. 3).

[4] Eubiotos son of Eukolos [Larsen p. 87–88 no. 2; Kramolisch p. 121–123 No. G 13] (Εὐβίωτος τοῦ Εὐκόλου).

[4a] *AE* 1917, p. 25 no. 313, 12. This inscription is a catalogue of manumissions, one section of which is dated by the *strategia* of Eubiotos, son of Eukolos by birth, and son of Klearchos son of Hegesaretos of Larissa by adoption (ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦ Εὐβιότου τοῦ Εὐκόλου, καθ' ὑποίαν δὲ Κλεάρχου τοῦ Ἡγησαρέτου Λαρισαίου). This Klearchos is Klearchos V on Kramolisch's *stemma* of the family of Klearchos of Larissa (p. 26). The father of Klearchos, Hegesaretos, is mentioned by Cicero and Caesar, and was prominent from 63 to 49 BC (Kramolisch, p. 100–102 no. F8). Klearchos himself, therefore, would hardly have been active before the middle of the century, nor would the adoption have taken place before this time, and so the *strategia* of Eubiotos son of Eukolos is hardly likely to have taken place much before the last quarter of the first century BC.

It would be tempting to connect the adoption of the heir of the principal family, using the names Kylllos and Eubiotos, from Hypata in Ainis by the important Larissaian family of the Klearchoi with the absorption of the Ainianian League into the Thessalian League. It should be noted, however, that any such suggestion has to be placed in a wider Thessalian context. The end of the first century BC saw a very large number of adoptions in Thessaly, including a large number of adoptions into Larissaian families, which have been commented on by Helly (*BCH* 99 (1975) p. 127). Undoubtedly the prime motive of these adoptions was financial.

[4b] The same individual, this time without patronymic, appears as a *strategos* in a manumission document from Pherai (*IG IX* (2) 415 a, 38). This inscription lists emancipations from a number of years in succession, and the entry under the *strategia* of Eubiotos is followed by an entry dated by the *strategia* of Augustus. Kramolisch (p. 121–123) points out that since the title Augustus was only adopted by Octavian in January 27 BC, his Thessalian *strategia* cannot be earlier, and in all probability dates to the year 27 (cf. Helly, *Gonnoi* 1 p. 127). The *strategia* of Eubiotos, therefore, must be earlier than 27 BC. It should be noted that the emancipation payments are made in staters in this inscription (lines 13, 27, 40), which include that section of the inscription dated to the *strategia* of Eubiotos. In the latter section the emancipation payment is made in *denarii* at line 58, or alternatively in either staters or *denarii* at line 85–90. This is one of the few Thessalian inscriptions listing emancipations which is firmly dated by the listing of Augustus as *strategos*. It would seem, therefore, that *denarii* started to replace staters in these inscriptions about 27 BC, in other words that the Thessalian league suspended the issue of staters in that year.⁴

[4c] *IG IX* (2) 549, 6 is another emancipation catalogue, from Larissa, in which “Eubiotos son of Eukolos by birth and son of Klearchos son of Hegesaretos by adoption” is mentioned as serving as *tagos* in the city of Larissa. Of course Eubiotos is only holding the office of *tagos* at Larissa through his adoptive Larissaian citizenship, and there is no reason to dissociate Eubiotos son of Eukolos from the Hypataian family of the Kyllloi and Eubiotoi. Sums paid over to the city in this emancipation document are reckoned in *denarii*, and so it would be reasonable to date it near the end of the first century BC.

[4d] *AE* 1930, p. 177, 16. This emancipation catalogue from Larissa is dated to the *strategia* of Eurydamas son of Androsthenes, which has been placed in the year 26/5 BC or thereabouts⁵. the date is

⁴ Franke p. 67; ed. Denis Knoepfler, *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque, Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en honneur de Jacques Tréheux* (1988) pp. 283–4.

⁵ Stählin, *AE* 1931 p. 180; Helly, *Gonnoi* I p. 127, II p. 137; Kramolisch p. 129–130 no. H¹ 3.

not absolutely certain, but the use of staters in the inscription indicates a date after 27 BC. Eubiotos son of Eukolos is named as holding the office of gymnasiarch at Larissa. We can, therefore, assign this document to the same individual who is mentioned in the three inscriptions above with complete certainty.

All four documents above can be assigned to the same individual, Eubiotos son of Eukolos, either because the name is given in full or because of chronological considerations. The documents listed below can only be associated with him conjecturally.

[4e] As well as his first *strategia* held shortly before 27 BC, it would seem that Eubiotos son of Eukolos also held the office of *strategos* for a second term. A catalogue of emancipations from Larissa (*IG IX* (2) 541, 11) is dated to the year “when Eubiotos was *strategos* a second time” (Εὐβιότου τὸ δεύτερον). There is only one Roman name, Ῥοῦφος, in this inscription (line 1), which would indicate an early date. One might expect more Roman names if the inscription belonged to the middle of the first century AD, when our Eubiotos’ homonymous grandson [No. 8] held the *strategia* at least once. On the other hand the emancipations in the inscription are paid for in *denarii*, whereas one would expect staters to be specified if the inscription dated to a *strategia* held by our Eubiotos No. 1, whom we have suggested to have been the uncle of his Eubiotos son of Eukolos, some time in the middle of the first century.

Taking all the factors outlined above into consideration, I think that the Eubiotos mentioned in this document can be identified with Eubiotos son of Eukolos. Eubiotos must have held his second term of office as *strategos* some time after 27 BC. A date *circa* 10 BC would seem to be a reasonable guess as to the approximate date.

[4f] *AE* 1917, p. 12 no. 305, 5 is a catalogue of emancipations from Chyretiai dated simply by the formula “when Eubiotos was *strategos*”. Again the payment formula is in *denarii* not staters, which would seem to make a date as early as the middle of the first century BC unlikely. However, though there are still comparatively few Roman names in the inscription, a Κάσσιος at line 12, a Πρῆμος at line 14, and a Ῥώμη at line 16, there are enough of them to allow a date in the middle of the first century AD. Therefore it is possible that this inscription should be placed with our Eubiotos No. 8.

[4g] A further inscription, from Pythion, listing emancipations (*IG IX* (2) 1290 II, 22 contains the words [-]ππου Εὐβιό[του] in the dating formula of one section of the inscription. Arvanitopoulos (*AE* 1924, p. 176-7 no. 409) later read ἐπὶ στρατηγῶ Εὐβιότου [τοῦ Κύλλου] at the same place, and further restored Εὐβιότου τοῦ Κύλλου at lines 26 and 32. As has been noted by Larsen (p. 87), the restoration of the patronymic at line 22 is uncertain, and even the restoration of the name Eubiotos is uncertain in the other two places. *Denarii* are again used for the emancipation payments, which makes a date in the middle rather than the end of the first century BC unlikely. Again it is possible that this inscription could be placed with our Eubiotos son of Kyllos No. 8, but it is perhaps preferable to suggest that Eukolos should be restored as the patronymic of Eubiotos rather than Kyllos.

[4h] It may be possible to associate a federal stater bearing on the reverse the names Εὐκόλος (nom.) at top and Ἀντίγονος (nom.) at bottom. (*SNG Cop.* 272). Antigonos seems to belong to reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (cf. Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 p. 96 n. 3)

[No. 5] Kyllos I [Larsen, p. 88–89 no. 3; Kramolisch, p. 126–128 no. H¹ 1] (Κύλλος α’).

[5a] *IG IX* (2) 532 is an inscription from Larissa, dated (l. 4) to the year when Kyllos was *strategos* (ἐν στρατηγῶ Κύλλω). It contains a list of victors in the bull-fighting competitions of the “Stenaia”, which were founded to commemorate the participation of the Thessalian cavalry in the Battle of the Stena in 171 BC (cf. Kramolisch, p. 135–136). On the basis of a study of the inscriptions associated with these Games, Helly (cf. *SEG XXXIII* 462), has placed this inscription in the reign of Augustus. The date of

the inscription is confirmed by the fact that Themistogenes son of Androsthenes, who had already served as *strategos* shortly before 31 BC (Kramolisch, p. 121 G 12, cf. p. 34 (*stemma*)), is named as one of the Larissaian *tagoi*. Themistogenes, a descendant of Italos of Gortyn, furnishes another example of the large numbers of adoptions which took place among the Thessalian aristocracy during this period.

It seems reasonable to assume that this Kylllos is the son of Eubiotos son of Eukolos [No. 4] (cf. Kramolisch, p. 126). In view of the dates suggested above for the tenure of the office of *strategos* by Kylllos' father Eubiotos, possibly on two occasions, a date in the first decade of the first century AD or thereabouts is likely.

[5b] An emancipation document from Doliche (*BCH* 35 (1911) p. 240 no.10 = *AE* 1913, p. 181–182 = *AE* 1923, p. 151 no. 382) lists a Kylllos as *strategos* in the dating formula at line 12. The patronymic has been lost, but Arvanitopoullos was probably correct to restore Eubiotos. The context of this inscription makes it plain that this Kylllos must be the Augustan Kylllos, rather than the Flavian Kylllos [No. 9], or the Kylllos [No. 2] who held the *strategia* during the middle of the first century BC. *Denarii* are quoted exclusively in the payment formulae, which should place the inscription at some date after 27 BC. Furthermore one of the other *stratego*i mentioned in the inscription, at line 2, is Antigonos, who is known to belong to the reign of Augustus or Tiberius (cf. Kramolisch p. 43 n. 109; Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 p. 167).

[5c] If an alteration in the text from Κυδ[ίτου] to Κύλ[λου] by Wilamowitz is correct, a catalogue of emancipations from Larissa (*IG* IX (2) 543) also mentions the *strategia* of one Kylllos in line 12. Helly (*Gonnoi* 2 p. 167) has pointed out that Sosipatros, who is named as a *strategos* in another entry in the inscription (line 1), may be identified with the Sosipatros who is known to have held the *strategia* during the Flavian period, and so associates the Kylllos mentioned in this inscription with the Flavian Kylllos [No. 9].

Sosipatros is, however, quite a common name in Thessaly. Another individual named Sosipatros held the *strategia* in 41/2 BC, and this has led to the suggestion (*Chiron* 8 (1975) p. 346) that the Κύλ[λος] of *IG* IX (2) 543 might have held the *strategia* shortly after that date. If this suggestion is correct, this Κύλ[λος] might be identical with our No. 6 'Kylllos the Second'. However, regnal dates are not recorded alongside the *strategos*-dates in *IG* IX (2) 543, as one would expect to find in a Thessalian catalogue of emancipations of the Claudian period. An Augustan *strategos* named Sosipatros has also been identified, though of the other two inscriptions assigned to an Augustan *strategos* Sosipatros by Kramolisch (p. 158, cf. p. 94 n. 15), *IG* IX (2) 1043 is certainly Flavian (cf. Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 no. 135), while *IG* IX (2) 1300 could also be assigned to the Flavian period from the letter-forms.

However, *IG* IX (2) 543 does seem to be a document of the Augustan period. Jardé and Laurent (*BCH* 26 (1902) p. 370-1) were the first to suggest that the city *tamias* named in line 12, Demokritos son of Theoxen[os], could be identified with the city *tamias* Demokrates in another inscription (*IG* IX (2) 542, 3), a second register of emancipations, dated to the *strategia* of Agathanor, who seems to have held office during the Augustan period. However, in line 9 of this document payment is made in [stater]s, which were discontinued in 27 BC or shortly thereafter, and consequently Kramolisch (F 90) identifies this Agathanor with Agathanor son of Eurydamas of Gomphoi, who held the *strategia* shortly after 60 BC. Consequently the dating of this inscription is, to say the least, problematic. However, I have decided to assign it, tentatively, to the Augustan Kylllos, though the identification is far from certain. Kroog (p. 36-7) thought that *IG* IX (2) 543, together with the *stratego*i Sosipatros and Kylllos named there, were Augustan in date. Kramolisch variously dates *IG* IX (2) 543 to the first century AD (p. 103 n. 86), or to the Augustan period (p. 128 n. 33; p. 158 *s.v.* Sosipatros).

The fact that a later member of the family calls himself "Kylllos the Third" in an inscription of Flavian date from Gonnoi [No. 7a], allows us to postulate that the Kylllos under current discussion was the first in a line of three holders of the name Kylllos, that is father, son and grandson, who presumably

constituted the principal line of inheritance of the family. This Kyllos is therefore designated Kyllos I. It seems that Kyllos I also had a second son called Eubiotos [No. 8].

[6] Kyllos II [Larsen, p. 89 no. 6] (Κύλλος β').

Larsen considers this second of three Kyllloi to be unattested.

[6a] A Kyllos and Eubiotos are mentioned as joint manumittors in an inscription from Hypata (*IG IX (2) 15, 4, 7 ἀπὸ Κύλλου καὶ Εὐβιότο[υ]*), and, as Larsen (p. 87) has already pointed out, it is reasonable to assume that they are brothers. One would expect the elder of the two to be named first. It is strange that Larsen did not associate this inscription with Kyllos II. The second section of this inscription, at line 8, is dated to the *strategia* of Philiskos son of Eudemos, and thus to shortly before AD 40 (Kramolisch, p. 32 n. 51, cf. p. 158). The inevitable conclusion is that the Eubiotos mentioned in the inscription is the individual of that name who held the *strategia* in AD 43/4 [No. 8].

See also section 5c above, where the Kyllos of *IG IX (2) 543* is assigned to the Augustan Kyllos, rather than to a *strategos* of that name who held office during the Claudian period.

[7] Kyllos III [Larsen, p. 89 no. 7] (Κύλλος γ').

[7a] An inscription from Gonnoi, of Flavian date, an emancipation catalogue (*IG IX (2) 1041 c = Helly, Gonnoi 2 p. 169 no. 142*) is dated by the *strategia* of one Kyllos, the name Kyllos being followed by the numeral 3 (γ'). Larsen (86-7) argued that the only way this can be read is “Kyllos the Third”, and that “the Third” must refer to the fact that Kyllos was the third consecutive individual to be so named, rather than that Kyllos was holding the office of *strategos* for the third term. In Thessalian (as in all inscriptions, when the *strategos* formula mentions that an individual is holding the office of *strategos* for the third time the numeral, or more commonly the ordinal spelled out in full, is generally preceded by a τό.

Helly (*Gonnoi 2 p. 167–168*), in republishing this inscription, rejected Larsen’s argument, and preferred to understand the numeral as referring to Kyllos’ third *strategia*. Helly seems to have done so because he wished to associate this Kyllos with the contemporaneous Kyllos son of Eubiotos [No. 9]. If, however, it is accepted that during the Flavian period the Hypataian family was represented by two branches, one exclusively using the name Kyllos, and the other alternating the names Kyllos and Eubiotos, it follows that there would be two grandsons of the original Kyllos I active in the Flavian period, and both would be called Kyllos. In this article I have preferred Larsen’s interpretation of the numeral rather than Helly’s, though both are possible. Kyllos III is not known to have had any offspring for certain, and it seems as though the first branch of the family did not survive into a further generation.

[8] Eubiotos [Larsen, p. 89 no. 4] (Εὐβίωτος)

[8a] We have already seen in section 6a above that two brothers, called Kyllos and Eubiotos, are mentioned as joint emancipators in an inscription from Hypata dating to around 40 BC. Assuming that the interpretation of No. 7 as “Kyllos the Third” is correct, it follows that the Kyllos of the Hypataian inscription was “Kyllos the Second”. It follows, therefore, that the brothers Kyllos and Eubiotos were sons of “Kyllos the First”, and it is logical to assume from their relative placing in the inscription that Eubiotos is the younger of the two.

[8b] An emancipation document from Meliteia (*IG IX (2) 206 III c*) is dated both to the *strategia* of Eubiotos, and to the thirtieth year of Tiberius’ reign, which is, Kramolisch (*Chiron 5 (1975) p. 341, 347*) has suggested, AD 42/3 rather than 43/4. Identification of this Eubiotos with the Eubiotos, whom we have deduced to have been the son of Kyllos I, in the Hypataian inscription of *circa* 40 AD discussed above, seems inevitable. This Eubiotos is Larsen’s No. 4.

[8c] An inscribed statue base from Delphi dating to the end of Domitian's reign (AD 81-96) was erected by Kyllos the son of Eubiotos the Thessalian (see section 9a below). From this inscription we can deduce that Eubiotos had a son called Kyllos.

[9] Titos Flavios Kyllos son of Eubiotos [Larsen, p. 89 no. 8] (Τ. Φλάουιος Κύλλος)

[9a] An inscribed statue-base from Delphi (*FD* III (1) 538) records that one Kyllos son of Eubiotos, *epimeletes* of the Amphictyonic League, erected a statue to Titus Avidius Quietus proconsul of Achaëa. Kyllos later acquired Roman citizenship with the *nomina* Titus Flavius, which must have been bestowed before the death of Domitian, the last Flavian emperor, in AD 96. Had Kyllos already been awarded citizenship at the time the statue was erected, it is highly probable that he would have given his name in full. As, however, he uses only the Greek form of his name, this inscription is most probably to be dated to before AD 96. Pomtow (in *Syll.*³ 822 n. 1–3) dated Quietus' Achaean proconsulship, and this inscription, quite specifically to AD 95. If this were correct, it would follow that Kyllos must have been awarded Roman citizenship the following year, as is also pointed out by Pomtow. A date of AD 95 for Quietus' proconsulship of Achaëa is, however, far from certain,⁶ but it can hardly have been very much earlier. West (*Class. Phil.* 23 (1928) p. 263) placed the *agonothesia* of Kyllos in AD 91.

Thus in the Flavian period the Hypataian family ceased to be a family of purely local significance, and entered the social milieu of the most important families of Roman Greece. It was presumably thanks to contacts established during his activity as *epimelete* of the Amphictyonic League at Delphi that Kyllos eventually received Roman citizenship.

[9b] Kyllos' receipt of Roman citizenship is confirmed by an inscription from Hypata (see section 11a below) honouring his son who is termed Τ. Φλάουιος Τ. Φλαοίου Κύλλου υἱὸς Εὐβίωτος.

[9c] An emancipation document from Chyreteai (*AD* 1917, p. 130 no. 345) mentioning a *strategos* Kyllos, without patronymic, in lines 5-6, has been associated with the Flavian Kyllos by Helly (*Gonnoi* 2 p.167), on account of the appearance of Hermon as *strategos* in the catalogue above Kyllos, whom Helly dates to the second half of the first century BC.

[9d] We have already discussed the emancipation document from Gonnoi dated to the *strategia* of "Kyllos the Third" in section 7a above. On another face of the same stone is a further inscription (Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 p. 165-9 no. 141) recording manumissions dated to the *strategia* of Kyllos. In the original publication of this inscription (*IG* IX (2) 1041 b) the name of the *strategos* was interpreted as Kyllos son of Eubiotos. However Woodward (*JHS* 33 (1913) p. 330), who is followed by Helly, demonstrated that the Eubiotos mentioned after Kyllos is the name of the city treasurer, following the normal formula of these inscriptions from Gonnoi (cf. e.g. Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 p. 162–3 no. 137), and not the patronymic of the *strategos*.

Helly did not accept the interpretation of Κύλλος γ' as "Kyllos the Third", but thought that the reference was to the third *strategia* of the Flavian Kyllos son of Eubiotos. Consequently he assigned both these inscriptions, as well as the two (9c & 9d) above to Kyllos son of Eubiotos [our No.9]. I believe, however, that I have demonstrated that there must have been two individuals, almost certainly cousins, called Kyllos who held the *strategia* during the Flavian period. It follows, then, that 9c–9d could be associated with Kyllos III rather than Kyllos son of Eubiotos. However, given that the *strategos* is named as Kyllos and not as Kyllos III, the balance of probability is that all three are to be associated with Kyllos son of Eubiotos rather than Kyllos III.

⁶ E. Groag & A. Stein, *PIR* A 1410 "haud satis firmis constitutum est fundamentis"; E. Groag, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (1939) 43 '91/95 n. Chr.'.

Helly (*Gonnoi* 2 p.167) also assigned the emancipation catalogue from Doliche, discussed in section 5b above, to the Flavian Kyllos son of Eubiotos. However, as the *strategos* Antigonos, who seems to have an Augustan or Tiberian date, is also mentioned in this catalogue, it would not be safe to place this inscription in the Flavian period. See also section 5c, where the Kyllos of *IG IX* (2) 543 is assigned to the Augustan Kyllos, rather than the Flavian Kyllos.

[10] Habroia (Ἡβροῖα)

[10a] Larsen (p. 90 no. 11) suggested that “Habroia and Eubiotos” who are mentioned as manumittors in line 9 of *IG IX* (2) 30, a manumission document from Hypata, are “obviously husband and wife”. In such case he suggested that the Habroia of this document might be the wife of Titos Flavius Eubiotos [13], the son of Kyllos. This is possible, but it would be unusual for the wife to be listed before the husband, nor would it be usual for sister to be listed before brother. Therefore it might be preferable to suggest that the relationship is of mother, presumably widowed, to son. In which case two possibilities exist. Habroia might be the wife of Kyllos No. 9, who was still alive *circa* AD 96, or of Kyllos No. 12, who was still alive in AD 156. If Habroia was a widow when she made the emancipation jointly with her son Eubiotos, then dates of *circa* AD 100, or of *circa* AD 160-170 might be appropriate for this inscription. The letter-forms of this inscription, to judge from the majuscule copy, include late features, such as a continuation of the right-hand stroke of the *delta* in line 6, but do not otherwise seem particularly late. The curved *upsilon* of line 5, for example, is an early feature. Moreover none of the manumittors have Roman names, which one would expect in a document from the later second century.

I suggest that this document dates to *circa* AD 100, and that Titus Flavius Kyllos [No. 9] married one Habroia, who perhaps first brought the name Habroia into the family nomenclature, and that the Eubiotos mentioned is their son, Titus Flavius Eubiotos [No. 11]. This is to be regarded, however, as a tentative suggestion, for the dating of the inscription is most uncertain, and it could conceivably be placed as early as the first century BC. Therefore it is at least possible that the Habroia and Eubiotos of this document belonged to a much earlier generation of the family.

[11] Titos Flavius Eubiotos son of Kyllos [cf. Larsen, p. 89–90 no. 9] (Τ. Φλάουιος Τ. Φλαουίου Κύλλου υἱὸς Εὐβίωτος)

[11a] The principal epigraphic reference mentioning Titus Flavius Eubiotos, which confirms that he was the son of Titus Flavius Kyllos [9], is *IG IX* (2) 44. In this inscription, found at Hypata, the *polis* of Hypata honours Titus Flavius Eubiotos, son of Titus Flavius Kyllos, high priest and *agonothetes* of the *Theoi Sebastoi*, that is of the local civic cult, *agonothetes* of the Great Pythian Games, *epimeletes* of the Amphiktyonic League and Helladarch. It is interesting to note that Eubiotos continues to spell his name Φλάουιος. The identification of Eubiotos’ father with our Kyllos No. 9 was made by Preuner, who was followed by Pomtow, and in more recent times by Larsen and Helly⁷.

The inscription displays an impressive record of official achievement. We have seen that Eubiotos’ father, Titus Flavius Kyllos, had achieved the distinction of acting as *epimeletes* of the Amphiktyonic League. It should perhaps be explained that during this period the Pythian *agonothetai* were identical with the *epimeletai* of the Amphiclyonic League. The office was held for the full four-year duration of a Pythiad, for the first year of which the individual also officiated as *agonothetes* at the Pythian Games (A. B. West, *Class. Phil.* 23 (1928) p. 262). Now in the succeeding generation this increasingly wealthy and important family becomes even more closely involved with the social, cultural, and administrative life of Roman Greece outside Thessaly, above all at Delphi.

[11b] One other individual who was becoming increasingly involved in the secular life which revolved around the Delphic oracle during the initial stages of its Imperial revival was Plutarch of Chaironeia.

⁷ *Ath. Mitt.* 28 (1903) p. 377; *Syll.*³ 822 n. 3; Larsen *CP* 48 (1953) p. 89–90 no. 9; Helly, *Gonnoi* 2 p.166.

Plutarch was born around the middle of the first century AD and held a priesthood at Delphi since the 90's (C.P.Jones, 'Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works' *JRS* 56 (1966) p.66). By the end of his life Plutarch was resident at Delphi at least as frequently as at Chaironeia.

As with the interlocutors mentioned in most of the Socratic discourses of Plato and Xenophon, real historical personages lie behind the names Plutarch supplies to the participants in his dialogues contained in the *Moralia*. Some of the individuals included by Plutarch in his discourses have been successfully identified with known Thessalian aristocrats. The most important of these is the Petraios mentioned in *Mor.* 409 c and 674 f as *agonothetes* of the Pythian Games, who has been identified with Lucius Cassius Petraeus. A series of inscriptions from Delphi (*Syll.*³ 825 A-C) tell us that Petraios, son of one Derkios of Hypata, was *archiereus*, dedicated a statue to Trajan circa AD 115 and held the *agonothesia* of the Pythian Games twice, probably in AD 99 and 103 (K. Ziegler, 'Plutarchos (2)' *RE* (1951) 680; *PIR*² II p. 121 no. 514). Another of Plutarch's unidentified symposiasts is Menekrates the Thessalian, mentioned in *Mor.* 639 b (= *quaest. conv.* 2.5.1). He can perhaps be identified with Menekrates who is mentioned as holding the office of *strategos* of the Thessalian *koinon* in an inscription (*AE* 1917, p. 128 no. 342 B, 10) dating to the second half of the first century AD. This Menekrates may be the son or grandson of another Menekrates, mentioned in a register of emancipations from Larissa dating to AD 131/2 (*IG* IX (2) 546, 28). This identification is, however, evidently uncertain.

Plutarch's dialogue 'On the Cleverness of Animals' (*de sollertia animalium*) is a discussion between some six speakers. During the conversation, which takes place at Delphi, the speakers are approached by a group of expert huntsmen (*Mor.* 965b). This group includes Aiakides and Aristotimos, the sons of Dionysios of Delphi, and also an individual named Eubiotos, who is known to Autoboulos, one of the speakers. The possibility that the Eubiotos of this passage might be identified with an individual of the family from Hypata was already noted by Bourguet in the last century (*BCH* 21 (1897) p. 155 'ami de Plutarque'). In fact the 'expert huntsman' of the passage must be identified with Titus Flavius Eubiotos under discussion here.

The *de sollertia animalium* was probably written after the death of Titus in AD 81 (C.P. Jones, *op.cit.* p.71), but how soon after is unknown. Most of Plutarch's writing was done after AD 96 (C.P. Jones, *op.cit.* p.73). The inscription (*Syll.*³ 829) on the base of a statue erected in honour of the emperor Hadrian, probably soon after 117, shows Plutarch still holding a priesthood at Delphi and acting as *epimeletes* of the Amphiktyonic League. It appears that he died soon after, and he was certainly dead by 125, for an inscription (*Syll.*³ 835 B) on the base of a further statue erected in honour of the Emperor in that year records that Titus Flavius Aristotimos now held the same priesthood. As the priesthood at Delphi was an appointment for life, we can be sure that were Plutarch still alive, he would have been mentioned in this inscription in place of Aristotimos (C. P. Jones, *op.cit.* pp. 63, 66).

Thus the only certain statement which can be made as to the date of birth of Eubiotos is that, given that an "expert huntsman" would hardly have been aged less than 25, and that the latest possible date for the composition of *de sollertia animalium* is AD 125, his birth must have taken place before the turn of the century. However, it is highly probable that the Aristotimos who served as priest in AD 125 is the same individual as the Aristotimos son of Dionysios of Delphi who is mentioned in the dialogue as being another of the "expert huntsmen". It would probably be reasonable, though not certain, to suggest that Eubiotos and Aristotimos are of a similar age. We might guess that Aristotimos may have been about fifty when he took part in the erection of the statue honouring the Emperor, and so the date of birth of both Aristotimos and Eubiotos may have been around AD 75.

[11c] Eubiotos' service as *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony is also recorded in an inscription from Delphi, which informs us that the Temple of Asklepios was built during his tenure of office. The original editor (E. Bourguet, *BCH* 21 (1897) p. 155) identified the Titus Flavius Eubiotos mentioned in the inscription as our Eubiotos, the son of the Titus Favius Kyllos [No. 9], which seems reasonably certain. West

(*Class. Phil.* 23 (1928) p. 265) placed the *agonothesia* of Eubiotos some time after AD 123. Daux and Salač: (*FD III* (3) 61) suggested that it should be put around the end of the reign of Hadrian or the beginning of the reign of Antoninus (AD 138). A somewhat earlier date is, however, possible.

[11e] For the sake of completeness one might also mention the simple inscription Εὐβιότου, preserved on a door-lintel from Hypata, which was later re-used in the Antonine period to record manumissions carried out during the *strategia* of T. Aelius Sabinianus, who held the office some time during the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 138–161). Kern, who examined this inscription (*IG IX* (2) 20b), makes it clear that the name Eubiotos was carved on the door-lintel previously, and has nothing to do with the manumission document which was carved subsequently.

[12] Titos Flavius Kyllos [Larsen, p. 90 no. 10] (Τίτος Φλάβιος Κύλλος)

[12a] One Titus Flavius Kyllos (Τίτος Φλάβιος Κύλλος) is mentioned in an inscription from Aizanoi in Phrygia dating to AD 157⁸. This document is one of a series of inscriptions comprising a dossier recording correspondence concerning Ulpius Eurykles, a member of the Panhellenic synhedrion, carved on the wall of the Temple of Zeus at Aizanoi. It informs us that Kyllos was *archon* of the Panhellenes and priest of the Panhellenic cult of Hadrian (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν Πανελλήνων καὶ ἱερεὺς θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Πανελληνίου). In this capacity Kyllos promises to write to the Emperor Antoninus Pius on Eurykles' behalf.

The establishment of the Panhellenion by Hadrian provided a further outlet for the important families of Roman Greece to exercise their desires to acquire honours. The rise of Titus Flavius Kyllos to one of the highest such positions available to a native of Roman Greece, that of *archon* of the Panhellenes, demonstrates the further rise in the prestige of this Hypataian family. The exercise of the office of *archon* would have required considerable periods of residence in Athens, and this shift of residence would have brought the family even more closely into the cultural circles which revolved so closely around Athens following the Greek cultural revival, which took place in the early second century and beyond.

Whilst the various officers of the Panhellenion, including the *archon* of course, came from the leading families of Greece, over half the Panhellenes, that is, the members of the Council, were not Roman citizens, and were therefore not of the elite. They were, however, individuals who were highly regarded for their culture, or *paideia*⁹. Whilst it is not to be doubted that the Kyllloi disposed of considerable wealth, it is reasonable to infer that the family also had some cultural “credibility”.

It might be suggested that Kyllos must have been of a reasonable age and stature to have held the post of *archon* of the Panhellenion in AD 157, and so it would be difficult to see Kyllos' date of birth being much later than AD 100. A date of birth around the turn of the century would fit in well with the date of birth suggested for Kyllos' father Eubiotos of around AD 75.

[12b] An inscription has been recovered from Athens mentioning the previous service of Titus Flavius Kyllos, here Τίτος Φλάβιος Κύλλος, as *archon* of the Panhellenes, and his service as *agonothetes* at the Great Panhellenic Games, and recording the honour bestowed on him the the Thessalian *koinon* on account of his goodwill towards the Panhellenion and the city of Athens¹⁰. The Panhellenia was a penteteric festival, associated with the Panhellenion. The first games were perhaps celebrated in AD

⁸ *OGIS* 504, [2],12 = *IGR IV* 573 = James H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius, Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (*Hesp. Suppl.* XIII, 1970) no. 28. For the date see M. Wörrle, *Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi I, 1. Eine Brückenweihung des Eurykles*, *Chiron* 22 (1992) 337–349, esp. 340 n. 12.

⁹ Cf. A. J. Spawforth & S. Walker, *The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis*, *JRS* 75 (1985) pp. 78–104 esp. pp. 87–89; cf. A. J. Spawforth & S. Walker, *The World of the Panhellenion. II. Three Dorian Cities*, *JRS* 76 (1986) pp. 88–105.

¹⁰ Anna S. Benjamin, *Hesp.* 37 (1968) p. 340–344 no. 48c = *SEG XXV* 211; cf. Louis Robert, *AE* 1969, p. 30–31.

133,¹¹ and Kyllos could have served as *agonothetes* in these or any subsequent games preceding his tenure of the office of *archon*.

It is of particular interest that the Thessalian *koinon* is found honouring Kyllos, a Thessalian native, for his services to Athens. This is hardly surprising, however, given that Athens was the cultural and social capital of Greece, and, especially as a result of Hadrianic patronage, to some extent its political centre too. It is reasonable to suppose that Kyllos' service to Athens probably involved considerable outlay of money (Benjamin, *loc.cit.* p. 341). This inscription again reinforces our picture of the family now becoming involved in the affairs of Greece as a whole, and becoming much more drawn into life in Athens. The fact that it is the Thessalian *koinon* which is found honouring Kyllos, however, suggests that Kyllos had previously served as one of its officers, which is a self-evident probability anyway.

[12c] The *Anthologia Palatina* (11.16) preserves a derogatory epigram by Ammianos, a Greek poet resident in Smyrna and active around the middle of the second century AD¹². His date is fixed by an attack on Antonius Polemo (*PIR*² A 862), the well-known sophist of the age of Hadrian. The epigram runs as follows:

Κύλλος καὶ Λεῦρος, δύο Θεσσαλοὶ ἐγγεσίμωροι
 Κύλλος δ' ἐκ τούτων ἐγγεσιμώτερος.
 "Kyllos and Leuros, two Thessalian spear-morons,
 and Kyllos the more spear-moronic of the pair."

The joke in the epigram is a play on the word ἐγγεσίμωρος, a Homeric epithet compounded from ἐγχείη, an epic form of ἔγχος "lance". The second element in the compound, it seems, imparts the meaning "illustrious", hence it may be translated as "renowned for his lance"¹³. Ammianus clearly intends it to be understood as μῶρος "fool". Most of the post-Homeric ancients themselves, however, probably did not know the derivation. They explain the epithet as οἱ περὶ τὰ δόρατα μεμορημένοι, and derive it from μόρος, μοῖρα, "whose fate it is to carry the spear".

The date at which Ammianus was active makes it inevitable that it is Titus Flavius Kyllos [No.12] who is being insulted in this epigram (cf. James H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius, Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (= *Hesp. Suppl.* XIII, 1970) p. 100). Though the context is obscure, it would be reasonable to suppose, as the use of a lance is being referred to directly, that the epigram refers to some fairly incompetent performance by Kyllos, followed by some slightly less incompetent performance by Leuros, either in the fields of hunting or of fighting. The jibe of Ammianus could be interpreted as simply an attack on the rustic habits of the Thessalian nobles, devoting their time to hunting instead of more cultured pursuits. Alternatively the jibe could be interpreted in a context of unsuccessful performance in combat.

It is clear from the story of the Lucius who is turned into an ass, as described both in Lucian's *Lucius, or the Ass*, and in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, that the region of Hypata was one of those areas of Greece infested by gangs of bandits in the second century AD¹⁴. It would have been the duty of the *strategos* of the Thessalian League to attempt to suppress these bandit gangs, using locally available forces of police and military units. It is possible that the epigram of Ammianus refers to policing

¹¹ Simone Follet, *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle. Études chronologiques et prosopographiques* (1976) pp. 128–9 suggests 131/2, but see Wörle (op. cit. n. 8) 343.

¹² Reitzenstein, Ammianus (1), *RE* (1894) 1845; cf. C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (1986) p.115–116.

¹³ F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Halle 1914) p. 106–107; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I* (Heidelberg 1960) p. 440; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots II* (Paris 1970) p. 311.

¹⁴ Cf. Fergus Millar, *The World of the Golden Ass*, *JRS* 71 (1981) pp. 66–67; P. A. McKay, *Kleptika: the Tradition of the Tales of Banditry in Apuleius*, *Greece & Rome* 10 (1963).

operations against an outbreak of banditry by two officers of the Thessalian League, Kyllos and Leuros, who may have been *strategoï* of the League in subsequent years. The attempts of Kyllos to take action against the bandits would have gone badly, while those of Leuros would have been only slightly more successful.

[13] Habroia who is also (called) Neikostrata (Ἰαβροία ἢ καὶ Νεικοστράτα)

[13a] This might be a convenient point to discuss a further inscription from Hypata mentioning a Habroia (*IG IX (2) 32*). The inscription records a dedication to the Goddess Roma and to the *Theoi Sebastoi*: the cult, dedicated to the worship of ‘the imperial family both living and dead’ (cf. Ronald Mellor, *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ, The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World (Hypomnemata 42, Zurich 1975) p. 159*). It should be noted that an inscription from Hypata (see No. 11a above) demonstrates that Titos Flavios Eubiotos, the son of the Habroia postulated as our No. 10, and possibly the father of the Habroia under discussion here, was high priest and *agonothetes* of the *Theoi Sebastoi* there. It may therefore be suggested that the cult of *Theoi Sebastoi* had been established at Hypata by the early second century, and that the dedication of Habroia could date from the beginning of the second century.

The relationship of the three individuals mentioned in the text of the inscription, which is only partially preserved, is rather difficult to understand. It would seem that a dedication is being made by Damoitas and Habroia, who was also known as Neikostrata, the parents of Amphias (οἱ γονεῖς Ἀμφία Δαμοίτας καὶ Ἰαβροία ἢ καὶ Νεικοστράτα). This would rule out an identification of the Habroia of this inscription with either Flavia Habroia [No. 15] or with the Habroia discussed in section 10a. However the name is very rare, for it is seemingly confined to the material discussed in this article, and only occurs otherwise in connection with the family of the Kylloi and Eubiotoi. Furthermore this Habroia is also based in Hypata. Therefore two possibilities exist. Habroia could belong to the family of the Kylloi and Eubiotoi, being a daughter married out of the family to one Damoitas, who presumably belongs to another wealthy Hypataian family. Otherwise this Habroia could belong to another Hypataian family using the name, which is otherwise unattested. It is, of course, impossible to know which way the name spread. Nevertheless, if only for the reason of including this individual in the *stemma*, I suggest that it is at least possible that this Habroia was a daughter of T. Flavius Eubiotos [No.11], and was named after her grandmother. The alternative name Neikostrata may have been adopted to distinguish Habroia from her homonymous grandmother.

[13b] A second emancipation document from Hypata (*IG IX (2) 29, 1*) also mentions a manumittor named Habroia. The fact that the inscription comes from Hypata perhaps allows us to associate Habroia with a member of the family currently under discussion. I discuss it here for the sake of completeness.

This document, like the one discussed above, is most difficult to date. The inscription, though only partially preserved, contains only Greek peregrine names, with no Latin *tria nomina*, which one would expect in a document of the mid-second century. Furthermore, the document is dated by the *strategos*-year (line 7), and it seems that the office was discontinued some time late on in the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 138–161). It would be difficult, therefore, to date this inscription as late as the second half of the second century, and so also difficult to associate it with Flavia Habroia (No. 15). On the other hand the majuscule copy shows a ligature in line 7, which is a late feature, as is the name Pardalis in line 12. Therefore I would tentatively suggest that this inscription should be placed in the first decades of the second century AD, and that the Habroia mentioned in it should be identified with the individual mentioned in 13 a. It hardly needs to be said that the grounds for dating this second document are most uncertain, and the Habroia mentioned in it may not even be directly connected with the family.

[14] Titos Flavios Eubiotos [Larsen, p. 90 no. 11] (Τίτος Φλάβιος Εὐβίσιος)

Larsen suggested that Flavia Habroia [No. 15] was the grand-daughter of Titos Flavios Kyllos [No. 12] rather than the daughter. He postulated an intervening generation, represented by one Titos Flavios

Eubiotos, though he was unable to supply any literary or epigraphic evidence to support his contention. Larsen's suggestion can, however, be supported by arguing from the dates of birth which can be established for the various generations of the family, assuming an average age of 30 for the male parent.

As we have already seen, Kylllos held the office of *archon* of the Panhellenion in AD 157, and his date of birth might reasonably be put around the turn of the century. Secondly Flavia Habroia's son, Markos Ulpios Eubiotos Leuros, is honoured, together with his two sons, in an Athenian inscription of around 230 (see 17b below). Presumably the sons had reached adulthood, and so would have been born around the turn of the century. Consequently their father Eubiotos' birth should be placed about AD 170. It would also be reasonable to suppose that Habroia was in her twenties at the time of his birth, and so her birthdate should be placed around the middle of the century. So Kylllos, born around the beginning of the century, is much more likely to have been her grandfather than her father, in accordance with Larsen's suggestion.

[14a] An inscription from Megara (*IG VII 104*) informs us that the *boule* and the *polis* of Megara honoured Titos Flavios (here Φλάβιος) Eubiotos on account of his goodwill shown towards the city. Preuner (*Ath.Mitt.* 49 (1924) p.119 no.13) identified the honorand of this inscription with our Titos Flaouios Eubiotos [No. 11]. It should be noted, however, that Eubiotos' name is spelt Φλάβιος, not the earlier form Φλάουιος used by No. 10, so this inscription may well belong to his grandson, our No. 14.

[15] Flavia Habroia [Larsen p. 90 no. 12] (Φλαβία Ἰαβροία)

Flavia Habroia is named in a number of inscriptions, but the interest of this individual stems principally from a possible literary reference to her in Lucian's *Lucius or the Ass*.

[15a] Lucian's short satirical comedy is set in Thessaly, and the action starts in Hypata, the home city of the Kyllloi and Eubiotoi. Examination of this piece in any detail is hampered by the fact that the interrelationship of Lucian's work with the *Golden Ass* of Lucius Apuleius, and of both of these works with the lost *Metamorphoses* of Lucius of Patrai, is not precisely understood. The traditional view was that both Lucian and Apuleius based their works on that of Lucius of Patrai, which may, in its turn, be based on a traditional traveller's tale. A wide range of opinion exists among modern scholars as to the correctness of this traditional view, however, and some deny that the work was by Lucian at all. For the time being I shall assume authorship by Lucian, before returning to the question below.

The 'hero' of Lucian's satire, one Lucius, is staying in the house of Hipparchos, whose wife is a witch, when he meets a lady called Habroia in the street. The description of Habroia, who makes just this one brief appearance in the whole work, is remarkable. She is described as 'still young, well off, as far as one could judge from seeing her in the street; for she had a flowery (ἀνθινά) cloak, a great many slaves, and gold to excess'. She approaches Lucius and tells him 'I am Habroia (ἐγὼ Ἰαβροία εἰμι), if you have heard of a friend of such a name from your mother; and I love you who are born of her as those I myself have given birth to.' She invites Lucius to stay in her house, warning him against the witchcraft of Hipparchos' wife, but Lucius declines her offer. Habroia then disappears from the work.

Given that the name Habroia seems to be confined to the family of the Kyllloi and Eubiotoi, and given that the satirical novella is set in Hypata, Lucian is perhaps making a direct reference to Flavia Habroia, who may well have been known to him personally through the social and cultural circles of Athens. Alternatively it is possible that Lucian is using this well-known Thessalian aristocratic name to signify the 'type' of a rich Thessalian, or provincial, woman.

It should be noted that this passage is the single occasion where the personal name Habroia appears with both accent and breathing. The accent on the first *alpha* comes as no surprise¹⁵, but one would not

¹⁵ Henry W. Chandler, *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*² (Oxford 1881) p. 32 para. 109 accents the name on the final *alpha*, which it has taken enclitically from the following εἰμί.

have expected the smooth breathing which appears in the texts. This seems to be a mistake, as the name may be presumed to be a form derived from Habron, and, indeed, Kern marks the name with a rough breathing in his edition of *IG IX (2)*. His spelling has been followed in this article.

Unfortunately there is nothing in *Lucius or the Ass* to date the work. Lucian was born in Samosata in Commagene some time between AD 115 and 125, and began writing his dialogues at the age of forty, at about which time he arrived in Athens (C.P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (1986) p. 8 n. 10). The exact date of his arrival in Greece cannot be established with certainty, as it depends on how one interprets his statement (*Peregrinus* 35) that the Olympic Games of 165, at which Peregrinus cremated himself, were the finest he had witnessed, although he had seen four festivals. This should give a date of 157 for his first attendance at the festival, and thus for his arrival in Greece (cf. Jacques Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate (Collection Latomus 83, Brussels 1965) opp. p. 148*). Most of Lucian's literary output seems to have come in the 160s and 170s, with a few works in the 180s. *Lucius or the Ass* could therefore have been written at any time between 157 and 180.

The description of Habroia in this passage implies that she has already given birth to at least one child. Eubiotos, who may be presumed to be her firstborn male child, seems to have been born around 170, so this would fit a date for the composition of *Lucius or the Ass* in the 170s or 180s, thus a relatively late work of Lucian's. However Lucian pointedly remarks that Habroia was 'still young', though she has had her children, so, although one is led to think of a woman around the age of 40 at the time of composition of the work, she may have been younger when she bore her children (around 170), so her date of birth could have been as late as 150.

Habroia also seems to be very wealthy. Although an *argumentum e silentio* can never prove a point, the fact that no further member of the family of the Kylloi and Eubiotoi is attested either in the epigraphic record or in literature, suggests that Habroia may have been an only child, and may have been an heiress to the wealth of the family; this is perhaps confirmed by the fact that Habroia's son adopts the name Eubiotos as his principal *cognomen*, rather than Leuros.

Although Lucian shows us Habroia in Hypata, it is probable that the family now divided its time between periods of residence in Hypata and Athens. It is also highly probable that the family played a significant role in the social and cultural life of the capital, and therefore that Habroia was known to Lucian. This may explain the idiosyncracies in Lucian's description of her: that she wore gold to excess and flowery raiment. The parallel description of Byrrhene in Apuleius' *Golden Ass* (2. 2) mentions the gold, but not 'flowery raiment' (*aurum in gemmis et in tunicis, ibi inflexum, hic intextum*), which seems confined to Lucian's description. "Flowery raiment" is frequently worn by courtesans in the texts of the classical period which Lucian strives to imitate,¹⁶ and has a rather ambivalent quality. Elsewhere in Lucian Demonax (*Dem.* 16) ridicules an athlete for being seen in flowery raiment, even though he was an Olympic champion, and in the *Toxaris* (15) Deinias gives a number of gifts including flowery raiment to Charikleia, the wife of Demonax: a flirting strumpet who had seduced the young man. It could be maintained, therefore, that Lucian is passing slightly barbed comments about a possible acquaintance. This would be quite in character with Lucian's work.

No similar connection can be made between the miser Hipparchos and any attested historical figure. It might be worth mentioning that there are a few attested holders of the name who could be forebears of a historical Hipparchos of Hypata whom Lucian may have known. One Hipparchos, son of Boutheras, is mentioned as holding the office of Ainiarch in an inscription (*IG IX (2)* 5a, 5; 5b, 2, 15) dating to the second century BC. Another Hipparchos, ethnic unknown, held the office of Thessalian *strategos* in 26/5 BC (Kramolisch p. 132 no. H¹ 7). Finally one Hipparchos is named as an emancipator in a register of emancipations from Hypata (*IG IX (2)* 14, 12) known to date to AD 53 (*Chiron* 5 (1975) p. 345–347). It is possible that these individuals all represent previous generations of an influential family which used the name Hipparchos and are ancestors of a historical character named Hipparchos known to

¹⁶ Cf. Jennifer Hall, *Lucian's Satire* (1981) p. 362.

Lucian. There is nothing to disprove, however, that the character Hipparchos in Lucian is entirely fictional.

As has already been mentioned, doubts have been raised as to whether *Lucius or the Ass* is a genuine composition of Lucian. The major objection to Lucian's authorship is that this work contains un-Lucianic linguistic elements. Some modern commentators find these linguistic arguments conclusive, but Graham Anderson, after noting that Lucian writes in a number of styles, has argued that the linguistic peculiarities could have been introduced deliberately to "coarsen" the style.¹⁷ I believe that the reference to Habroia provides further confirmation that the work is by Lucian. In the *Golden Ass* the role of Habroia is taken by one Byrrhene, Hipparchus the miser is replaced by one Milon, his wife is named Pamphyle, and their servant-girl is called Photis rather than Palaistra. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that Habroia appeared in the original "Ass" story on which Lucian based his work.¹⁸

[15b] *IG ii² 3695* is a double statue-base of Eubiotos set up to his father Ulpios Leuros and his mother Flavia Habroia (see section 17b below).

[15c] Flavia Habroia is mentioned in a single further inscription. Oliver¹⁹ has demonstrated that *IG ii² 3696* and *IG ii² 4053* represent respectively Graindor's and Prott's copy of the same inscription, which he restores as follows:

ἡ πόλις >Φλ.< "Αβροϊαν τὴν
[λαμπροτ]ά[τη]ν ὑπατικὴν.

It should be noted that Habroia is described as [λαμπροτ]ά[τη] ὑπατικὴ 'the most illustrious consular'. Larsen (p. 90 no. 12) pointed out that it would be unlikely that Habroia would be termed 'consular' simply because her son Eubiotos had achieved this rank, and he therefore postulated a further Habroia, a wife of Flavia Habroia's son Eubiotos. A simpler solution would be to infer that Habroia took the appellation from her husband Ulpios Leuros, who had achieved consular rank²⁰.

[16] Markos Oulpios Leuros (Μ. Οὔλπιος Λεῦρος)

The name Leuros seems to be a Thessalian one. Oliver at first suggested that the name might be Lusitanian in origin, relating it to one *Tapora Leuri* cited in an inscription from that province, but he later withdrew this suggestion in light of the information supplied by the *Anthologia Palatina* 11.16 (see section 12c above)²¹. In fact it seems reasonable to suggest that Leuros was either the son, or more probably the grandson, of the Leuros linked to Titos Flavios Kyllos in the epigram of Ammianus. The use of the name Oulpios indicates that the family had received Roman citizenship during the reign of Trajan (98-117), in which case Ammianus has only given Leuros' Greek *cognomen*. Only two other Thessalians are known to have used this *gentilicium*, Oulpios Nikomachos, a Thessalian *strategos* under Hadrian, and the Magnesian *strategos* M. Ulpus Hegestos, who may or may not be identical with the fragmentary Μ. Οὔ[λ]π[ιος --] of *IG IX (2) 1116 b*²².

¹⁷ E. g. C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (1986) pp. 46 n. 2, 170; Graham Anderson, *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* (Leiden 1976) p. 34-49.

¹⁸ Cf. Thomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (1983) p. 179.

¹⁹ James H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia* (= *Hesp. Suppl.* 6, 1941) p. 132 nt. 23.

²⁰ Simone Follet, *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle, etc.* (Paris 1976) p. 39; cf. A. Degrassi, *I Fasti Consolari dell'Imperio Romano dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo* (Rome 1952) p. 138 where Ulpios Leuros is listed as of consular rank.

²¹ J. H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius, Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (= *Hesp. Suppl.* 13, 1970) p. 100-101 n. 7; J. H. Oliver, "Senators from Greece and Macedonia", in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio. Atti di Colloquio Internazionale A.I.E.G.L.* (Rome 1982) II p. 590-591.

²² Helly, *BCH* 99 (1975) p. 130 n. 33 with Habicht in *Demetrias V* p. 282 no. 18 c, 9 and p. 290.

[16a] An inscription republished recently²³, informs us that the *synedroi* of the *koinon* of the Thessalians voted to honour M. Oulpios Eubiotos, the son of M. Oulpios Leuros. It is to be noted that the name of M. Oulpios Eubiotos is not quoted in full, so it is perfectly possible that the name of M. Oulpios Leuros was not given in full either.

[16b] A further undateable inscription carved on a statue-base recovered from the temple of Athena Itonia records that the *koinon* and *synhedroi* of the Thessalians honoured one M. Oulpios Domitios Leuros ‘Skarphe’ (Σκαρφῆ), the son of Leuros²⁴. The meaning of this last title (in the accusative) is not known for certain. It has been suggested that Σκαρφῆ may be a variant form of Σκαρφεύς, the ethnic of Skarpheia in Lokris. If this interpretation, which is far from certain, is correct, then the ethnic must refer to an honorific grant of citizenship, as it is clear that the family of Leuros is Thessalian. Habicht²⁵ has suggested that the honorand was a close senior relative of M. Oulpios Leuros, most probably his brother.

There is no real reason why the M. Oulpios Domitios Leuros ‘Skarphe’ of this inscription might not be identified with the M. Oulpios Leuros of the inscriptions discussed above and below, in which the name of both Leuros and of his son Eubiotos is given in abbreviated form. In fact if the two are not to be identified, almost any type of relationship, such as uncle or brother, is possible. However I shall assume that the M. Oulpios Domitios Leuros ‘Skarphe’ of this inscription is the father of our M. Oulpios Leuros, and that his father, who is simply named as Leuros, is to be identified with the Leuros mentioned in the epigram of Ammianos (*AP* 11. 16; see section 12c above), who, for the reasons of chronology discussed above, is more likely to have been M. Oulpios Leuros’ grandfather than his father. Thus it may be that we are dealing with three generations of the same noble family all using the name Leuros.

[16c] *IG* ii² 3695 records that Eubiotos set up statues to his father Ulpios Leuros and his mother Flavia Habroia.

Οὐλ. Λεῦρον τὸν Εὐβιότου πατέρα.
Φλ. Ἀβροίαν τὴν Εὐβιότου μητέρα.

It is remarkable that Eubiotos simply gives his Greek *cognomen*, although it is known that his full name was Μάρκος Οὐλπίος Εὐβίος Λεῦρος Γαργήτιος and that he held consular rank. Therefore the fact that Ulpios Leuros is mentioned without his Athenian demotic cannot be taken as evidence that Leuros did not hold Athenian citizenship, nor can the fact that he is not honoured with the title ‘consular’ be taken as evidence that Leuros was not of consular rank. Proof that Leuros was, in fact, of consular rank, is supplied by a further Athenian inscription (see section 14c above) which describes Leuros’ wife Habroia as ‘most illustrious consular’. It is beyond reasonable doubt that Habroia uses this title by virtue of her husband’s rank. Ulpios Leuros may well have held Athenian citizenship too.

[16d] One Silvanus, son of Leuros (*Leuri*) is attested in a Latin inscription, dating from the end of the first or the beginning of the second century AD, from Cherchel in Africa, serving in the *Ala II Thracum* stationed in Mauretania Caesariensis (*L’Année Epigraphique* 1976 no. 747). Given the rarity of the name, it is possible that Silvanus is a Thessalian serving in this Thracian regiment. This is, however, extremely speculative: I give the name here for the sake of completeness.

²³ Chr. Habicht, in *Demetrias V. Die Deutschen Archäologischen Forschungen in Thessalien* (Bonn 1987) p. 309 = *SEG* XXXVII 492.

²⁴ A. D. Keramopoulos, *AE* 1927/8, pp. 218–220.

²⁵ *Demetrias V. Die Deutschen Archäologischen Forschungen in Thessalien* (Bonn 1987) p. 311 = *SEG* XXXVII 493.

[17] Markos Oulpius Eubiotos Leuros, of the deme Gargettos [Larsen p. 90 no. 13] (Μάρκος Ούλπιος Εὐβίωτος Λεῦρος Γαργήτιος)

It is significant that this individual took his principal Greek *cognomen* from his mother's side of the family. I suggest that the most probable explanation for this phenomenon is not simply that the Kylloi and Eubiotoi were a more important family than the Leuroi, but rather that Eubiotos' mother Habroia was an heiress, as were many women of this social class.

[17a] The inscription in which the Thessalian *koinon* honours M. Oulpius Eubiotos the son of M. Oulpius Leuros has already been discussed (see section 16a above).

[17b] An Athenian inscription²⁶ preserves two decrees honouring Eubiotos, a man of consular rank, and his two sons, for relieving the city from a famine by a contribution of wheat and by a donation of 250,000 drachmas for the purchase of further grain. A date near AD 230 seems likely for this inscription²⁷. Presumably Eubiotos' two sons were of adult age, and had taken some part in Eubiotos' act of philanthropy. Thus we may guess that Eubiotos' sons were born *circa* AD 200, and that Eubiotos himself may have been born around 170.

[17c] An inscription (*IG ii² 3700*) on a seat in the Theatre of Dionysos at Athens records that it was reserved by the city for Markos Oulpius Eubiotos the most illustrious consular and eponymous archon, because of his good deeds, and for his sons Teisamenos and Maximos. Eubiotos and his family were presumably being rewarded for their act of generosity towards the city discussed above.

[17d] Markos Oulpius Eubiotos is also mentioned in a further Athenian inscription (*IG ii² 3699*) where he is also termed illustrious consular and eponymous archon.

[18] Markos Oulpius Flavios Teisamenos (Μάρκος Ούλπιος Φλάβιος Τεισαμενός)

Teisamenos, who regularly appears before his brother in the Athenian decrees honouring the brothers and their father for helping the city with grain and money (see section 17b above), may be presumed to be Eubiotos Leuros' first son. Apart from this inscription he is also mentioned in two others. The first (*IG ii² 3700*), noted above (17c), records that a seat has been reserved for Ulpus Eubiotos and his sons Teisamenos and Maximos in the theatre of Dionysos. In the second one (*IG ii² 3701*) the city honours Teisamenos "the most excellent lawgiver", the son of M. Oulpius Eubiotos.

[19] Markos Oulpius Poupenios Maximos (Μάρκος Ούλπιος Πουπήνιος Μάξιμος)

The second son of Eubiotos Leuros seems to have been named after M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus, one of the two Emperors appointed with the support of the Senate in AD 238. Pupienus was born before 175, probably about 164, and held the proconsulship of Greece at an early stage in his career, later also holding the proconsulship of Asia. It would be reasonable to suppose that Eubiotos Leuros became a friend of Pupienus during the residence of the latter in Athens, and that Eubiotos Leuros named his second son after the proconsul²⁸.

²⁶ J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerousia* (= *Hesp. Suppl.* 6, 1941) p. 125–141 no. 31; cf. *id.*, "On the Athenian Decrees for Ulpus Eubiotos", *Hesp.* 20 (1951) pp. 350–354.

²⁷ J. H. Oliver, "The Areopagus and the Whole City Honor M. Ulpus Eubiotos Leuros", *ZPE* 38 (1980) p. 107–114, esp. p. 107.

²⁸ *PIR² C 1179*; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1971) p. 171–174; J. H. Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* p. 132; Chr. Habicht, in *Demetrias V* p. 314.

Pupienos Maximos is mentioned in the Athenian inscription (17b) honouring Eubiotos and his sons for their help during a shortage of grain which has been discussed above, and in the inscription (17c) in the Theatre of Dionysos recording the reservation of a seat for Eubiotos and his sons. A further series of Attic inscriptions (*JG* ii² 3702-3703) mention Pupienus Maximos.

THE EUBIOTOI AND KYLLOI OF HYPATA DURING THE IMPERIAL PERIOD

