DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES AND THE ATHENIAN CALENDAR

The fortunate discovery of a new decree of 307/6 B.C., by Dr. Broneer,[1] should go far toward establishing the calendar of this peculiar year. The number of documents of calendar importance is thereby now increased to fourteen: *I.G.*, II², 455, 456, 457 + 1347 (*S.E.G.*, III, 87, 156) = *X Orat. Vit.*, p. 852 A, 458, 459, 460, 461 = 726, 462, 463, 464, 466, 1589; *S.E.G.*, III, 86;[2] and *Hesperia*, II, p. 398. Even so, however, the arrangement of the year still presents difficulties.

We have before us two interrelated problems, the lunar calendar with twelve or thirteen months of 29–30 days, and the prytany calendar according to which the year (of 354/5 or 384 days) would ordinarily have been divided into equal parts corresponding to the number of tribes. The decrees, generally dated by both systems, furnish mathematical equations by which we should be able to determine the essential facts about both aspects of the calendar. With regard to the year 307/6 B.C., however, every additional document seems to complicate the problem.[3]

According to Broneer's restoration of the new decree, in itself epigraphically sound, we obtain the following calendar equation:

(Boedromion 29)–Prytany (III, 2) 5, Demetrias. It will be observed, however, that the decree retains only the words Δημητρι[άδος] and πέντ[τηι]; the rest is conjectural.[4] And this restoration, as will be shown, encounters obstacles of three kinds, historical, calendarial, and epigraphical.

On the historical side, it seems impossible that the enlargement of the number of tribes from ten to twelve, by the creation of the two new " Macedonian tribes," could have been accomplished at the very beginning of the year (or even within the first prytany), as is implied by Broneer's allowance of 32 days (384 ÷ 12) for each of the first two prytanies.[5] For we know that Demetrius Poliorcetes, in whose honor they were

---

[1] *Hesperia*, II, 1933, pp. 398–402.

[2] I should note that this is the unpublished decree which was supposed to join II², 566 (Wilhelm, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1914, p. 281), and was erroneously so listed by me (*Archons of Athens*, p. 13); but Hondius has shown that II², 566 is from a different stone (*Nov. Inscr. Att.*, pp. 39, 42 n. 2).

[3] For the literature on the subject consult Köhler, *I.G.*, II¹, 240b, suppl. p. 68; Beloch, *Klio*, 1901, p. 413; Kirchner, *Sitz. Berl. Akad.*, 1910, pp. 982–984, and *I.G.*, II², 456, 458, 460; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 96, n. 2; Johnson, *Classical Philology*, 1914, pp. 426–428; Hondius, *Nov. Inscr. Att.*, pp. 45–46; Klaffenbach, *Gnomon*, 1926, pp. 709–710; Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, pp. 377–385; Broneer, *Hesperia*, 1933, pp. 398–402.

[4] It might even be considered that the numeral should be restored [εἷ]πεν· π[ερὶ ὧν] as, for example, in *I.G.*, II², 47 and 50. But Dr. Broneer informs me (letter) that the following letter was clearly Τ and not Ε.

[5] According to Kirchner's scheme with the first prytany of 36 days, the new tribes would have been created either during the first or the second prytany; according to mine, during the sixth prytany.

created, entered Athens only during the course of this very year, the archonship of
Anaxikrates (307/6).[1] It happens that we have a very complete synopsis of the movements
of Demetrius at this time. Arriving off the Peiraeus on the fifth day before the last of
Thargelion (June 10, 307; Plutarch, *Dem.* 8), he conducted negotiations with the party
of Demetrius of Phaleron, sent the latter under safe conduct to Thebes, but " as for
himself, he declared that although he desired to see the city, he would not do so before
he had completed its liberation by ridding it of its garrison; meanwhile, after running
a trench and a palisade round Mounichia, he sailed against Megara, where a garrison
had been stationed by Cassander " (*Dem.* 9). Next came the siege of Megara, the journey
to Patras for an affair with Cratesipolis, and the final capture of Megara. " Coming
back again to Mounichia and encamping before it, he drove out the garrison and demolished
the fortress, and this accomplished, at last, on the urgent invitation of the Athenians, he
made his entry into the upper city, where he assembled the people and gave them back
their ancient form of government " (*Dem.* 10). All this clearly indicates a lapse of
considerable time before his arrival at Athens; the delay is particularly stressed by
Plutarch, and the events cited would hardly have been compressed into sixty-six days
before the termination of the first prytany.[2] In fact, not only are we told that the
capture of Mounichia, which preceded the entry into Athens, occurred in the archonship of
Anaxikrates (Parian Marble, under 307/6; Pseudo-Plutarch, X *Orat. Vit.*, p. 850 D), but also
that the capture of Megara, a still earlier event, fell within this same archonship (Philochorus,
frg. 144 = *F.H.G.*, I, p. 408).[3] Again, both the circumstantial account by Plutarch, and
a logical interpretation of the events, demonstrate that the honors granted to Demetrius
Poliorcetes, and consequently the institution of the two new tribes, followed the arrival
of the conqueror at Athens itself. " Now that Demetrius had shown himself great and
splendid in his benefactions, the Athenians rendered him odious and obnoxious by the
extravagance of the honors which they voted him. For instance, they were the first
people in the world to give Demetrius and Antigonus the title of King, although both
had up to that time shrunk from using the word ... Moreover the Athenians were the
only people to give them the appellation of Soteres, and they put a stop to the ancient
custom of designating the year with the name of the annual archon, and elected every
year a priest of the Soteres, whose name they prefaced to their public edicts and private
contracts ... They also created two new tribes, Demetrias and Antigonis; and they
increased the number of the council, which had been five hundred, to six hundred, since
each of the tribes must furnish fifty councillors. But the most monstrous thing that came
into the head of Stratokles (for it was he who invented those elegant and clever bits of

---

[1] Dinsmoor, *op. cit.*, p. 377, n. 1; cf. Parian Marble, in *I.G.*, XII, 5, 444, or Jacoby, *Marmor Parium* or
Frag. Gr. Hist., under 307/6; Diodorus, XX, 45; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Deinarchus*, 2, 3, 9; Pseudo-
Plutarch, X *Orat. Vit.*, p. 850 D.

[2] I.e., 34 days of Thargelion and Skirophorion, 32 days of the first prytany following.

[3] Diodorus (XX, 46) mentions the capture of Megara after the entry into Athens; but this was doubtless
for the sake of unity in his story.

obsequiousness) was his motion that envoys sent by public decree and at public expense to Antigonus or Demetrius should be called, not ambassadors, but *theoroi*, like those who conducted to Delphi and Olympia the ancient sacrifices in behalf of the cities at the great Hellenic festivals. And, finally, they changed the name of the month Mounichion to Demetrion, and that of the last day of the month, the 'Old and New,' to Demetrias, and to the festival called Dionysia they gave the new name of Demetria " (*Dem.* 10–12). It seems to me quite clear that all these honors must have been proposed by Stratokles quite late in the year.[1] And this seems necessary also in view of *I.G.*, II², 466, which mentions Antigonus and Demetrius, Mounichia (captured in the archonship of Anaxikrates), and favors to the city of Athens, and yet at the same time refers to the Council of Five Hundred. It belongs, therefore, to a period in 307/6 B.C. after the capture of Mounichia, but before the two new tribes had chosen one hundred additional councillors. And if we were to seek an appropriate time, we should probably select the sixth prytany, that of Antiochis, when Stratokles was likewise busily proposing honors for another great hero of the democracy, Lycurgus of Boutadai (Pseudo-Plutarch, *X Orat. Vit.*, p. 852 A, a decree from which the extant epigraphical version, *I.G.*, II², 457, omits the date).

On the calendarial side, Broneer's restoration would force us to assume that, while planning an intercalary year from the very beginning, giving prytanies of 32 days $(384 \div 12)$, the Athenians forgot their intention of employing an intercalary month (Posideon II) until a month too late, and then had to insert an extraordinary intercalary month (Gamelion II). Such forgetfulness, to be sure, would not in itself be impossible. But it seems very doubtful when combined with an extraordinary irregularity in the lengths of the prytanies: $32 + 32 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 26 + 26 + 39 + 39 + 40 = 384$ days.[2] No reasons are offered for the reduction of the third to ninth prytanies inclusive, and for the consequent enlargement of the remaining three.

Finally, we turn to the epigraphical difficulties, resulting from the necessity of restoring the other inscriptions of this year so that they will fit into a consecutive, if not consistent, calendar. In *I.G.*, II², 455, Broneer eliminates Stratokles as the mover in order to shorten the lines by one letter (though Stratokles appears as mover in at least 86 per cent of the other known decrees of this year);[3] and he fills out line 3 with two unnecessary *iotas*,

---

[1] The very next event mentioned by Plutarch is the departure of Demetrius for the naval campaign of 306 B.C. off Cyprus (*Dem.* 15). This also occurred within the archonship of Anaxikrates (Parian Marble, under 307/6).

[2] Kirchner had obtained $36 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 29 + 29 + 26 + 26 + 39 + 39 + 40 = 384$ days.

[3] I.e., in *I.G.*, II², 455, 456, 457 + 1347, 460, 461 = 726; *S.E.G.*, III, 86. And he *might* have been the mover also in *I.G.*, II², 458, 459, 462, 464 and 466. The restoration [Δημοχάρης Λάχητος Λευκονοιεύς] in *I.G.*, II², 463, is due to Frickenhaus (*Athens Mauern*, p. 30, on the basis of *X Orat. Vit.*, p. 851 D); but it is significant that it occupies 27 letters which would be exactly suitable for Stratokles. With regard to the decrees of Stratokles, of which I attempted to give a complete list of twenty-one (*Archons*, pp. 13–14; read " 457 + 1347," and omit " 566 + unpub." as noted above, p. 303), I may note that Dow has now restored his name in II², 474 of 306/5 (*A.J.A.*, 1933, p. 412), because the space of 27 letters exactly fits his name, while Broneer has found it in a new decree of 302/1 B.C. (*Hesperia*, I, p. 45). With the new decree of 307/6 B.C., therefore, the total number is now increased to twenty-four.

in -ειευς and ὀγδοίης.[1] *I.G.*, II[2], 456 he accepts as it stands, though restoring the equation as Maimakterion (26) = Prytany V, 2 (1);[2] the only epigraphical difficulty is the restoration of an extra letter in line 4,[3] and this would not be impossible since it occurs in three other lines of the same inscription. The real difficulty in the way of a literal acceptance of *I.G.*, II[2], 456, is the senseless havoc which it creates in the calendar. In *I.G.*, II[2], 458, Broneer returns to the unsatisfactory restoration [ὀγ]δ[οίη]ς. In *I.G.*, II[2], 459, he makes the same restorations [ὀγδοίης] and ὀγδ[οίηι], and assumes a scribal error of considerable extent, the writing of Ἀνθη[λιῶνος] for Γαμηλιῶνος; he also suggests that this decree may not belong to 307/6 B.C.[4] Finally, in the case of *I.G.*, II[2], 464, Broneer offers no restoration, but says that mine " fills all the requirements according to (his) arrangement." But this may be doubted, inasmuch as the space of 16 letters for the name and number of the prytany could be filled by [Δημητριάδος τρίτ]η[ς] only on the assumption that two letters were inscribed in a single space.[5] Admitting this possibility, one could also restore [Αἰγηῖδος (or Οἰνηῖδος) ἐνδεκάτης] with the month [Θαργηλιῶνος], which would likewise fit Broneer's scheme.[6] But, without assuming an extra letter in line 2 or 4, or both, it would be impossible to make a satisfactory restoration of *I.G.*, II[2], 464.[7]

   I shall attempt, therefore, to restore the new decree in such a way as to avoid these numerous difficulties. It is true that line 1 must have contained 28 letters,[8] and the same is apparently true of line 5 (where the less desirable alternatives πένπ[τηι καὶ δεκάτηι] or πένπ[τηι καὶ τριακοστῆι] would require 27 or 30 letters respectively). On the other hand, line 3 would preferably have included 29 letters, restoring Διομεεύς (as in *I.G.*, II[2], 458, and, by restoration, 455, 456, 457, 461, 462, *S.E.G.*, III, 86),[9] or even 30 letters, restoring Διομειεύς (as in *I.G.*, II[2], 460, 464). In order to employ 28 letters in this line, Broneer is obliged to restore an unprecedented spelling Διομεύς.[10] It is preferable to

---

[1] Against this letter form I have argued elsewhere (*op. cit.*, p. 379, n. 1).

[2] Instead of Kirchner's Maimakterion (29/30) = Prytany V, 2 (2).

[3] Such an extra letter had been restored also by Kirchner in the same line.

[4] The additional letters in line 4, which Broneer regarded as not hitherto observed, were given in *I.G.*, II[1], 241; II[2], 459 add.

[5] The 28th day of the third prytany would fall on Pyanopsion 3.

[6] The 28th day of the eleventh prytany would fall on Thargelion 8.

[7] I.e., the 16 letters for the name of the tribe and number of the prytany could have been filled, according to Broneer's scheme, only by Ἐρεχθηῖδος or Κεκρωπίδος with πρώτης or ἐνάτης, by Λεωντίδος or Αἰαντίδος with ἑβδόμης, or by Αἰγηῖδος or Οἰνηῖδος with δευτέρας. On the other hand, the gap of 11 letters containing the name of the month in line 4 would admit only of Πυανοψιῶνος, Μουνιχιῶνος, or Θαργηλιῶνος. But according to Broneer's scheme, the 28th day of the first prytany would fall on the corresponding day of Hekatombaion, that of the second on the last day of Metageitnion, that of the seventh on Gamelion II, 5, while the ninth had only 26 days, in Anthesterion; none of these months could fill the requirements of the inscription. Nor could we restore any of the available months Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, Μεταγειτνιῶνος, or Γαμηλιῶνος ὑστέρου in 12 letter spaces (omitting the final letter of ἐγραμμάτευεν); and only if we assumed that, in addition, two letters were inscribed in one space, could we restore one of these months, Ἑκατομβαιῶνος.

[8] I follow the numbering of the lines in Broneer's text (*loc. cit.*, p. 399), though in his restoration (p. 398) the numbers are one line higher.

[9] Concerning Broneer's restoration of *I.G.*, II[2], 455 with Διομειεύς, see above.

[10] He refers to some analogies in other demotics (*loc. cit.*, p. 399, n. 1).

assume that there were actually 29 letters in line 3. Hence we cannot definitely claim that line 4 had 28 rather than 29 letters. In this line, the day of the month occupied so little space that the only possible restoration is the last day (ἕνηι καὶ νέαι). Consequently, the name of the month would have occupied 12 letters (with 28 letters in the line) or 13 letters (with 29 letters in the line). In the former case, it could only have been Boedromion (as restored by Broneer), which encounters the many difficulties listed above. In the latter case, it might have been Hekatombaion, Anthesterion, Elaphebolion, or Skirophorion. Considering these in turn, it is obvious that we must eliminate Hekatombaion (of which the last day could never have coincided with the 25th day of a prytany likewise beginning on the first day of the year), and also Skirophorion (because the last day of the year could never have coincided with the 25th day of the last prytany, which must have had either 40 days, as in the scheme of Kirchner and Broneer, or 29 as I calculate). Elaphebolion is eliminated because Hippothontis held the tenth prytany during this entire month (*I.G.*, II², 460–462; *S.E.G.*, III, 86). There remains only Anthesterion, of which the last day would be the 266th day of the year; and, since the prytany of Demetrias was then in its 25th day, its first day would have been Anthesterion 5. Furthermore, Anthesterion 5 being within one day of the date assigned by Broneer (Anth. 4) and myself (Anth. 6) to the beginning of a prytany, there can be little doubt that we are to restore the month as Anthesterion.[1] And, with such a calendar date, it is apparent that the prytany must have been the eighth, which might have been written in line 2 with 28 letters (ὀγδόης) or, less probably, with 29 (ὀγδοίης). It may be suggested that lines 1–2 were written with 28 letters in order to terminate the phrase with line 2, and that the remainder of the decree had 29 letters in each line (with a gap in line 5, or a single letter occupying two spaces, as in three instances in *I.G.*, II², 463 of this year). In any case, the restoration of the new decree would seem to be as follows:

Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικ[ράτους ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆ]   (28)
ς Δημητρι[άδος ὀγδόης πρυτανείας]   (28)
[ῆ]ι Λυσία[ς Νοθίππου Διομεεὺς ἐγραμ]-   (29)
[μά]τευεν [Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἕνηι καὶ νέ]-   (29)
5   [αι] πέμπ[τηι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτα]-   (28)
[νεία]ς· ἐ[κκλησία· κτλ.]

In *I.G.*, II², 459, where, with the alternatives Demetrias and Akamantis, I had restored the former as holding the ninth prytany, some correction is necessary. In addition, Broneer has noted that the lines probably had one letter less at the beginning, with [Ἐπ'] Ἀναξικρ-, [νεί]ας Ἀνθη- and [εγδὸ]ν ὀγδ- respectively. Restoring [ἐνάτης πρυτα] at the end of the first line, and eight to eleven letters for the name of the tribe, the line would have contained between 47 and 50 letters. The second line could still be restored

---

[1] According to the form of the fracture, Βοηδρομιῶνος should have left a trace of the B; but the existing blank surface is exactly suitable for A.

with 50 letters in the line, as follows: [νεί]ας, Ἀνθη[στηριῶνος δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι - -δεκάτηι ἡμερολ]. But now, with the eighth prytany beginning one day earlier than I had formerly calculated, it seems preferable to move the ninth one day earlier as well, so that we restore ἐν(instead of δω)δεκάτηι. The name of the tribe must, therefore, have contained eleven letters as before; and, since Demetrias is required for the eighth prytany, Antigonis for the seventh, and Pandionis for the twelfth, we are limited to Akamantis, the second of the alternatives which I had formerly considered.[1]

With this single alteration, I believe that my former arrangement of the calendar of this peculiar year remains valid. The equations yielded by the various inscriptions are the following:

II², 1589	(Hekatombaion) 2 = Prytany I, (2)
II², 464	(Pyanopsion) = Prytany (III), 28–(Erechtheis or Kekropis)
II², 456	Maimakterion (16) = Prytany V,[2] 2 (8)–(Aigeis or Oineis)
	or Maimakterion[3] (15) = Prytany V, 2 (1)–(Aigeis or Oineis)
II², 458	Gamelion II, 28 = Prytany (VII), 21–Antigonis
Hesp., II, p. 398	(Anthesterion I, 29) = Prytany (VIII), (2) 5–Demetrias
II², 459	Anthesterion (II, 11) = Prytany (IX), 8–(Akamantis)
II², 460–462	Elaphebolion (9) = Prytany X, 9–Hippothontis
S.E.G., III, 86	Elaphebolion (–) = Prytany (X)–Hippothontis
II², 455	(Skirophorion 7) = Prytany (XII, 7)–(Pandionis)

And on these we may base the calendar itself as follows:

	Tribe	Pryt.	Months	Days
II², 1589			I, Hekatombaion 1–Metageitnion 5 = 35	(1–35)
			II, Metageitnion 6–Boedromion 11 = 36	(36–71)
II², 464	Erechtheis or Kekropis		III, Boedromion 12–Pyanopsion 18 = 36	(72–107)
II², 456	Aigeis or Oineis		IV, Pyanopsion 19–Maimakterion 23 = 35	(108–142)
			V, Maimakterion 24–Posideon 30 = 36	(143–178)
X Orat. Vit., 852 A II², 457	Antiochis		VI, Gamelion I, 1–Gamelion II, 7 = 36	(179–214)
II², 458	Antigonis		VII, Gamelion II, 8–Anthesterion I, 4 = 27	(215–241)
Hesp., II, p. 398	Demetrias		VIII, Anthesterion I, 5–Anthesterion II, 3 = 28	(242–269)
II², 459	Akamantis		IX, Anthesterion II, 4–Anthesterion II, 30 = 27	(270–296)
II², 460–462 S.E.G., III, 86	Hippothontis		X, Elaphebolion 1–Elaphebolion 29 = 29	(297–325)
			XI, Thargelion 1–Thargelion 30 = 30	(326–355)
II², 455	Pandionis		XII, Skirophorion 1–Skirophorion 29 = 29	(356–384)

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 383.
[2] Error for IV.
[3] Error for Posideon.

With this arrangement we have a system which appears to meet the historical requirements. The two new tribes were created during the sixth prytany, that of Antiochis, when honors were decreed both to Demetrius Poliorcetes and to Lycurgus. Antigonis and Demetrias were inserted in official order as soon as they came into existence, and the remaining four tribes followed in an order determined by lot.[1] Again, the calendar requirements are better satisfied. The year began as an ordinary one, with prytanies of 35 or 36 days; six prytanies were held on this assumption, averaging $35\,^2/_3$ days. Then the year was increased to 384 days, and the remaining 170 days distributed among six prytanies averaging $28\,^1/_3$ days each. But three of these last prytanies were reduced to $27\,^1/_3$ days, in order to attain concordance with the lunar months, so that the final three prytanies averaged $29\,^1/_3$ days each. Finally, the epigraphical irregularities are reduced to a minimum. Apart from the possible vacillation between 28 and 29 letters in the lines of the new decree, we have only the scribal error discovered by Broneer, writing Ἀνθη[στηριῶνος] for Ἀνθεστηριῶνος (I.G., II², 459), and another scribal error in I.G., II², 456, either Μαιμακτ[ηριῶνος] by mistake for Ποσιδεῶνος (cf. II², 375)[2] or [π]έμπτης by mistake for τετάρτης (cf. II², 358, 649, Magnesia, no. 37).[3]

In addition to meeting these requirements, my arrangement yields what seems to be a reasonable explanation of the story told by Plutarch, and mentioned also by Philippides, with reference to Demetrius Poliorcetes and the calendar.[4] We have already quoted the portion of the story which Plutarch attaches to 307/6 B.C.: " They changed the name of the month Mounichion to Demetrion, and that of the last day of the month, the ' Old and New,' to Demetrias " (Dem. 12). But in a later passage, and apparently referring to the second sojourn of 304/3 B.C., Plutarch again discusses the vagaries of the calendar: " When Demetrius was getting ready to return to Athens, he wrote letters to the people saying that he wished to be initiated into the mysteries as soon as he arrived, and to pass through all the grades in the ceremony, from the lowest to the highest. Now this was not lawful, and had not been done before; but the lesser rites were performed in the month Anthesterion, the great rites in Boedromion; and the supreme rites were celebrated after an interval of at least a year from the great rites. And yet when the letter of Demetrius was read, no one ventured to oppose the proposition except Pythodorus the Torchbearer, and he accomplished nothing; instead, on motion of Stratokles, it was voted to call the current month, which was Mounichion, Anthesterion, and so to regard it, and the lesser rites at Agra were performed for Demetrius; after which Mounichion was again changed and became Boedromion instead of Anthesterion; Demetrius received the remaining rites of initiation, and at the same time was admitted to the highest grade of ' epoptus.' Hence Philippides, in his abuse of Stratokles, wrote:—' Who abridged the

---

[1] It is now no longer necessary to assume that this order was determined at the beginning of the year, as I formerly suggested (op. cit., pp. 379–380).

[2] Cf. Archons, pp. 9, 373, 383.

[3] Cf. Archons, pp. 9, 357, 371, 384.

[4] I had obtained the same result in my former study (Archons, p. 383).

whole year into a single month'" (*Dem.* 26). Diodorus likewise separated these events (XX, 45 and 110). But it is noteworthy that Philippides ridiculed the abridgement of the year in the very passage which attacked Stratokles on the subject of the honors granted to Demetrius.[1] And it hardly seems that the calendar would have been altered, and liberties taken with the same month Mounichion on two separate occasions. We may assume that Demetrius altered the calendar and was initiated into the Mysteries during the tenth month of the year (April 6–May 5), and departed shortly thereafter for his campaign off Cyprus.

---

[1] Philippides, in Plutarch, *Dem.* 12 and 26 (Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.*, III, p. 308).

WILLIAM BELL DINSMOOR