

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LATE FOURTH CENTURY

IN the *Works and Days* Hesiod names one of the days of the month *τρισεινάδα* (*Days*, line 814), and in his scholia Proklos defines the *τρισεινάδα* of Hesiod as the 29th (*τρίτην εἰνάδα τὴν εἰκοστὴν εἶπεν ἐνάτην*). Hesiod says that few know this day to be best “for hauling a fast ship with many locks down to the wine-blue waters. For there are few who call true things by their right names.” I use here Richmond Lattimore’s translation of lines 817-818, which contain the significant phrase

παῦροι δέ τ’ ἀληθέα κικλήσκουσι.

These words led Proklos to comment on the ambiguity that Hesiod knew in the definition of the 29th day: sometimes it was called the 29th, if the month had 30 days, and sometimes it was called *τριακάς*, if it was itself the last day of the month. The text of Hesiod exposes the difficulty and makes the above comment upon it. Proklos’s scholion reads as follows: *τοῦτ’ ἐναργὲς ἐποίησεν, ὅτι τρίτην εἰνάδα κέκληκεν οὐ κατὰ Ἀθηναίους τὴν δευτέραν εἰκοστὴν ἀνάπαλιν ἀριθμοῦντας τὰς φθινούσας—δεκάτην, ἐνάτην, ὀγδόην καὶ ἐξῆς—ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸ τριακάδος· περὶ γὰρ ταύτης ἀμφιβάλλουσιν, εἴτε ἐσχάτη ἐστίν, εἴτε πρὸ τῆς ἐσχάτης· εἰκότως οὖν ὀλίγοι τὴν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐνάτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν καλοῦσιν.* “This makes it clear, that he has named as the “third ninth” not the 22nd, like the Athenians who count the waning days backward—tenth, ninth, eighth, etc.—but the one before the 30th, for concerning this they are in doubt whether it is the last or before the last. *So it is understandable that few name aright the true twenty-ninth.*”¹

The italicized comment carries the burden of what Proklos wished to explain about Hesiod’s *παῦροι δέ τ’ ἀληθέα κικλήσκουσι*. The importance of the passage as a whole is that it shows Proklos to have had knowledge of the backward count of the last decade of a full month in classical Athens,² and that it also shows his knowledge that Hesiod’s count was forward.³ It must be read in connection with another scholion

¹ I have profited much from discussion of these scholia with Paul Clement, who has guided my thought about them and helped me, I am confident, to a better understanding than I could have had without his criticism and advice. I take it that *τοῦτ’ ἐναργὲς ἐποίησεν* means *τοῦτο τὸ στιχίδιον* (*vel sim.*; cf. the scholion on lines 820-821) *ἐναργὲς ἐποίησεν*, referring to Hesiod’s line rather than to Hesiod himself (i.e., not “he makes this clear, etc.”). The subject of *ἀμφιβάλλουσιν* is surely general, not *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι* (understood). I leave the translation in all its ambiguity, because the Greek is ambiguous. But Proklos is explaining a line of Hesiod, not an Athenian dilemma, and this fact must be kept in mind for a proper evaluation of his scholion on lines 765-768.

² Cf. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 45. The designation *δεκάτη φθίνοντος* did not survive the fourth century.

³ The scholion on line 780 which I cited in *Historia*, XI, 1962, pp. 443-444, as showing that Proklos counted the last decade of Hesiod’s month forward is not really necessary to the argument. Felix Jacoby attributed the scholion to Proklos (*Frag. Gr. Hist.*, III B 328 F 189), but Pertusi apparently disagrees. It does not matter. If the scholion comes from Proklos it confirms the other

in which Proklos earlier commented on the ἡμέρα ἐκ Διόθεν (lines 765-768). Here, as he explains, Hesiod began his enumeration of these days of the month with the thirtieth (τριακάς), on which day was the true conjunction: ἀρχεται οὖν ὁ Ἡσίοδος ἐκ τῆς τριακάδος, καθ' ἣν ἡ ἀληθής ἐστι σύνοδος, ὅτε μὲν οὖσαν τριακάδα ἄνευ ἐξαίρεσεως, ὅτε δὲ εἰκοστήν ἐνάτην, ὅτε καὶ ὑπεξαίρεῖται ἡ πρὸ αὐτῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων.

Such, at least, is the text as published by A. Pertusi in his edition of 1955. But the final ὅτε should be read ὅτε; otherwise the scholion makes no sense.⁴ If left as it is, the words "sometimes being the 30th without subtraction, sometimes the 29th, sometimes also the day before it is subtracted by the Athenians" are unintelligible. And anyway the text would have to be emended by the addition of δέ after the final ὅτε to balance the ὅτε μὲν and the ὅτε δέ which precede. The only way to justify such a jumble as now exists is to assume that the whole phrase ὅτε καὶ ὑπεξαίρεῖται ἡ πρὸ αὐτῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων was a marginal gloss (needing no postpositive δέ) which has been taken into the text proper without being truly merged with it.⁵ But if this was the case it was not part of Proklos's comment. This, however, though possible, may not be the explanation, for the ἄνευ ἐξαίρεσεως of Proklos's description of a full month seems to lead up to mention of the ὑπεξαίρεσις which makes the month hollow, and in these circumstances the final ὅτε must be read ὅτε.⁶ The translation "Hesiod begins from the τριακάς, sometimes being the 30th without subtraction, sometimes the 29th when in fact the day before it is subtracted" makes good sense, is complete as it stands, and is, I submit, the scholion as Proklos probably wrote it.⁷ The words ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων are superfluous and again destroy the meaning. Proklos was describing Hesiod's count of days, which he knew to be forward in the last decade of the month, and which he elsewhere (see above) contrasts, *not* equates, with the Athenian count. Athens here has nothing to do with the case. The omission of Hesiod's 29th day was not brought about by anything done in Athens, and the absurdity of saying so condemns the tag ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων.

evidence here quoted; if it is not from Proklos it shows that some other scholiast used the Boiotian count.

⁴ This change was made in my quotation of Pertusi's text in *The Athenian Year*, pp. 38-39. How my reference to Proklos there as the bishop rather than the philosopher came to be made I do not know; it is quite in error, entirely regrettable, and I have no explanation.

⁵ A letter from Professor Pertusi, whom I consulted about the text of this scholion, states that he finds it ambiguous and difficult to interpret: "Confesso che anche a me il testo — — — non è molto chiaro, anzi piuttosto ambiguo."

⁶ Pertusi also writes that, taking the text as a whole, perhaps it would be better to read ὅτε in place of the final ὅτε: "sarà meglio leggere ὅτε, e non ὅτε (καί), come ho stampato."

⁷ The word καί is one of the most difficult in the Greek language to translate, but its use here falls best into that category the purpose of which Liddell-Scott-Jones describe as "to add a limiting or defining expression." This is just what the phrase in question does for the preceding clause: it defines exactly how the 30th becomes the 29th and is still called the 30th. But this all happened in Boiotia.

The words ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων are, in fact, omitted in manuscripts ZB, though this reflects no continuous tradition and cannot be too much stressed. According to the stemmata constructed by Hermann Schultz⁸ and A. Pertusi,⁹ manuscript B depends on A either directly (Schultz) or through the medium of Z (Pertusi); and A, of the tenth or eleventh century, has ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων in its text. The omission in ZB, therefore, is due either to carelessness or to the perspicacity of the scribe who saw that it was unintelligible.¹⁰ The words ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων existed in the manuscript tradition at least as early as A. They were evidently known to Manuel Moschopoulos (ca. 1300) who explains in his scholion on ἡμέτερα ἐκ Διόθεν (Gaisford's edition, p. 344): οὐχ ὑπεξαίρεσιν, ὡς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι δηλονότι, ποιοῦντες· οὗτοι γὰρ τὴν πρὸ τριακάδος ὑπεξαίρουντες ἐνάτην καὶ εἰκοστήν τὴν τριακάδα καλοῦσιν. Without background knowledge of the actual calendar in Athens he had no other way to interpret the scholion as he knew it, and though he is earlier by about 650 years than some moderns who have come to his conclusion his judgment carries no more weight than can be got from the scholion of Proklos itself. We can go back, apparently, no farther than the lost archetype of A, as indeed of all the manuscripts, which Schultz has shown to have been everywhere liable to omissions and interpolations, of which he gives examples.¹¹

The text as it now stands, whether one reads ὅτε or ὅτε, needs emendation. My suggestion is that ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων be deleted; apparently this too was the opinion behind the "manus prima" of Z. But it might be saved if one were to read, for example, ὅτε καὶ ὑπεξαίρεται ἢ πρὸ αὐτῆς <ὥσπερ> ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων. Something like this seems to have been understood by Moschopoulos, though no useful purpose is served by the reference to Athens, and I suspect, even so, that ὥσπερ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων (if such indeed be a good emendation) was a gloss that crept into the text from the hand of some late commentator, a bit of specious erudition that has nothing to do with the case. But this scholion, unlike that on lines 817-818, is not concerned with the direction of the count; its concern is only that sometimes the 29th day was called the 30th. This was in fact the case in post-Solonian Athens as well as in pre-Solonian Boiotia, and it may be that back of the garbled text lies nothing more significant than a desire to make this comparison.

The day "omitted" in Boiotia was Hesiod's *τρισευῶς*, *alias* *τρίτη εἰνᾶς*, *alias* *ἐνάτη φθίνουσα*, or, more conventionally, *ἐνάτη φθίνοντος*. In Athens *ἐνάτη φθίνοντος* was known in the late fourth century and thereafter as *ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας*, and this was in fact the day omitted from the hollow months (with backward count) in Athens.

⁸ *Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, NF XII, 4, 1910, p. 79.

⁹ *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Milan, 1955, p. XX.

¹⁰ Sometimes the scribes, if learned enough, omitted what they could not understand. Cf. Schultz, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹¹ Hermann Schultz, *op. cit.*, p. 65: "für die Proklos-Scholien zu den Erga lernen wir, dass wir überall mit Auslassungen und Interpolationen zu rechnen haben."

The lacuna that has to be assumed between *πρὸ αὐτῆς* and *ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων* to accommodate some word like *ὥσπερ* and to make the gloss intelligible may have specified also that the omitted day was the *ἐνάτη* of the third decade of the month. This would be factually true both for Boiotia and for Athens, and the line could be thus emended: *ὅτε καὶ ὑπεξαίρεται ἡ πρὸ αὐτῆς* (thus far Proklos, and here follows the gloss) *<ἡ ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας δηλονότι, ὥσπερ> ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων*. This is an almost classic example of the figure of speech known as *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*. For Boiotia the *τρίτη εἰνὰς* or *ἐνάτη φθίνοντος* was indeed *ἡ πρὸ τῆς τριακάδος*; in Athens *ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας* was not (in backward count) *ἡ πρὸ τῆς τριακάδος*. The *τριακάς* was known in Athens as *ἔνη καὶ νέα*, a precise detail which Proklos does not trouble to specify; his concern was with Hesiod and not with Athens. Since the scholion in general was merely to explain how the 29th day came to be called the 30th Proklos does not bother with the direction of count. And the author of the gloss was apparently not aware that this created a dilemma in his gratuitous comparison between Athens and Boiotia. But I still prefer the solution which deals solely with Hesiod and deletes *ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων*.

As between the corrupt text here and the clear-cut and intelligible evidence of the Aristophanes scholia that the day before the 30th in the calendar-count of days was *not* omitted in Athens in a hollow month when the count was backward,¹² the decision must favor the scholia on Aristophanes. This too is the evidence, taken without prejudice, of the inscriptions which cover the years in question of classical Athens. As a compact sample, it so happens that a goodly number of texts, more than usual, have been preserved from the end of the fourth century, and it is instructive to study these as a unit, reconstructing from them the equations between the conciliar and the festival years from 307 to 301 B.C.

The year of the archon Leostratos (303/2) was intercalary in the festival calendar at Athens. The equations between the festival year (months) and the conciliar year (prytanies) range in the preserved documents from early Anthesterion to the last day of the last month and prytany.¹³ They indicate a normal year in which the prytanies all had 32 days and in which the months began with hollow Hekatombaion and alternated throughout hollow and full until hollow Skirophorion, which was given an extra day at the end. The year contained 384 days.¹⁴

The calendar equations are clear except in *I.G.*, II², 498, where Kirchner restored the twelfth prytany and the month Skirophorion, but no date. B. Leonardos (*Ἀρχ. Δελτ.*, 1915, p. 215), cited as 1916 in the *Addenda* of the *Corpus*, suggested [*Σκιροφοριῶνος ἕκτηι ἰσταμένου, ὀγδόῃ τῆς πρυτ*] *ανείας*. This restoration fits the known calendar

¹² Cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 43-45, especially the phrase "that day which we call the 21st they (the Athenians) call *ἐνάτη φθίνοντος*."

¹³ *I.G.*, II², 489-498; *Hesperia*, XXI, 1952, pp. 367-368 (8).

¹⁴ See Kirchner's commentary on *I.G.*, II², 489.

of the year, and has been accepted by Pritchett and Neugebauer in their *Calendars of Athens* (p. 69). Yet the restoration cannot be correct because the meeting of the ekklesia when *I.G.*, II², 498 was passed was an [ἐκκλησία κυρ]ία, one such only being permitted in any given prytany. This is a calendrical fact known from Aristotle, to which Pritchett and Neugebauer have elsewhere appealed,¹⁵ and which is important here because the ἐκκλησία κυρία of the twelfth prytany in 303/2 came on the twenty-third day (*I.G.*, II², 494) and not on the eighth.

Hence *I.G.*, II², 498 must be assigned to some prytany other than the twelfth, and I suggest the following skeleton restoration in the opening lines:

I.G., II², 498

a. 303/2 a. ΣΤΟΙΧ. 29

[ἐπὶ Λεωστράτου ἄρχ]οντο[ς ἐ]πὶ τῇ[ς . . .]

[.....¹⁶.....] πρυ[τα]ν[είας ἥι Δ]

[ιόφαντος Διονυσοδ]ώρ[ου Φηγούσιος]

[ἐγραμμάτευεν·¹⁷.....]

5 [.....¹⁶..... τῆς πρυτ]ανείας·

[ἐκκλησία κυρ]ία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψή

[φιζεν Στρά]τιος Φιλοτίμου Σφήττιο

[ς¹⁶ κα]ὶ συμπρόεδροι· ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλε

etc.

If the prytany is restored as Leontis XI in lines 1-2, then in lines 4-5 any one of the following equations will meet the calendar requirements:

326th day [Θαργηλιῶνος δευτέραι ἱσταμένου, ἕκτηι τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

327th day [Θαργηλιῶνος τρίτηι ἱσταμένου, ἑβδόμηι τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

328th day [Θαργηλιῶνος τετράδι ἱσταμένου, ὀγδόηι τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

329th day [Θαργηλιῶνος πέμπτηι ἱσταμένου, ἐνάτηι τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

These dates correspond to the indicated pattern of months and prytanies within the year, as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29 + 1 = 384
Prytanies	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32 = 384

But other days are also possible. One might restore Hippothontis III in lines 1-2, and then read the date, for example, as:

67th day [Βοηδρομιῶνος ὀγδόηι ἱσταμένου, τρίτηι τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

¹⁵ *Calendars*, pp. 58-59; see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 108-109.

¹⁶ For the name of the proedros see *Hesperia Index I-X*, p. 180, where the note is based on Agora Inv. No. I 4720, as yet unpublished, where the name appears in full.

With Demetrias, Pandionis, or Akamantis V (Antigonis was X: *I.G.*, II², 491) the month could have been Maimakterion with either of the equations:

- 131st day [Μαιμακτηριῶνος τρίτη ἐπὶ δέκα, τρίτη τῆς πρυτ]ανείας
 136th day [Μαιμακτηριῶνος ὀγδόη ἐπὶ δέκα, ὀγδόη τῆς πρυτ]ανείας
 137th day [Μαιμακτηριῶνος ἐνάτη ἐπὶ δέκα, ἐνάτη τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

Also permissible would be Antigonis X (cf. *I.G.*, II², 491) with the calendar equation:

- 298th day [Μουνιχιῶνος τρίτη ἰσταμένου, δεκάτη τῆς πρυτ]ανείας.

Indeed, this last equation is the most probable of all, for the decree, like *I.G.*, II², 491, praises a distinguished foreigner, and the likely time for them to have been in Athens was during and after the Dionysiac festival. It may well be that *I.G.*, II², 491 and 498 were passed at the same meeting of the ekklesia, on the same day.

But, leaving the calendar equation of *I.G.*, II², 498 out of account, the known other equations of the year may be tabulated as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 244th day | Prytany VIII [20] = Anthesterion 8 | <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 489 |
| 253rd day | Prytany [VIII 2]9 = Anthesterion 1[7] | <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 490 |
| 375th day | Prytany XII 23 = Skirophorion 21 | <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 493, 494 |
| 383rd day | Prytany XII 31 = Skirophorion 29 | <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 495, 496, 497 |
| | (ἔνη καὶ νέα προτέρα) | |
| 384th day | Prytany XII 3[2] = Skirophorion [30] | <i>Hesperia</i> , XXI, 1952, pp. |
| | (ἔνη καὶ νέα) | 367-368 |

Skirophorion must have been planned as a hollow month (29 days), for the ἔνη καὶ νέα had to be repeated to bring its total up to 30 days and allow the festival and the conciliar years to end together in the summer of 302. This is additional proof that in the hollow month the omitted day was not δευτέρα φθίνοντος (or here δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας), for if the count had come down through the twenties just as in a full month, which is what Pritchett and Neugebauer claim for every hollow month until they reach δευτέρα φθίνοντος, there would have been no need for an intercalated ἔνη καὶ νέα to round out the thirty days; the count could simply have let δευτέρα φθίνοντος stand as the 29th and ἔνη καὶ νέα could have been in quite normal order the 30th. But the Aristophanic scholia show that the omitted day in a hollow month came where the backward count began. When δεκάτη φθίνοντος was the 21st day in a full month, this day was omitted in a hollow month and the backward count began with ἐνάτη φθίνοντος as the 21st. When δεκάτη ὑστέρα meant the 21st, the backward count began with ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας and this day was therefore omitted in a hollow month. In the closing days of Skirophorion in 302 the naming was as follows:

- Skiophorion 21 = δεκάτη ὑστέρα
 Skiophorion 22 = ὀγδὴ μετ' εἰκάδας
 (ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας omitted in this hollow month)¹⁷
 Skiophorion 23 = ἐβδόμη μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 24 = ἕκτη μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 25 = πέμπτη μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 26 = τετρὰς μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 27 = τρίτη μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 28 = δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας
 Skiophorion 29 = ἔνη καὶ νέα προτέρα
 Skiophorion 30 = ἔνη καὶ νέα (ἐμβόλιμος)

There was no help for it, as the month drew to a close, but to have an intercalated day to round out the thirty and allow the festival year and the conciliar year to end together. If we believe that the omitted day in a hollow month was *δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας*, we are faced with the curious dilemma that the Athenians must have omitted this day *even as they knew* that an extra intercalation would have to be made to take the place of it. They might have passed over the 21st as a routine matter of alternating full and hollow months, but the problem on the 29th was immediate. Their only need was to bring the month out even with the last prytany which had the normal number of days (32) for an intercalary year. They could do this simply by letting *δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας* stand (according to Pritchett's counting), but the intercalation on which they had to rely shows that *δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας* was not available to them for the 29th. It had, in fact, already been used for the 28th, for backward count, in a hollow month, omitted the first day (*ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας*) with which the backward count began.

The year 304/3 was ordinary, and like 303/2, it ended with a hollow month made full by the addition of an extra final day. This implies, in effect, the sequence of two months of thirty days each at the end of 304/3 and explains the fact that in 303/2, as outlined above, the year began with hollow Hekatombaion. Similarly, it will be expected that 302/1 will also begin, after the sequence of two months of thirty days at the end of 303/2, with hollow Hekatombaion. We shall return to this later.

In 304/3 the year was planned originally to have 354 days, with months and prytanies probably arranged as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	30	29	30	29 = 354
Prytanies	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29 = 354

Attention should be called to the fact that this is a quite normal pattern both for months and for prytanies, for no approximation to the theoretical rule of Aristotle

¹⁷ See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 58-59.

(by analogy from the fourth century) or to the general rule of Pollux (for the years of the twelve phylai) governed in individual cases the arrangement of the prytanies in actual practice.¹⁸ Yet here, as the year neared its end, the decision was made to add an extra day to Skirophorion (the evidence is in *I.G.*, II², 486) and presumably also to the twelfth prytany, to give a year of 355 days, as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	30	29	30	29 + 1 = 355
Prytanies	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	30 = 355

Within this framework all the known calendar equations of 304/3 find their proper setting:

106th day	Prytany IV [19] = Pyanepsion 18	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 481
170th day	Prytany VI [2]4 = Posideon 2[3] ¹⁹	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 482
205th day	Prytany VII 29 = Gamelion 28	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 483
215th day	Prytany VIII ? = [Anthesterion 9]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 484
321st day	Prytany XI [25] = [Thargelion] 2[6]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 485
354th day	Prytany XII 29 = Skirophorion 29	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 486; <i>Hesperia</i> , VII, 1938, p. 297, No. 22
354th day	no equation	Skirophorion [29] <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 597 with <i>Addenda</i> ; cf. Louis Robert, <i>Collection Froehner</i> , I, <i>Inscriptions Grecques</i> , p. 3, No. 3

With Prytany VI having 30 days the span from Posideon 23 to Gamelion *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* was 35 days. Since Posideon was full this makes Gamelion *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* the 28th day of a hollow month. In other words, here again *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* was not omitted in a hollow month, but merely moved back to the 28th day. Any attempt to count the day as Gamelion 29 will necessitate at least one prytany of 31 days or, alternatively, somewhere earlier than Gamelion two hollow months in succession. There is, I think, no escape from the conclusion that Gamelion itself was a hollow month and that *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* was the 28th day of it. Only in this way can the succession of months be kept in order²⁰ and the lengths of the prytanies be maintained at normal.

In *The Athenian Year* I argued that in the archonship of Thymochares (258/7)

¹⁸ For the variety of possible combinations see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 138-140.

¹⁹ Restoring [ὀγδόῃ μετ'] *εικάδας* for the full month.

²⁰ G. Donnay, in his review of *The Athenian Year* (*Revue Belge*, XLI, 1963, p. 137) calls my use of alternating full and hollow months in the festival year "une hypothèse." It is more than that: it is attested by Geminus, and is in fact astronomically justified as a kind of working rule. Cf. *The Athenian Year*, p. 25 note 12, pp. 47-48.

the year was ordinary and that one of the first two prytanies had 31 days.²¹ The irregular length of prytany is, however, not necessary. One possibility (and I think the right one) was overlooked in the restoration of *I.G.*, II², 700. The reading should be [Βοηδ]ρομῶνος ἔνει καὶ [νέαι προτέραι, τριακοστὴ τῆς πρυτανείας]. Instead of claiming with Pritchett and Neugebauer that there were two prytanies of 30 days and three consecutive hollow months (a true monstrosity) we find months and prytanies marching almost *pari passu*:

Prytany I	29 days	= Hekatombaion	29 days
Prytany II	29 days	—Metageitnion	30 days
Prytany III	30 days	—Boedromion	30 days
Prytany III	30	= Boedromion	29 = 88th day

The ordinary year 306/5 has been specially studied by Pritchett.²² The arrangement of months and prytanies within it is as follows: ²³

Months	29	30	29	30	30	29	30	29	30	30	29	30	= 355
Prytanies	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29	29	29	30	= 355

There are several calendar equations:

Pryt. VI (?)	= Posideon [?]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 773; cf. Dow, <i>A.J.A.</i> , XXXVII, 1933, pp. 415-416
Pryt. VII [14]	= Gamelion (?)	<i>Hesperia</i> , III, 1934, p. 5, No. 6
207th day Pryt. VII [2]7	= [Gamelion 30]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 470
225th day Pryt. VIII 16	= [Anthesterion] 1[8]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 675; cf. Pritchett, <i>A.J.P.</i> , LVIII, 1937, p. 332
296th day Pryt. X 29	= Mounichion 30	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 471, 472

Since the year 306/5 ended with full Skirophorion, the first month of 305/4 was probably hollow, and its pattern may be diagrammed as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	= 354
Prytanies	29	29	30	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	= 354

The calendar equations are:

50th Day Pryt. II [21]	= Metageitnion 21	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 796; cf. <i>Hesperia</i> , V, 1936, p. 203.
------------------------	-------------------	---

²¹ Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 140-141. For other speculation about *I.G.*, II², 700, see Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, p. 81 note 9. Dow has a comment on the Calendar of this year in *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 356.

²² *A.J.P.*, LVIII, 1937, pp. 329-333.

²³ For the first four months, see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 139.

88th day	Pryt. [III] 30	= [Boedromion] 29	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 797; cf. <i>Hesperia</i> , V, 1936, p. 203
264th day	Pryt. [IX] 30	= Elaphebolion 28	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 703; cf. <i>Hesperia</i> , V, 1936, p. 203
312th day	Pryt. XI [1] 8	= [Thargelion] 1 [7]	<i>Hesperia</i> , V, 1936, p. 201

The distribution of the prytanies is too uncertain to make the equation in Elephebolion sure, but if the month was hollow (as the pattern of the months seems to demand) then an equation with the 28th day of it is quite possible.

On the other side of 303/2 comes the ordinary year 302/1. This too, since Skirophorion of 303/2 had thirty days, starts with hollow Hekatombaion, and the pattern of months and prytanies appears to be as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30 ⁺²	29 ⁻²	30	29	30	29	30	= 354
Prytanies	29	30	29	30	29	30	30	29	29	29	30	30	= 354

There are enough equations in this year to make the pattern fairly certain:

58th day	Pryt. [II] 2[9]	= Metageitnion [2] 9	<i>Hesperia</i> , I, 1932, p. 45
113th day	Pryt. IV 25	= Pyanepsion 25	<i>Hesperia</i> , IX, 1940, pp. 104-105, No. 20
178th day	Pryt. VII 1	= Posideon 29	<i>Hesperia</i> , V, 1936, p. 415, No. 12

Posideon 29 should have been the 176th day. It must be assumed that two days had been intercalated into the festival calendar before Posideon 29. This is indicated above by +2 over the numeral 30 for Posideon in the pattern of months.

190th day	Pryt. VII [1] 3	= [Gamelion] 1 [1]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 499
-----------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------------------------

Gamelion 11 should have been the 188th day. The two extra days added earlier were probably omitted shortly after this date, for the equation in Anthesterion is again normal. The omission is indicated above by —2 over the numeral 29 for Gamelion in the pattern of months.

234th day	Pryt. VIII 27	= (Anthesterion) 28	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 500
235th day	Pryt. VIII [2] 8	= Anthesterion 2 [9]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 501; cf. <i>Hesperia</i> , IV, 1935, p. 546
287th day	Pryt. [X] 22	= Mounichion 2 [2]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 502; cf. <i>Hesperia</i> , IV, 1935, p. 546
313th day	Pryt. XI 19	= Thargelion 18	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 503

345th day	Pryt. XII 21	= Skirophorion 21	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 505
346th day	Pryt. XII 22	= Skirophorion [22]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 504

In the foregoing five years (306/5—302/1) there is no irregularity in the prytany calendar, and there is only one irregularity, that just observed, in the festival calendar: the addition of two days late in Posideon of 302/1 and the dropping of two days by way of compensation about the middle of Gamelion. In 306/5 the first six prytanies were of 30 days each and the last six of 29 days each, except that the last prytany had a 30th day to make the prytany year come out even with the 355-day festival year. In 305/4 the scheme is almost the reverse of that shown in 306/5, but both would be quite normal, since various modifications of their two basic primary schemes are possible. In 304/3 the first four prytanies were of 29 days each, the next six of 30 days, and the last two again of 29 days, with a 30th day added to the final prytany to make a total of 355 days. In 303/2 the year was intercalary, and all twelve prytanies were of 32 days each. In 302/1 the year was ordinary, and commenced according to the rule of Pollux, by which each prytany lasted a month.²⁴ But there were extra intercalations in the festival calendar in Posideon, and in the second half of the year the prytanies, instead of alternating with the months, ran 30 29 29 30 30. The year had 354 days.

These years show empirically, what we already know from the Aristophanic scholia, that the omitted day in a hollow month with backward count was not *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας*. This appears most clearly in the years 304/3 and 303/2. Moreover, we should not lose sight of a passage in Pollux which attributes the day *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* to every month, whether full or hollow (VIII, 117): *καθ' ἕκαστον δὲ μήνα τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐδίκαζον (οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται) ἐφεξῆς, τετάρτη φθίνοντος, τρίτη, δευτέρα*.²⁵ And I would adduce also Aristophanes himself, in that passage of the *Clouds* where he shows Strepsiades worrying about his debts (lines 1131-1134):

*πέμπτη, τετράς, τρίτη, μετὰ ταύτην δευτέρα,
εἰθ', ἣν ἐγὼ μάλιστα πασῶν ἡμερῶν
δέδοικα καὶ πέφρικα καὶ βδελύττομαι,
εὐθὺς μετὰ ταύτην ἔσθ' ἔνη τε καὶ νέα.*

Aristophanes stresses the anxiety with which Strepsiades sees the last day (*ἔνη καὶ νέα*) closing in upon him. If he could have chosen a month without *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* I cannot believe that he would have failed to do so. The tension would have been greater, the realization of Strepsiades's fears closer to him, and there would have been the added ironic humor of losing a day of respite that he might have had in a

²⁴ See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 135 with note 1.

²⁵ This passage was cited by A. Mommsen in his *Chronologie*, p. 121.

full month. I shall not attempt to write Aristophanic Greek, but (with apologies to Benjamin Rogers) I do wish to show the sort of thing that might have been expected had there been no *δευτέρα φθίνοντος* in a hollow month:

“ The fifth, the fourth, the third, and here I near the end.
 For hollow is the month, and after three the day
 That most I loathe and shrink from and abominate.
 The moon has robbed me of *δευτέρα φθίνοντος*,
 And this month yields me not that extra day of grace
 To spare me from my creditors.”

I regard this as corroborative detail; the evidence is clear enough without it.

In their discussion of the arrangements of twelve prytanies within the year Pritchett and Neugebauer concluded that the evidence “is too elusive to permit the formulation of one rule for the sequence of 29- and 30-day prytanies.” This is an understatement: the evidence positively forbids the formulation of one single rule, even if one accepts only the documents cited by them.²⁶ The sequence of 29- and 30-day prytanies could be given as all 29's followed by all 30's or *vice versa*, or as any desired combination of 29's and 30's to make the year come out even with the months. In the intercalary year the prytanies were all the same, all of 32 days.

These are the rules, not rigid, but flexible, by which the prytanies were ordered. If it seems hard to reconcile them, literally, with the statement of Pollux that the prytanies each lasted for a month, that is of passing interest only in showing that Pollux's rule is not to be taken *au pied de la lettre*. It was doubtless sometimes literally true, as in 288/7, for example, and in 287/6.²⁷ Pritchett and Neugebauer quote Pollux's rule and say that from it “one might be tempted to conclude that there was exact coincidence between prytanies and the months of the civil calendar.” They resist the temptation and show that such was not the case, at least not always. But for the fourth century they quote the rule of Aristotle that when there were ten prytanies the first four were of 36 days and the last six of 35 days. Here again “one might be tempted” to believe that Aristotle meant this to be always true, not just a general rule. Pritchett and Neugebauer do not resist this temptation, which I should think quite on a par with the other, and they have evolved a rigid conciliar year which is not justified by the epigraphical evidence. Reviewers of these calendar studies (some of them) have held that Aristotle proves their rigid scheme correct.²⁸ This claims too much, and utilizes only a fraction of the evidence. Aristotle is right so far as he goes. With the flexible arrangement of prytanies I too believe Aristotle, and accept his

²⁶ *Calendars*, pp. 78-79.

²⁷ See Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, pp. 80-81.

²⁸ See, for example, G. Donnay, *Revue Belge*, XLI, 1963, p. 137.

statement as true, just as true for the fourth century as Pollux is later true for the era of the twelve phylai.

Aristotle says nothing about intercalary years, yet the advocates of a rigid calendar postulate that intercalary years should have (on the testimony of Aristotle) four prytanies of 39 days followed by six of 38 days, and they have drawn up rigid tables to show how they believe it was managed.²⁹ Reasonable though this may be, it is pure hypothesis;³⁰ empirically, it meets the test some of the time; some of the time all the long prytanies come at the end;³¹ and some of the time the long and the short prytanies are divided. Empirically, too, we find this same kind of variety in the ordinary years, but it does not mean that Aristotle was wrong; it merely means that he has, by some, been taken far, far, too literally.

The year 307/6 offers the student more evidence about the calendar than almost any other, as well as a great variety of problems. It is a most instructive year, bafflingly difficult to reconstruct, but at last its plan has become more clear. The year started as ordinary, with twelve months and twelve prytanies, although it was not until after the fifth prytany, at least, that the new phylai of Antigonis and Demetrias were ready to function.³² Then in Gamelion the decision was made to intercalate an extra month; this became Gamelion II (*I.G.*, II², 1487: [Γ]αμηλιῶνος ὑστ[έρου]) and the thirty days thus added to the year were distributed evenly over the remaining six prytanies. In the festival calendar there had already been one slight postponement of days in Gamelion I (*I.G.*, II², 458) where backward count, incidentally, was defined as *ἡμερολεγδόν*.³³ The postponement was soon corrected, but there was later another major postponement of 12 days in Elaphebolion now evidenced by Dow's attribution of *I.G.*, II², 358 to the archonship of Anaxikrates,³⁴ and confirmed by supplementary evidence in *I.G.*, II², 462.³⁵ From literary sources it is known that Antiochis held the sixth prytany, though the calendar equation is not preserved.³⁶

The pattern of months and prytanies within the year is as follows:

Months	29	30	29	30	29	30	⁺² 29 ⁻²	30	29	⁺¹¹ 30 ⁺¹	⁻¹² 29	30	30 = 384
Prytanies	30	30	30	30	30	30	34	34	34	34	34	34	34 = 384

²⁹ Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, p. 37.

³⁰ Cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 9-10.

³¹ Cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 130.

³² The late functioning of these phylai was demonstrated by W. K. Pritchett, *A.J.P.*, LVIII, 1937, pp. 220-222, with new readings in *I.G.*, II², 466 and 456b.

³³ See Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, p. 33.

³⁴ *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 56-60.

³⁵ B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 437.

³⁶ *X Orat. Vitae*, 852A, an archival version of *I.G.*, II², 457.

These are the known calendar equations:

2nd day	Kekropis or Erechtheis	Pryt. I (2)	= [Hek.] 2	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1589
11th day		Pryt. [I 11]	= Hek. [11]	Pritchett and Meritt, <i>Chronology</i> , p. 8
118th day	Aigeis or Oineis	Pryt. [IV] 28	=(Pyanepsion) (30) ³⁷	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 464
147th day	Oineis or Aigeis	Pryt. V 2[7]	= Maim. 29	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 456
	Antiochis	Pryt. VI	no equation	<i>X Orat. Vitae</i> , 852A = <i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 457
201st day	Antigonis	Pryt. VII 21	= Gam. 22+2 ³⁸	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 458
	Demetrias	Pryt. VIII ³⁹	no equation	<i>Hesperia</i> , II, 1933, p. 398
		no equation	Gamelion II	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 1487
256th day	Erechtheis or Kekropis	Pryt. [IX] 8	= Anth. [20]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 459; cf. <i>Chronology</i> , p. 19
285th day	Hippothontis	Pryt. X [3]	= Elaph. [9] ⁴⁰	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 461, 462; <i>S.E.G.</i> , III, 86
307th day	Hippothontis	Pryt. X 2[5]	= Elaph. 30+1	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 358 ⁴¹

³⁷ The lacuna in line 5 of *I.G.*, II², 464 can be supplied either with *Πνανοψιώνος* or with *ἐννη καὶ νέαι*.

³⁸ The 21st day of the seventh prytany should have fallen on Gamelion 24, but the day named in the inscription is *δευτ[έ]ραι ἐ[μ]βολίμωι ὀγδόε[ι] μετ' εἰκάδας ἡμερολογδόν*, namely, the 22nd of Gamelion with backward count plus two intercalations of the same day-number. The omitted day in the hollow month was not *δευτέραι μετ' εἰκάδας* (cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 176-177). The rectification in the calendar may have been made before the end of the month, so that after all Gamelion had only 29 days. This is indicated by +2—2 over the number 29 for Gamelion in the pattern of the year above.

³⁹ Restoring *ὀγδὼς* in line 2 of *Hesperia*, II, 1933, p. 398. Cf. *Chronology*, p. 20.

⁴⁰ The third day of the tenth prytany should have fallen on Elaphebolion 20, but at some time before the ninth eleven extra days had been intercalated, thus postponing Elaphebolion 9 to the 285th day of the year. The decrees of *I.G.*, II², 461 and 462 and *S.E.G.*, III, 86, were probably all passed on the same day. See Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 16-17, for the spacing of the texts in *I.G.*, II², 461 and 462, and *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 437, for the new interpretation of *I.G.*, II², 462. *S.E.G.*, III, 86 deserves further special study, to which I shall return later.

⁴¹ See Dow, *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 56-60; Meritt, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 435-437. Another extra day was added at the end of Elaphebolion giving to that normally full month a total extra of twelve days, eleven before the 9th and one after the 30th. This is indicated in the pattern of the year above by the numerals +11+1 over the number 30 for the month Elaphebolion. The 25th day of the tenth prytany was the 307th day of the year. The twelve extra days thus added in Elaphebolion were probably compensated by the omission of twelve days from

326th day	Pandionis	Pryt. [XI 10] ⁴² = [Tharg. 2]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 455
357th day	Leontis or Aiantis	Pryt. [XII 7] = [Skir. 3]	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 460 ⁴³

One will observe that the two Macedonian phylai began to serve in midwinter, as soon as they were ready, and in proper sequence, Antigonis preceding Demetrias and both occupying the seventh and eighth prytanies. The regularity of the calendar pattern, except for the abnormalities in Gamelion and again at the time of the Dionysiac festival, supports the other evidence already derived from the study of the years 306-301 that in a hollow month *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* with backward count was not omitted. Since, as we believe, the text of Proklos, usually cited to support the claim that it was, makes no mention of Athens in the best intelligible tradition,⁴⁴ and is in fact rather an explanation of Hesiod's calendar and hence Boiotian and not Athenian, the case for the backward count including *δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας* in every month, full or hollow, appears unshakable. It has the support of the Aristophanic scholia, and of other evidence as well of which mention has been made above, and finally of the empirical testing of the inscriptions themselves.⁴⁵

One final word about the postponement of the Dionysia in the spring of 306 B.C. I suggested years ago that an exceptionally severe winter may have been the cause,⁴⁶ disrupting the festival and destroying the crops. I still believe that this may have been so. Plutarch gives a harrowing account (*Demetrius*, XII): *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ τὰ τῶν Διονυσίων ἐγίνετο, τὴν πομπὴν κατέλυσαν ἰσχυρῶν πάγων γενομένων παρ' ὧραν καὶ πάχνης βαθείας ἐπιπεσούσης οὐ μόνον ἀμπέλους καὶ συκᾶς ἀπάσας ἀπέκαυσε τὸ ψῦχος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σίτου τὸν πλεῖστον κατέφθειρεν ἐν χλόῃ*. The agents were the gods, of course, showing their displeasure.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

Mounichion, as indicated by the notation —12 over the number 29 for the month of Mounichion in the pattern of the year above.

⁴² For the disposition of the letters in this stoichedon text of 43 letters per line, see Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 20, and Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 177.

⁴³ See the text in Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 17-18, as revised in Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 177.

⁴⁴ Or, alternatively, perhaps even names *ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας* as the omitted day.

⁴⁵ I call to mind also the evidence of the two texts from 333/2 (*I.G.*, II², 338 and 339) which I have discussed elsewhere, most recently in *The Athenian Year*, pp. 48-51.

⁴⁶ *Hesperia*, V, 1936, p. 205; XXXII, 1963, p. 437.