THE YEAR OF NEAICHMOS

(320/19 B.C.)

STERLING Dow has published recently an epigraphical essay on "Three Athenian Decrees" in which he comments on problems of restoration and gives a number of indications of method.[1] I wish to set forth objections to some of his proposals and to offer suggestions which I believe are confirmatory of others. Dow's concern with technical details and minutiae is well known, and the results are usually salutary. On the debit side of the ledger, however, one must note that the details are not always accurate and that they are often trivial. In *A.J.A.*, LXVII, 1963, p. 264, for example, Dow has half a column on the spelling of the proper name Νυνφόδοτος rather than Νυμφόδοτος. It makes no difference, except as an orthographic curiosity, and this has already been treated by Meisterhans and others. The use of nu for mu before labials is common in all ages and needs no comment. But the Attic example for Νυνφόδοτος cited by Dow from *I.G.*, II², 2001, line 17, as unique is in fact not so; another example (again of no importance) exists in *I.G.*, II², 2231, line 26. On the same page Dow writes about Νικίας and Νεικίας as two names; they are one name with only an orthographic difference in spelling depending on the date of the inscriptions in which they occur. He claims that "barring one or two late instances, the spelling Νεικίας is unknown in Athens." On the contrary, there are at least 47 (forty-seven) known instances of Athenians and 4 of foreigners with the name epigraphically so spelled.[2] The matter is of no consequence except as a sidelight on the reporting of trivia with what L. Robert in another context once characterized as "précision admirable dans l'inexactitude."

More basic differences can be illustrated with Dow's analysis of the text of Agora I 5626 which I published in *The Athenian Year*, 1961, pp. 119-120, and which he republishes in *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 73-75. It is best to consider only these two versions of the text, for attempts made earlier were made without study of the stone itself, to which I had no access before, during, or just after the war. It was impossible to know the right margin and, though what could be done with photographs gave an approximation of it,[3] I consider it a waste of time to go through again[4] the

[1] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 55-75.

[2] All documented in my index of names from Athenian inscriptions, which is available to all scholars (see *Year Book of the American Philosophical Society*, 1954, p. 268).

[3] See my remarks on the use of photographs in *Epigraphica Attica*, 1940, pp. 37-41.

[4] As by Dow, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-70. His declaration that the margin "should of course have been noted, with measurements, on the squeezes made in 1938" shows lack of understanding of the fine service of the Agora staff, in spite of some limitations of personnel, in providing photographs, records, and squeezes to all who have been concerned with the Agora documents.

arguments that we now know were based on uncertain premises. Yet I agree with Dow that " in spite of the efforts and ink expended " (now no longer by me alone) " a credible text of Agora I 5626 has yet to be produced." The reader, if he is sensible, will pay no attention to the texts proposed before the margin was fixed. Otherwise he will now have six versions, instead of the five of which Dow complains, for Dow adds his own to the lot. But the " deuces-wild game " which he claims was " played with bluffing," on a " scholarship-is-what-you-can-get-away-with conception " (*op. cit.*, p. 72) exists solely in Dow's imagination.[5] No one has been bluffing; no one has concealed or hidden or distorted any known fact. My purpose has been, as I am sure Dow's is, to establish a reliable text for an admittedly difficult document. It is no disparagement of this effort to say that Dow's latest offering, of which he is confident (*op. cit.*, p. 56) that it " needs only to be seen to be adopted " is made with an incorrect length of line, with a calendar that requires extraordinary explanation, with assumed exceptions in the stoichedon order which are unnecessary, and with barbarous Greek in the very opening lines of the preamble—all this in spite of his claim that he follows better rules of restoration wherewith " every feature must have authority sufficient to make it credible." Its faults are enough to condemn it out of hand, but there are also some remarks to be made on method.

If one compares my old text with his, one notes first the difference in assumed length of line. I have counted a final stoichos along the right margin which was largely uninscribed. It was used for certain, as Dow observes, for the numeral τετ[άρτηι] in line 5. I am content to call it a stoichos (uninscribed) into which one line, at least, protruded; Dow insists that it should not be called a stoichos, but merely a marginal space, if it was not intended for letters. This is a matter of technical terminology which I need not discuss further;[6] the space was there, and it was available for letters without crowding, a fact that it is sometimes useful to know when one is studying a restoration. My printed text makes this clear; Dow's does not.

A critical difference in our texts is that I have two uninscribed spaces between εἶπεν and ἐπειδή in line 9 by way of punctuation, whereas Dow closes the gap and has no space at all. The double space, he claims, is intolerable,—intolerable, that is, for this period (*op. cit.*, p. 73). One can cite a parallel for such punctuation with *one* space as early as 332/1, where a comparative study of *I.G.*, II², 344 and 368 shows that the restoration of *I.G.*, II², 344, lines 11-12, must be

[Πολύευκτος Σωστράτου Σφήτ]
[τιος εἶπεν· ν ἐπειδὴ Θεόφαντ].

[5] In the comity of scholars, the author's imputation is astonishing, but no less so the editors' willingness to publish it in *Harvard Studies*.

[6] Dow gives parts of two pages to it (*op. cit.*, pp. 71-72).

But Dow does not object, in principle, to one uninscribed space; it is the idea of two uninscribed spaces that he finds unacceptable. He has made an exhaustive study of uninscribed spaces in Athenian decrees,[7] beginning with the observation that there were such phenomena twice in the Themistokles decree,[8] in each instance the punctuation being of two spaces rather than one. Such usage, he says, has no parallel in all the decrees of fourth century Athens. So far as I know this claim is correct. But he distinguishes between the punctuation in the decrees proper and the punctuation in their headings. He knows the double-space punctuation in *I.G.*, II², 448, line 6 (323/2, inscribed in 318/7), in *I.G.*, II², 462, line 3 (307/6),[9] and in *I.G.*, II², 554, line 5 (306/5 or soon after), though he does not mention the fact that these examples are really double rather than single. Once the punctuation comes after the number and name of the prytany and before its secretary; twice it comes between the formula of resolution and the name of the orator. Its locale was not fixed, and perhaps not even always rational. In the Themistokles decree the stone-cutter did not place the punctuation in one instance where Dow would have preferred to have it.

Of course, punctuation in the third century was frequent and needs no special documentation. In one instance (*ca.* 250 B.C.) Dow has restored *four* spaces between εἶπεν and ἐπειδή,[10] though the text is not stoichedon, and he may have overestimated the space, as he did in the same text in line 7 in showing four spaces instead of three.[11] I distrust too rigid rules about such a relatively non-essential thing as punctuation. The usage grew and changed with the years, but was already under way during the second half of the fourth century. An example of double blanks before the orator's name is on the stone for all to see from 323/2 in a text which was inscribed in 318/7 (*I.G.*, II², 448). It does not seem to me intolerable to suppose that a mason could have put double blanks *after* the orator's name and before ἐπειδή in 320/19. The single space so used had made its appearance in 332/1. My views are surely less rigid than those of Dow, but I hesitate to enunciate, in the name of methodology—a word rather too much in vogue of late among American epigraphists—, a dogma which has too specious an aura, but not the substance, of scientific precision.

We must, as Dow says, approach the problem of restoring this text by searching first for lines where the restoration can be positive.[12] Dow emphatically rejects the idea that the calendar can be of help, but he has suggestions about the calendar which are not quite correct. There is a known equation in this year for the month of Posideon II (*I.G.*, II², 381, 382):

[7] *A.J.A.*, LXVI, 1962, pp. 365-367.

[8] See *Hesperia*, XXXI, 1962, pp. 311-312, lines 23 and 40.

[9] For the text see Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 16, and below, p. 437.

[10] *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, p. 62, No. 20, line 4.

[11] In this same inscription lines 12-13 should be corrected to read [ἐ]παινέσαι δὲ [καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ ἐπω|νύμου – – ca. 10 – – – Αἰ]γιλιέα [– – – –] instead of [ἐ]παινέσαι δὲ [καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τῆς | βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου] Γ[. .]εα [– – – – –].

[12] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, p. 73.

Posideon II 14 = Prytany V 36.

If Dow's restoration of the date in lines 5-6 is compared with this the difference is not three or four days, as he says, but four or five,[13] depending on whether Posideon II had 30 or 29 days:

[Gamelion 6] = Prytany [VI 2]4.

Prytany IV 24 should have fallen on Gamelion 10 or 11, and Dow would have us believe that the calendar was disturbed by the intercalation of extra days in Posideon II, after the 14th. This solution of the crux is prompted, no doubt, by the studies of Pritchett and Neugebauer, who attribute irregularities much more generously than they should to the festival calendar at Athens.[14] When Dow offers the alternative suggestion that [*ἐνάτηι ἰσ*]*ταμένου* might be read as the date by month instead of [*ἕκτηι ἰσ*]*ταμένου*, two iotas taking only one space, in order to regularize the calendar, he departs mildly from the stoichedon order but even so achieves no useful result (which would have been the excuse for the departure) because the regular calendar requires the 10th or 11th of the month, not the 9th.[15]

But we pass by the calendar, assuming for the moment that it is not decisive. No other line, according to Dow, is decisive until we come to line 9. Here I have assumed two spaces for punctuation after *εἶπεν*; Dow would allow one, but prefers none (see above). We agree on the name of the orator, and I agree that the name of the man honored was probably [Νι]*κόστρατο*[ς]. At any rate I have no candidate with a longer name. The absolutely positive line, however, still eludes us, for if there was even one uninscribed space in line 9 between *εἶπεν* and *ἐπειδή* all other calculations are affected. It does no good to say that the closed version of line 9 is substantiated by the way in which *ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι* fits into lines 7-8,[16] for whether it fits or does not fit depends on how one abbreviates the demotic Στειριεύς at the end of line 7. Epigraphically this is attested, in abbreviation, in various ways, the most common perhaps being Στει, Στειρ, and Στειρι. If Στει is chosen *ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι* will not fit at all; Dow has opted for Στειρ; but if Στειρι is chosen then the line has to

[13] The simplest way to avoid error in these arithmetical computations is to plot out the entire intervening span of days.

[14] Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, 1947; cf. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, 1961, for criticism and refutation. Dow has a tendentious section (*op. cit.*, p. 56) devoted to *Calendar Theory* vs. *Epigraphical Fact*. Less dogmatism about the epigraphy and more effort to learn the facts of the calendar (as this present article will show) would make a more worthy theme. We know more about the calendar, in spite of some intransigents, than we did only a few years ago; our purpose should be to advance this knowledge and our epigraphical knowledge *pari passu*. Theory will ultimately give way to fact, one hopes, in both fields.

[15] Dow could have had a good calendar by omitting final nu of *ἐγραμ*[*μάτευεν*] and writing the two iotas of [*δεκάτηι ἰσ*]*ταμένου* in one space (see below, p. 432).

[16] I follow Dow here in omitting mention of the *συμπρόεδροι*.

be lengthened by one letter and solid ground is once more taken from beneath our feet.

This upsets all Dow's calculations, for he has decided on a 35-letter line, and he bases this decision on what he believes reliable in lines 7, 8, and 9. He submits this as the "*only* (underlined) sound basis" on which "a restoration of the earlier lines may be attempted." So he constructs a text (*op. cit.*, p. 74) which has two admitted weaknesses in the stoichedon order and which makes nonsense of the calendar. We must reject all this and find a better foundation on which to build.

This better foundation lies, in principle, behind my latest text of which Dow disapproves. It is the reconstruction of lines 2-3, where all the collateral evidence available shows that the reading must be ἀναγραφέως δὲ Ἀρχεδίκου τοῦ Ναυκρίτου Λαμπτρέως. The use of asyndeton (which Dow posits) between ἄρχοντος and ἀναγραφέως is not defensible; indeed, it results in syntactic chaos. Dow brushes this aside, and claims that the asyndeton "is precisely the same as in *IG* II², 378: [ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππου ἄρχοντος] ἀναγραφέως Θρασ[υκλέους, κτλ." But the supporting evidence here depends on a restoration, pure and simple, for which no one holds any brief, so far as I know, except Dow.[17] It is not sound method to cite a questionably restored text to support something equally questionable which one is trying to prove.

With this ancillary inscription we come to another epigraphical essay which Dow has recently published on "The Athenian Anagrapheis."[18] It offers a kind of tabulation, and sets up a category of preamble which in fact does not exist: Type II (so-called) on p. 45. The sole purported example of this is *I.G.*, II², 378, for which the best text is still that of *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, p. 99, with the commentary on it in Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 87-88.[19] The formulae of date are as follows:

I.G., II², 378 = *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, p. 99

[ἄρχων Ὀλυμπιόδωρος· ἐπ'] ἀναγραφέως Θρασ ΣΤΟΙΧ. 33
[. . . . . .[19]. . . . . Φυ]λασίου· ἐπὶ τῆς
[. . . .[8]. . . . δος ἕκτης πρυταν]είας· Ποσιδει
[ῶνος ἑβδόμει μετ' εἰκάδας, τε]τάρτει καὶ ε
[ἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλ]ησία κυρία
etc.

[17] Ulrich Koehler published this text in 1895 with asyndeton in line 1 (*I.G.*, II, 5, 229*b*), but this was corrected by A. Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte*, XI, 1908, p. 94. Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 26, revived the proposal of asyndeton, but in turn was corrected by J. Kirchner in *Gnomon*, VIII, 1932, p. 451, and by Walter Kolbe in *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1933, p. 508; Dinsmoor later acknowledged his error (*Archon List*, p. 35). I illustrated the asyndeton in 1961 only to reject it (*Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, p. 291).

[18] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 37-54.

[19] There is a minor, but significant, correction by Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 27. And I should now prefer to read the name of the phyle in line 3 as [. . . .[8]. . . . δος]; it might have been [Δημητριάδος].

There is here no irregularity of any kind whatsoever. The method of naming the archon is the same as that in *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, p. 562, No. 40 (*ἄρχων Οὐρίας*) of 281/0, and in *I.G.*, II², 658 (*[ἄ]ρχων Εὔθιος*) of 283/2. No closer parallels are needed. All this has been said before, but needs saying again because of Dow's claim, in the name of uniformity, that "the Arkhon is never in the nominative."[20] This insistence upon uniformity is unnecessary. In these preambles which mention the anagrapheus there are changes from year to year, even within a year, and for 320/19 the anagrapheus appears in the nominative six times and in the genitive once. Are we to demand uniformity for the archon but not for the anagrapheus? This is surely unreasonable, and illustrates once again the folly of enunciating a general rule based upon trivial, inconsequential, or non-existent evidence. Since *I.G.*, II², 378, as I believe, belongs to the year 294/3 anyway (*pace* Dow) there is no other evidence within the year with which to compare it, and it would not matter if there were.

Dow dates *I.G.*, II², 378 in 321/0, because of his belief that the anagrapheus *Θρασ[– – – – – – – – –]άσιος* who is named in lines 1-2 is the same as the anagrapheus now known for 321/0: *[Θρασ]υκλῆς Ναυσικράτου[ς] Θ[ριάσιος]* of *Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, p. 290, No. 184.[21] The fact is that the names in the genitive (and this should be given more attention than it has had) differ in length by three letters, and even if the demotics were the same (which is questionable)[22] they cannot reasonably be made identical. *[Θρασ]υκλῆς Ναυσικράτου[ς] Θ[ριάσιος]* (29 letters) and *Θρασ[υκλῆς . . . .⁹. . . . . Θρι]άσιος* of *I.G.*, II², 378 (26 letters) are simply not the same, even assuming Thrasykles to be the name and Thriasios the demotic. Add to this the doubt whether the demotic was *Θριάσιος* or *Φυλάσιος* (*Ἀναγυράσιος*, *Πτελεάσιος*, and *Τειθράσιος* are probably excluded by the evidence of what is preserved of the stone) and the fact that at least 21 names beginning with *Θρασ – – –* different from *Θρασυκλῆς* are known to Athenian prosopography, and the chances against the identification are much increased. The problem is one of proper procedure in restoration. Dow must assume that the patronymic in line 2 of *I.G.*, II², 378 appeared without

[20] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII 1963, p. 53. Dow says (*op. cit.*, p. 46) that the formulae of 320/19 are "well stabilized"; of 319/8 he says (*op. cit.*, p. 50) "it is a year of variety, perhaps of confusion." A rule of uniformity would seem to me here to have little value.

[21] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 42-45, 75.

[22] I reported in 1961 that the lambda in the demotic of *I.G.*, II², 378 was very faint, if to be read at all. Eugene Schweigert had read the sloping stroke of lambda. The entry in my notebook, made in the Epigraphical Museum in May of 1961, runs as follows: "whether the demotic ended in *– – – ιασίου* or *– – – λασίου* cannot be decided with certainty. There looks to be a sloping stroke, but it may be the way the stone is broken." A good photograph is published in Meritt, *Epigraphica Attica*, 1940, p. 95. Meritt cites (*loc. cit.*) the mediocre quality of the writing as characteristic of the lack of skill in stone-masonry after the sumptuary laws of Demetrios of Phaleron, a fact which favors the third-century date as against 321/0. Photographs are also available in *Jahreshefte*, XI, 1908, p. 94, and in *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, p. 98. A photograph of the companion piece (now frag. *b*) is published in *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, p. 174.

the article τοῦ (*de rigueur* when the whole name was in the genitive) or that extra letters were crowded in, and he must assume asyndeton (for which there is no supporting evidence) in line 1. These facts are inescapable. I do not know how Dow plans to manage the calendar of the year. It does not seem to me possible during the era of the ten phylai.[23]

In fact, the text of *I.G.*, II², 378 offers no support for an irregular asyndeton in the opening lines of Agora I 5626, where line 2 is the decisive element which controls the restoration. I now supplant my earlier suggestion ἐπ'] ἀναγραφέω[ς δὲ Ἀρχεδίκου, κτλ. not because I hesitate to restore three prepositional phrases in succession with ἐπί,[24] but because the evidence available shows two types for wording only (no asyndeton) after ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος ἄρχοντος: the continuation may be with the formula καὶ ἀναγραφέως (the alternative being ἐπὶ ἀναγραφέως without subsequent δέ) or one can write ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος ἄρχοντος ἀναγραφέως δέ (without preceding καί or ἐπί). Since no restoration of lines 2-3 is possible with καί or ἐπί (ἐπ'), the restoration must be made [ἐπὶ Νεαίχμου ἄρχοντος] ἀναγραφέω[ς δὲ Ἀρχεδίκου, κτλ. – – –]. Once again, since this makes an impossible combination in lines 2-3 when written out in full, the unique and *only* sound restoration, using the full width of the stone of 36 letters in every line, is as follows:

Agora I 5626 = *The Athenian Year*, pp. 119-120

[Νικόστρατος – –]λωνος Φιλ[ιππεύς ?]
[ἐπὶ Νεαίχμου ἄρχοντος] ἀναγραφέω[ς δ' Ἀρχεδί] ΣΤΟΙΧ. 36
[κου τοῦ Ναυκρίτου Λαμπ]τρέως ἐπὶ τῆ[ς Οἰνεῖδ]
[ος ἕκτης πρυτανείας ἧι . .]νων Ὀῆθ ἐγραμ[ματε]
[νεν· Γαμηλιῶνος δεκάτηι ἱσ]ταμένου, τετ[άρτηι]
[καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανεί]ας· ἐκκλησί[α· τῶν π]
[ροέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν . .[5]. . .]οφῶν Στει[ρι· ἔδοξ]
[εν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι·] Δημάδης Δη[μέου Π]
[αιανιεὺς εἶπεν· ᵛ ἐπειδὴ Νι]κόστρατο[ς . .[5]. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – –]τε τῶν ἐς Σ[. . .[6]. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – –] Ἀθηναίων μη[. . . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – –]τοὺς ἐπιβουλ[. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – –]Ἀθηναι[. .[5]. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – γυναι]ξὶ καὶ παι[σὶν]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ε[.] ὁ μέλλων Λ[. . .]

[23] I refer the reader to the discussion in *Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, pp. 290-293.

[24] Dow, *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 53, 72, has objections; but see, for example, *I.G.*, I², 324, lines 4-5: [ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδο]ς πρυτανείας – – – [– – ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς – –] ἐπὶ Εὐθύνο ἄρχοντος. Dow thinks ἐπ' for ἐπί not impossible (p. 72), though why this needs comment I do not know. He adds that he has "not counted instances."

[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – κα]ταληφθῆναι [. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ων καὶ δι Λ[. .⁵. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ν αὐτὸν Ἀθ[ηναῖ]
[ον – – – – – – – – – – ? ἐπίσταται]αι ὁ δῆμος ὁ [Ἀθη]
20 [ναίων – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ο πλέον τ[. . . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ι μετ[. . . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]τα [. .⁵. . .]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]ι[. .⁵. . .]

For the elision in line 2 compare *I.G.*, II², 405 of 334/3 B.C. (cf. *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, p. 340: εἶ[ναι δ' Ἀμύντορ]α. If one wishes to avoid this assumption of elision, it may be suggested that the last two letters (one of them an iota) were slightly crowded at the end of the line. Dow in his preferred text (*op. cit.*, p. 74) suggests that this was done at the ends of two lines.

For two iotas in one space in line 5, see Dow, *op. cit.*, p. 75. The alternative is to omit the final nu of ἐγραμ[μάτευεν], as was done, for example, in *I.G.*, II², 380, of this same year.

From the technical point of view this is as nearly perfect a text as one can reasonably expect. All lines end at the right margin; nothing protrudes (as twice with Dow's text); and the calendar equation falls into place in a normal calendrical reconstruction of the year. The single space left blank in line 9 is unexceptionable,[25] and even this can be avoided if one prefers to leave the end of the preceding line one letter short in order to make a better division of the orator's name.[26]

In the Athenian festival calendar the year was intercalary, with months and prytanies arranged as in the table opposite.

The reader will notice that I have left *I.G.*, II², 383*b* in the third prytany with a restoration calling for an " irrational " uninscribed space in line 4, as I gave the text in *The Athenian Year*. I do this with full knowledge of what Dow has written about its improbability. Such uninscribed spaces do occur, for whatever reasons, and Dow gives a number of plausible examples in addition to my own. One need not insist that the uninscribed space followed τρίτης immediately; it may have come before or in the word or elsewhere within the line. The important point is not which stoichos was left blank but that somewhere in the line there may have been finally only six letters in a space of seven stoichoi.[27] The alternative is to write δεκάτης instead of τρίτης in

[25] I should, in fact, find even two spaces still permissible if the rest of the text had been so disposed as to require them.

[26] For such a division of the name see the text of *I.G.*, II², 1139, as republished by Mitsos and Vanderpool, *Hesperia*, XXII, 1953, p. 177 (cf. *S.E.G.*, XII, 96). This example illustrates well the vagaries of detail, subject to no rule, which may be encountered in the best of stoichedon inscriptions.

[27] This could have resulted from the erasure of a wrong ordinal and the inscribing of the correct but shorter τρίτης. The mason, with his mind on δεκάτηι τῆς πρυτανείας below, may have inscribed

THE CALENDAR OF 320/19

(Archon Neaichmos)

Number and Name of Prytany	*Number of days in Prytany*	*Month*	*Number of days in Month*	*First day of Prytany*	*Equation*	*Evidence*
I	39	Hekatombaion	30	Hek. 1		
		Metageitnion	29			
II Erechtheis	39			Met. 10		
		Boedromion	30		Boe. 11 = II 31 (70th day)	*I.G.*, II², 380
III Pandionis	39			Boe. 20		
		Pyanepsion	29		[Boe. 29] = [III] 10 (88th day)	*I.G.*, II², 383*b*; Meritt, *Athenian Year*, p. 113
IV	38	Maimakterion	30	Pyan. 29		
		Posideon	29			
V Antiochis	38			Pos. 8		
		Posideon II	30		Pos. II 14 = V 36 (191st day)	*I.G.*, II², 381, 382
VI Oineis	38			Pos. II 17		
		Gamelion	29			
VII	39	Anthesterion	30	Gam. 25	[Gam. 10] = [VI 2]4 (217th day)	Agora I 5626; see above
VIII	38	Elaphebolion	30	Elaph. 5		
		Mounichion	29			
IX	38			Moun. 13		
		Thargelion	30			
X	38	Skirophorion	29	Thar. 22		
	384		384			

line 4 and then of necessity to assume a different kind of irregularity, even more improbable: two days will allegedly have been inserted in the festival calendar out of order before the end of Thargelion. This may indeed be the solution, as Pritchett and Neugebauer proposed,[28] but the relative probability of it (to judge from what evidence we have) is so slight that I prefer the solution which leaves the calendar in order. The principal excuse for inserting extra days in the calendar was from time to time to delay a festival;[29] any days inserted to delay a festival in Thargelion (the Plynteria ?) should have been compensated long before the end of the month. Pritchett and Neugebauer had a theory that extra days, inserted no matter where, were compensated at the end of Skirophorion; but there is no evidence favoring this hypothesis and there does exist evidence against it.[30] To assume the correction of an alleged fault in the calendar of 320/19 after Thargelion 29 would mean the elimination of two days from Skirophorion, and there is no evidence anywhere that there was ever at Athens any irregularity in the festival calendar in Skirophorion.[31] When Dow stresses probability as the touchstone of a restoration, he may if he chooses quote odds of 499 to 1 against my proposal,[32] but I doubt that his own holding with Pritchett and Neugebauer to δεκάτης is the better of the two solutions. The question cannot be resolved entirely in terms of arithmetic; there are far too many subtle factors that enter into the restoration of such a text.

On the credit side of the ledger, Dow's observations have led to the assignment of *I.G.*, II², 336*b*, formerly dated in 320/19,[33] to the year 333/2 with the name of the secretary restored as [Ἀρχέλας Παλλ]ηνεύς.[34] I regard this as surely correct, and have therefore omitted the calendar equation of *I.G.*, II², 336*b* from the almanac of 320/19 published just above. The equation of *I.G.*, II², 336*b*, which is preserved as

[Ἐλαφ]ηβολιῶνος ἕνε[ι καὶ νέαι, ἕκτει κα]
[ὶ εἰκ]οστεῖ τῆς πρυτ[ανείας – – – κτλ. – –]

is precisely correct for the 295th day in the intercalary year of Nikokrates in which the months and prytanies may be arranged as follows:[35]

δεκάτης πρυτανείας and then another line or two before discovering the mistake and correcting it. It is best not to rationalize too closely about what must have been, *ex hypothesi*, an irrational irregularity; the range of conjecture is too wide.

[28] *Calendars of Athens*, p. 62; cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 114.

[29] See the index of *The Athenian Year*, p. 253, under "Festival calendar, usual time of tampering with."

[30] The anomaly in Elaphebolion of 271/0 was corrected well before the end of the year; cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 195.

[31] See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 208.

[32] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 66-67. I should regard this as another example of would-be "precision in error."

[33] Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 7; Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 119.

[34] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, p. 43.

[35] See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 48-51, 83-85, 119, 133.

Months	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30	29	30 = 384
Prytanies	39		39		39		38		38		38		39 = 384

This arrangement differs from that suggested as possible in *The Athenian Year,* p. 119, because it is no longer necessary to make it conform to the evidence for 320/19, and it differs from that proposed for the year 333/2 in *The Athenian Year*, p. 85, because the assignment of *I.G.*, II², 336*b* to 333/2 displaces *I.G.*, II², 358, with which it is obviously incompatible. The elimination of *I.G.*, II², 358 from 333/2 leaves thus a perfectly normal calendar in that year, unencumbered by any of the irregularity that had to be assumed when its equation had to be reconciled with known equations of that year in *I.G.*, II², 338-340.[36]

The re-assignment of *I.G.*, II², 358 is Dow's most noteworthy achievement, and here his careful measurements and observations of details have produced their best results. [37] I have verified on my own squeeze the measurements for line 1. The restoration [*ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτου*]*ς ἄρχο*[*ντος*] is without doubt of the correct length (23 letters); [*ἐπὶ Νικοκράτου*]*ς ἄρχο*[*ντος*] will not do. But Dow does not go far enough in pressing his claim for the date 307/6. Nor do I believe it justifiable to describe the standards of his predecessors as "loose." Everyone has been deterred from moving the text down to so late a date by the character of the writing (not here decisive), by the absence of mention of the *συμπρόεδροι* (also not really decisive), and above all by the difficulty of the calendar. One did what one could with a date earlier than 321/0, sometimes a little desperately, perhaps, but not loosely. And these difficulties, even now, have prevented Dow from following out the logical consequences of his new assignment, which in themselves involve an irregularity in restoration. This must be studied further.

It is known that the last days of Elaphebolion, at least, fell in the tenth prytany of 307/6, and that this prytany was held by Hippothontis. Herein lies the seat of the trouble, and Dow leaves line 2 without restoration, indicating merely the framework

[*ἐπὶ τῆς* .....[12].....]*της πρυτανείας ἥι.*

An unfortunate error has crept into the transcript at this point, for the framework, with a stoichedon line of 35 letters, is in reality

[*ἐπὶ τῆς* .....[14].....]*της πρυτανείας ἥι.*

Everything else is in order: Anaxikrates is right for line 1; the numeral for the prytany is ten; Lysias of Diomeia was secretary. The irregularities in these lines disappear with the assignment to 307/6, but in their place there must be posited a

[36] See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 85.
[37] *H.S.C.P.*, LXVII, 1963, pp. 56-60.

haplography, perhaps corrected, in line 2. The name of the phyle must be written Ἱπποθωντίδος (*vel sim.*),[38] occupying only ten letter-spaces, and the complete text is as follows:

I.G., II², 358

a. 307/6 *a.*

[ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτου] ς ἄρχο[ντος] ΣΤΟΙΧ. 23
[ἐπὶ τῆς Ἱπποθωντίδος δεκά]της πρυτανείας ἧι ΣΤΟΙΧ. 35
[Λυσίας Νοθίππου Διομεε]ὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν· Ἐ
[λαφηβολιῶνος ἕνηι καὶ ν]έαι ἐμβολίμωι, πέμ
[πτηι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρ]υτανείας· ἐκκλησί
[α· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζ]ε[ν] Φανόμαχος Αἰω[ν]
[ος Κυδαθηναιεύς· ἔδοξεν] τῶι δήμωι ^vvvvvvv
[.....21.....]νος Κυδαθηναιεὺ
[ς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ νῦν καὶ] ἐν τῶι ἔμπροσθεν
[χρόνωι ....8.... καὶ ὁ πατὴ]ρ αὐτοῦ Κυδρίων
[.....20..... το]ῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθην
[αίων .....14..... πράτ]τοντες ἀγαθὸν [.]
[.....16..... τὸ κοινὸ]ν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ὐ
[.....22..... κ]αὶ βουλαρχησα
[.....23.....]θον παρελθεῖν
[.....23..... τ]ετιμήκασιν σ
[– –]

The calendrical difficulties which Dow foresaw in this new assignment to the year of Anaxikrates are serious but not insuperable, now that we are better informed about the intercalation of extra days than we were before the publication of Pritchett and Neugebauer's *Calendars of Athens*. Normally, the last day of Elaphebolion would have fallen on the thirteenth day of the tenth prytany, being the 295th day of the year:[39]

Elaphebolion 30 = Prytany X 13.

But here the equation in Elaphebolion is with the 25th day of the tenth prytany, i. e., with the 307th day of the year. Somewhere before this date, presumably in Elaphebolion itself, extra days had been added to the festival calendar, and the final inter-

[38] A similar error and its correction have been observed in the text of *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, p. 31, No. 8, where the ten letters of Κεκροπίδος were inscribed in eight spaces. See A. E. Raubitschek, *T.A.P.A.*, LXXVI, 1945, pp. 106-107, and Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 126-127. As in the present text of *I.G.*, II², 358, this was the only known deviation from strict stoichedon order in an otherwise beautifully cut inscription.

[39] See the ideal scheme of the year's almanac in Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 177-178.

calary day of the month shows that this too was an extra day. There were twelve extra days in all, and the normal place for the first eleven of them was before the Dionysiac festival.[40] This raises the question whether the calendar equation of *I.G.*, II², 461 ought not to be so stated as to show the same discrepancy. One can assume the insertion of eleven of the twelve days (Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος ἕνη καὶ νέα ἐμβόλιμος itself being the twelfth) by writing in this text (*I.G.*, II², 461):

line 4 [αμμάτενεν· Ἐλαφηβ]ολιῶνο[ς ἐνάτει]
line 5 [ἱσταμένου, τρίτει] τῆς πρυ[τανείας·].

This was the 285th day of the year, whereas Elaphebolion 9 should normally have fallen on the 274th day, eleven days earlier. The months and prytanies within the year may now be arranged as follows:

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

This assumption of extra days early in Elaphebolion also allows a normal reading of *I.G.*, II², 462, where the calendar equation has heretofore been explained away, as, for example, by West and by Pritchett and me.[41] Now that days in the first decade of Elaphebolion, at least from the seventh to the tenth, fall within the tenth prytany the text of *I.G.*, II², 462 can be restored with the same date as in *I.G.*, II², 461, namely:

line 4 [μεεὺς ἐγραμμάτευε]ν· Ἐλα[φηβολιῶ]
line 5 [νος ἐνάτει ἱσταμέν]ου, [τρίτει τῆ]
line 6 [ς πρυτανείας· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψ]
line 7 [ήφιζεν − − − − − − κτλ. − − − −]

The adding of an extra day at the end of Elaphebolion gave to that already inflated month still another day. But all twelve extra days were probably compensated during Mounichion. Though the confusion in the calendar may indeed have had its cause in some adjustment to a postponed Dionysiac festival, the retardation may have been protracted even after the Dionysia,[42] during diplomatic negotiation with Aitolia for defense against anticipated war with Kassandros. The embassy of Olympiodoros to Aitolia in 307/6 is mentioned by Pausanias (I, 26, 3) and this decree of *I.G.*, II²,

[40] See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 33, 147-148, 149-151, 161-166, 208 with note 14, 239-240, 241.

[41] Cf. Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 16.

[42] We know from Plutarch (*Demetrius*, XII) that the late winter of 306 B.C. was bitterly cold and stormy in Athens, particularly during the month of Elaphebolion.

358 was doubtless passed soon after his return to Athens in the spring of 306 B.C.[43]

Dow's essay on the anagrapheis is accompanied by a summary of various changes in dates and attributions. The list appears at the bottom of p. 43 and I do not repeat here the five rubrics it contains. The first and third are not, in my judgment, valid;[44] the fourth confirms a determination already made; the fifth and last may or may not be true. One would like to know what disposition can eventually be made of *I.G.*, II², 546; for the time being I hold tentatively to the date 321/0. The second is of paramount importance. Dow's dating of *I.G.*, II², 358 in 307/6 contributes greatly to our knowledge of calendrical lore and political history in the last years of the fourth century.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

[43] See K. J. Beloch, *Gr. Geschichte*, IV², 1, p. 158. I express my thanks to Fordyce Mitchel for profitable discussion of the events of this year.

[44] See above, pp. 429-431. Dow calls the deme which he rejects in item 1 Phlya. It is confusing to perpetuate this mistake which he apparently took over from Dinsmoor, *Archon List*, pp. 20, 35-36, 47 (see Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 46). The deme in question was Phyle.

CORRIGENDA

A. E. Raubitschek has noted that the text of the second line of No. 61 (p. 45, above) is incorrect. The reading and restoration should probably be [*ἱερεὺς Ἀν*]*άκων ἀνέθηκεν.*

Jean Bousquet calls attention (by letter) to the fact that the text of No. 70 (p. 48, above) should read (see the photograph, Plate 15):

[– – – – – –]*ων*
[– – –]*νεὺς*
[*Ἀπό*]*λλωνι ὑπὸ*
Μακραῖς

ADDENDUM

When the page-proof of this number of *Hesperia* came to my hands for the preparation of the Epigraphical Index I found that there were still some things to be said about *I.G.*, II², 378. This addendum may be considered, therefore, as a supplement to note 21 on p. 430, above.

Apparently an argument for dating the inscription earlier than 307/6 is the fact that there is no room for the patronymic of the chairman of the proedroi in line 7 (above, p. 345). I believe that here the patronymic was not inscribed. And the symproedros from Paiania in line 7 could have come from Phyle I or V as well as III, which leaves quite open the name of the phyle in prytany in line 3. Moreover, this phyle, whatever it may have been, and I or V as the case may be are the only ones excluded from consideration for the demotic at the beginning of line 7.

The criterion of omitting patronymics for the chairman of the proedroi before 307/6, but not after, seems to me artificial, however impressive it may look in the table (above, p. 337). Kirchner's judgment was that *I.G.*, II², 727, for example, belonged in the third century. This is just as appropriate for the cruciform phi as late fourth century, and (in spite of Dow's assurance) some strokes in letters were omitted (e.g., the cross-bar in alpha of line 4 = Dow's line 7). Nor is it certain that the patronymic was used (see the table) in *I.G.*, II², 797. Name and demotic alone may have occupied the 22 available spaces. I do not claim this as certain, but it is entirely reasonable, and, if true, the intrusion of two " No " symbols amidst the three surely " Yes " in the table from 306/5 to 293/2 weakens its value as a guide to restoration. I distrust the formulation of binding rules on such scant and questionable evidence.

Dow has shown that the naming of the symproedroi was governed by no such rule of date. Similarly, the transition from the habit of naming the proedros without patronymic to the habit of naming him with patronymic would seem more naturally explained if it came about not by *fiat* at any given instant of time but rather over a longer and somewhat vague period of years in a kind of informal tolerance of the new usage.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY