

PHILINOS AND MENEKRATES

THE discovery, reported above, of an inscription from the archonship of Philinos with the prytany-secretary named in full adds another welcome bit of firm evidence for the chronology of the third century B.C. in Athens. Philinos himself, but not the secretary, has been known for some time.¹ Kirchner's date for him, following Schebelew (*P.A.*, 14308), was "ultimis annis s. III," which he also interpreted as "c. a. 200," or "paullo ante a. 200."² W. B. Dinsmoor suggested 212/1,³ and Pritchett and Meritt thought 210/09 possible,⁴ a conjecture to which Dinsmoor later subscribed.⁵ This late date for Philinos held the field generally until the discovery of a new text in the Agora naming the archon Philinos and showing by its letter forms that a date so late as the end of the third century was not possible. This text was edited by Meritt, who claimed for it a date "near the middle of the century, or earlier."⁶ This attribution, on the basis of letter forms alone, is now fully justified by the discovery of the new complete text published above (pp. 418-425).

Yet Meritt's date of 269/8 was too early; *faute de mieux* it seemed at the time the only year otherwise unoccupied and hence available. But the secretary Θεότιμος Σπρατοκλέους Θοραιεύς belongs to the phyle Demetrias, and according to the secretary cycle he must be assigned to 254/3. Indeed, on prosopographical grounds also this date for the archonship of Philinos is almost inevitable. Six of the 50 councillors named in the prytany list of the new text were councillors also only two years earlier.⁷ The chairman Ἀρεσίας Λαμπροκλέους Πειραιεύς comes of a known family and was probably grandson of the Ἀρεσίας Λαμπροκλέους Πειραιεύς whose *floruit* was ca. 318/7.⁸ Hence the next Aresias, son of Lamprokles, belongs two generations, or

¹ *I.G.*, II², 1304*b* (Addendum).

² See the notes under *I.G.*, II², 1304*b* (Addendum).

³ *Archons of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, p. 542.

⁴ *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1940, p. xxv.

⁵ *Hesperia*, XXIII, 1954, p. 316.

⁶ *Hesperia*, XXX, 1961, pp. 213-214 = *S.E.G.*, XXI, 371.

⁷ These are [Μ]νησαγόρας Νικομένον (Ἀλαιεύς) of line 47, whose name must be read in *I.G.*, II², 678, line 27, instead of the garbled Μησα[γ]όρα[ς Μν]ή[σων]ος of Pococke's transcript (see the facsimile of Pococke's copy in *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, 1937, p. 49); Καλλικράτης Πυθοδήλου (Κολλυτεύς) of line 56, whose name appears in *I.G.*, II², 678, line 30 and also in lines 7-8 (where the text must be read as in *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 11); Εὐξένος Εὐξίθεον (Ἐρχιεύς) of line 72, whose name appears in *I.G.*, II², 678, line 29; Ἀντίδωρος (Ἐρικεύς) of line 106, who is identical with Ἀντίδωρος Διοκλέον (Ἐρικεύς) of *I.G.*, II², 678, line 33; Μνήσαρχος (Ἀλαιεύς) of line 51, who is identical with Μνήσαρχος Μνησαρχίδου (Ἀλαιεύς) of *I.G.*, II², 678, line 24; Ἀριστίων Πολυκράτου (Κολλυτεύς) of line 53, whose name appears also in *I.G.*, II², 678, line 33 (where Pococke's reading Ἀριστέων is to be corrected to Ἀριστίων).

⁸ The first Aresias had his *floruit* ca. a. 384/3 a. (*P.A.*, 1595 = *I.G.*, II², 1436, line 5). His son Lamprokles was ταμίας τῆς θεοῦ in 351/0 (*P.A.*, 8992 = *I.G.*, II², 1436, line 5). In the next generation Aresias belongs about 318/7, for his son Nikostratos (*P.A.*, II045 = *I.G.*, II²,

about 66 years, later, in 252/1. This is admirably suited to the date of the new inscription, according to the secretary cycle, in 254/3.

There are other prosopographical indications of the date. *Λυκομήδης Διοχάρου Κον[θ]υλῆ[θε]ν* in line 23, who proposed the motion before the Council, was priest of Asklepios in 266/5.⁹ *Λύανδρος Λυσιάδου Ἀναφλύστιος* (*P.A.*, 9187) of lines 5-6 moved a decree and a rider to the decree honoring Phaidros of Sphettos (*I.G.*, II², 682, lines 92-96), and since the stele which has come down to us was paid for by the Single Officer of the Administration (*τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*) it is clear that Lyandros was active politically after the defeat of Athens and the end of the Chremonidean War.¹⁰ In the decree for Phaidros of Sphettos the agonothesia mentioned for his son Thymochares in the archonship of Euboulos is to be referred to the Euboulos of 256/5 rather than to him of 274/3, and Lyandros may well have proposed the decree for Phaidros when he was councillor, as witnessed by the new text above, in 254/3. *Εὐκλῆς Φιλοκλέους Τρινεμε[εύς]* of line 36 is known to have been Herald of the Council and Demos in 256/5.¹¹ He was still herald *ca. a. 250 a.*,¹² but had been replaced by his son before 235/4.¹³ His appearance here agrees with the date 254/3. *Διοκλῆς Ἀριστοφίλου Ἐρχιεύς* of line 70 is probably the same as [*Διο*]κλῆς [*Ἐ*]ρχι(εύς) who made a contribution to the state in 247/6.¹⁴ And, finally, *Δημοφάνης Ἐπιζήλου* (*Ἀλαιεύς*) of line 46 appears as orator of a decree in 235/4.¹⁵ There can be no doubt that 254/3 is the correct date for the present inscription and for the archonship of Philinos.

The discovery of the name and demotic of the secretary makes possible also the attribution of *I.G.*, II², 697, to the same year 254/3. This text has been most recently studied by Sterling Dow.¹⁶ With his disposition of it the opening lines are to be restored as follows:

I.G., II², 697

a. 254/3 a.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 37

[ἐπὶ Φιλίνου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς^sδος δω]

[δεκ]άτη[ς πρυτανείας ἥι Θεότιμος Σπρατοκλέο]

1682, line 17) is named in the archonship of Diotimos in 285/4, for whose date see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley, 1961, p. 233. Nikostratos must have been the uncle of the Aresias of the present text. The lapse of one more generation brings the date of this Aresias to 252/1.

⁹ Assuming that the priesthood belongs in the year of Nikias Otryneus, as is shown in Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. xix. The year of Nikias Otryneus is now surely 266/5. The name of *Λυκομήδης Διοχάρου Κονθυλῆθεν* is now to be restored as orator in *I.G.*, II², 769, lines 9-10, now dated in 233/2 (see below, p. 435 for the archon Antimachos).

¹⁰ See W. B. Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, pp. 65-66.

¹¹ *I.G.*, II², 678, lines 49-50, and *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, 1937, pp. 43-47, No. 9, of the same year.

¹² *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 173-178, No. 27.

¹³ W. K. Pritchett, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 242-244.

¹⁴ See *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 290, No. 56, line 37.

¹⁵ *I.G.*, II², 790, line 8.

¹⁶ *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 352-356, with a photograph on plate 84 = *S.E.G.*, XXI, 356.

υς Θορα[ιεύς ἐγγραμμάτευεν· Σκιροφοριῶνος δε]
 κάτει ὕσ[τέραι, τετάρτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυ]
 5 τανεία[ς·^v ἐκκλησία κυρία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπειρή]

For the continuation see *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 354.

The year 254/3 was thus intercalary, the date Skirophorion 21 being equated with Prytany XII 24 and Skirophorion being a hollow month. [It is impossible to tell the calendric character of the year from the new text published above.] The name of the phyle in *I.G.*, II², 697, can be restored as Ἀντιγονίδος, Ἀκαμαντίδος, Δημητριάδος, or Πανδιονίδος. This inscription is now removed from the archonship of Kimon (288/7), and the secretary for his year remains unknown.¹⁷

The question now is what to do with the archon and his secretary who have recently been assigned to 254/3. The association of Philostratos, as archon in 254/3, with a secretary from Potamos (II) has depended on restoration of the archon's name in *I.G.*, II², 477. It is true, however, that the secretary from Potamos may have belonged to any one of the phylai Antigonis (I), Demetrias (II), and Leontis (VI).¹⁸ Meritt, among others, has taken the archon's name to have had eleven letters in the genitive, and has restored Πολυστράτου¹⁹ or, more recently, Φιλοστράτου.²⁰ Kirchner, in the *Corpus*, restored a name of ten letters (Εὐξενίππου), as did Dinsmoor (Δημοκλέους).²¹ Either length of name seems to be possible. The inscription is not strictly stoichedon but has lines varying in length from 25 letters (line 6) to 29 letters (line 14). If the text is moved back from 254/3 by one year to the archonship of Alkibiades in 255/4 the ten-letter name Ἀλκιβιάδου can be restored and the deme Potamos in this instance assigned to the phyle Antigonis (I).²² The archon Philostratos is now free to be assigned elsewhere, and the surest indication for him comes from the well-known, and much discussed, Rhamnousian base *I.G.*, II², 2854, which gives the several stages in the military career of one Kallisthenes of Prospalta.

Kallisthenes was honored for having been phylarch under Philostratos, hipparch under Antimachos, and general under Phanostratos and Pheidostratos. Pouilloux has dated these steps in the career of Kallisthenes according to the dates of the several archons as given in Meritt's *Athenian Year*, p. 234,²³ and in Pritchett and

¹⁷ See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 232.

¹⁸ See W. K. Pritchett, *The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes* (Diss., 1943), pp. 8-10.

¹⁹ *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, p. 141.

²⁰ Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 98.

²¹ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List*, New York, 1939, p. 20.

²² The uncertainty of fixing the number of letters in the name is well illustrated by the fact that twelve letters at the ends of line 10 (where the restoration is certain) and of line 11 measure the same as eleven letters at the end of line 1. The uncertainties are accentuated by the further fact that iota sometimes takes a full space and sometimes, as may have been the case in line 2, only a half space. The phyle to be restored in line 2 was either Αἰγείδος or Οἰνείδος, counting as seven letters, or as a full eight letters if the tau of τῆς was inscribed at the end of line 1.

²³ J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, 1954, p. 122.

Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. xxi-xxiii. But the dating of these four archons has been upset by the discovery of a hitherto unknown archon Aristion, who appears in an Eleusinian text published by Eugene Vanderpool and assigned to the year 238/7.²⁴ Vanderpool tentatively dates Phanostratos in 234/3 and Pheidostratos in 233/2. The career of Kallisthenes can be kept entirely within the era of Demetrios II, and not divided at a considerable interval between Antigonos and Demetrios, if the now displaced Philostratos is moved from 254/3 down to 234/3. Since he in turn was followed by Antimachos, in whose year the secretary belonged to Myrrhinous of the phyle Pandionis (V), Antimachos must be assigned not to 251/0 as heretofore, but to 233/2. Phanostratos can be dated in the next year 232/1, which is as yet unoccupied, and Pheidostratos can be placed in 230/29²⁵ if Jason is kept in 231/0 or assigned to 231/0 if Jason belongs in 230/29.²⁶ The sequence as outlined by Pouilloux is thus maintained, and the career of Kallisthenes is given a compact unity, very much as suggested by Ferguson in 1932,²⁷ though with different dates. The removal of Antimachos to 233/2 means, *inter alia*, that the text of *I.G.*, II², 798, once assigned to the archonship of Kleomachos (*Hesperia*, IV, 1935, p. 583) must be given to Phanostratos, now taken to be the successor of Antimachos in 232/1.

The dating of *I.G.*, II², 477, in 255/4 and in the archonship of Alkibiades requires, in all probability, an ordinary year in the festival calendar of Athens, for the preceding year 256/5 is known to have been intercalary. There is no obstacle to this, since in an ordinary year the last day of Prytany V may have been the 150th day of the year, equated with the third day of Posideon.

Prytanies	Months
30 + 30 + 30 + 30 + 30	= 29 + 30 + 29 + 30 + 29 + 3 = 150

The opening lines of *I.G.*, II², 477, now read as follows: ²⁸

I.G., II², 477
a. 255/4 *a.*, NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. 25-29
 [ἐπὶ Ἀλκιβιάδῳ] ὁ ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ [ῥ]
 [τῆς .ἰ. εἶδος πέμ] πτης πρυτανεί

²⁴ Δελτίον, XXIII, 1968, pp. 1-6. See also J. Pouilloux, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, IV, 1969, pp. 1-6.

²⁵ Pheidostratos is no longer to be associated with a secretary from Erchia, as in Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. xxiii, and in Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 234. Vanderpool has shown that the demotic Ἐ[ρχειός] alleged in *Chronology*, p. 101, does not exist, and that the patronymic of the secretary is not Κτησίπ[πov]. See Δελτίον, XXIII, 1968, p. 5.

²⁶ For uncertainty about the year of Jason, see Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 224-225.

²⁷ W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, Cambridge, Mass., 1932, pp. 24, 81.

²⁸ Part of the final upsilon of the archon's name is still visible. But at the end of the line the surface of the stone is missing in the last letter-space. One cannot tell whether τῆς should be restored all in line 2 or the tau restored at the end of line 1 with an attempt at stoichedon order not otherwise observable at the ends of lines. See note 22 above.

- [as ἦι --- ^{ca. 8} --- Φ]ανοπόνπου Ποτά
 [μιος ἐγραμμάτευ]εν· Π[ο]σ[ιδε]ῶνος
 5 [τρίτει ἰσταμένο]ν· ἐκκλησία κυ ^v
 [ρία· τῶν προέδρων ἐ]πει[ήφι]ζεν Ἄν
 [--- ^{ca. 15} ---]νου Ἀχαρνέως
 [καὶ συμπρόεδροι· ἔ]δοξεν τῶι δήμῳ·
 [--- ^{ca. 14} --- Π]ιθεὺς εἶπεν· ὅ
 10 [πὲρ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ π]ρέσβεις οἱ ἀπο

For the continuation see *Hesperia*, VII, 1938, pp. 141-142.

The year of Philinos itself (254/3), to which *I.G.*, II², 697, is now also assigned, was intercalary, flanked by the two ordinary years 255/4 and 253/2. To this latter year the archon (. . .)bios of *I.G.*, II², 792, line 5, was attributed by Pritchett and Meritt, with a secretary from Kephisia (III) attested in *I.G.*, II², 774.²⁹

The second great prytany list discovered in the Agora of Athens in the summer of 1968, and published above (pp. 425-431) by Traill, dates from the archonship of Menekrates in 220/19 B.C. It gives the name of the secretary Φιλόδρομος Σωτάδου Σουνιεύς of Leontis (VI), hitherto unknown but correct for the orderly sequence of the secretary cycle. The inscription is poorly cut and contains numerous errors in redaction as well as in orthography, but it sheds valuable light on one of the perplexing periods of the third century. There are two decrees: (1) the decree of the Demos in lines 1-21, which is incorrectly docketed among βουλῆς ψηφίσματα, and (2) the decree of the Council in lines 38-58, which is incorrectly reported as emanating from an ἐκκλησία κυρία, i.e. a ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου. There is other confusion also in the preambles, where both Pandionis and Oineis are said to have held the sixth prytany. Obviously, the decree of the Council came first and was passed in the fifth (not sixth) prytany in the month of Maimakterion, and the decree of the Demos came later and was passed in the sixth prytany in the month of Posideon. In the period of the thirteen phylai to which these texts belong the one-to-one correspondence in dates between months and prytanies indicates an intercalary year in the festival calendar.

These years from the beginning of the twelfth Metonic cycle in 223/2 are confusing, but the new inscription makes the pattern of intercalations and calendar correspondences clear.

First, the year 223/2 seems to have been intercalary.³⁰ The name of the archon is not known, but the secretary from Kedoi (III) gives the date within the secretary

²⁹ See *Chronology*, pp. xxi and 99.

³⁰ This has been generally recognized in recent years, now that a forward count with μετ' εἰκάδας is not held permissible in the last decade of an Athenian festival month. See Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1947, p. 90, and for the direction of the count see Meritt, *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 256, note 200.

cycle. If the name of the month and the number of the prytany are both correctly given in the text of *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, 1937, pp. 76-77, No. 30, amplified now by the addition of a new fragment in *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, pp. 116-117, No. 23, the calendar equations show a proper one-to-one correspondence between month and prytany for an intercalary year in the period of the thirteen phylai:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Prytany VII } 2 &= \text{Posideon } 2 \\ \text{Prytany VII } 16 &= \text{Posideon } 16^{81}\end{aligned}$$

The anomaly of this reconstruction is that the intercalated month must be assumed to come before Posideon in order to make Posideon itself the seventh month. In view of the irregular intercalation of months elsewhere in the late third century this is no insuperable objection.⁸² Yet it is surprising that in the next year the month Anthesterion was irregularly intercalated, giving apparently two intercalary years in succession,⁸³ of which the second one is sure. The minor disturbance in the equation of line 37, where the evidence shows one or two days irregularly introduced into the festival calendar before Boedromion 24, does not affect the calendar character of the year.⁸⁴ The introduction of a second Anthesterion, on the other hand, changes the character of its year completely: it began as a year of 12 months, which were divided into thirteen prytanies, and it ended as a year of thirteen months. Meritt has discussed this phenomenon at length, and shown that the first known equation in the calendar of the following year 221/0 is the direct result of it.⁸⁵ The prytany year 222/1 was finished with the end of Thargelion in 222/1, and the first prytany of 221/0 began on Skirophorion 1. Hence the sixth prytany in the archonship of Thrasyphon (221/0) was equated with the fifth month Maimakterion.⁸⁶

The year 221/0 was thus ordinary in the festival calendar while having the prytanies scaled to thirteen months. It followed 222/1 which turned out to be intercalary in the festival calendar with the prytanies scaled to twelve months. The

⁸¹ The restoration of line 4 could be [ὥνος ἔκτει ἐπὶ δέκα, ἔκτει καὶ] δεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας. This corresponds most closely to the twenty spaces available for restoration estimated by Dow, though it is possible that either τρίτει or ὀγδόει or ἐνάτει should be substituted for ἔκτει.

⁸² See Pritchett and Meritt, *Chronology*, p. 102. Pritchett's hypothesis that the Athenians intercalated empirically, and according to no rule, is abortive (see his article in *Cl. Phil.*, LXIII, 1968, pp. 53-54 and Meritt's criticism in *Arch. Eph.*, 1968, pp. 111-112).

⁸³ *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, 1937, pp. 81-85, No. 36 (= *I.G.*, II², 848), now dated in 222/1. See Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, pp. 91-92, and Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 172-175 and 235. For the intercalation of a second Anthesterion see *I.G.*, II², 844, line 33.

⁸⁴ See Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, p. 90; Meritt, *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 256, note 200.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 257-258; *The Athenian Year*, pp. 173-175.

⁸⁶ *I.G.*, II², 839, lines 6-10, as restored in *The Athenian Year*, p. 174: [ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδι]ονίδος ἔκτης πρυτανείας ἢ [- ^{ca.} ¹⁰ -] του Παιανιεύς ἐγραμμάτε[υν· δῆμον ψη]φίσματα· Μαιμακτηριῶνος [ἔκτει ἐπὶ δέκα], ἔκτει καὶ δεκάτει τῆς πρυτ[ανείας· - - - κτλ. - - -].

probable correspondencies between prytanies and months can be illustrated schematically in a table which might well replace that first suggested by Meritt in *The Athenian Year*, p. 175:

	Prytanies	Months
222/1	The thirteen prytanies of the Council were scaled to an anticipated year of twelve months in the festival calendar.	

Prytany I 1	= Day 1	= Hekatombaion 1
Prytany II 1	= Day 29	= Hekatombaion 29
	etc.	
Prytany VIII 1	= Day 193	= Gamelion 15
Prytany IX 1	= Day 220	= Anthesterion 12

A second Anthesterion was added to the festival calendar (cf. *I.G.*, II², 844, line 33), a circumstance unforeseen at the beginning of the year, but the prytanies continued to have their normal number of days.

	Prytany X 1	= Day 247	= Anthesterion II 10	
	Prytany XI 1	= Day 274	= Elaphebolion 7	
	Prytany XII 1	= Day 301	= Mounichion 5	
	Prytany XIII 1	= Day 328	= Thargelion 3	
221/0	Prytany I 1	= Day 355	= Skirophorion 1	222/1

The thirteen prytanies of the Council now covered the last month of 222/1 and the twelve months of the ordinary festival year 221/0, making a one-to-one correspondence between months and prytanies.

Prytany II 1	=	Hekatombaion 1	221/0
Prytany III 1	=	Metageitnion 1	
Prytany IV 1	=	Boedromion 1	
Prytany V 1	=	Pyanopsion 1	
Prytany VI 1	=	Maimakterion 1	

Here Prytany VI 16 = Maimakterion 16
 (*I.G.*, II², 839; cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 174)
 etc.

The best way to indicate the sequence of ordinary and intercalary years is not to write, as Meritt did in 1961 in *The Athenian Year* (p. 235), where the O and I were based on the prytanies, but to show the three years from 223/2 to 221/0 thus, with the O and the I based on the festival calendar of the civil months:

Type of Year	Date	Archon	Deme of Secretary	Reference
I*	223/2		III Kedoi	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 917; <i>Hesperia</i> , IX, 1940, pp. 115-118, No. 23.
I*	222/1	Archelaos	IV Ankyle	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 844, 848.
O*	221/0	Thrasyphon	V Paiania	<i>I.G.</i> , II ² , 839; <i>The Athenian Year</i> , p. 174.

These determinations must now be scanned in the light of the new inscription of the year of Menekrates (220/19). The two equations in his year, as recorded above, show the one-to-one correspondence between months and prytanies characteristic of an intercalary year in the period of the thirteen phylai. Logically, therefore, one adds to the table:

I*	220/19	Menekrates	VI Sounion	above, pp. 425, 436
----	--------	------------	------------	---------------------

Evidently, the anomaly of having three intercalary years in a sequence of four calls for a radical re-examination. Pritchett has examined in detail the evidence for the date of creation of the phyle Ptolemais.³⁷ He concludes that the epigraphical evidence of the great archon list *I.G.*, II², 1706, proves a date for Ptolemais earlier than 220/19, but considers this a minor gain since the creation must in any case have been earlier than the death of Ptolemy Euergetes and Berenike in 221. He claims 223/2 as a *terminus ante quem* for the functioning of the phyle, which he thinks was created in 224/3. The evidence lies partly in *I.G.*, II², 917, because some day of the seventh prytany seemed to fall in Posideon. But this is not all. Pritchett has also shown that in 223/2 the deme Aphidnai had already been transferred to Ptolemais. The representation of demes in *Hesperia*, Suppl. I, pp. 71-73, No. 28, cannot, by process of elimination in the count of the councillors, include Aphidnai still among the demes of Aiantis. This determination was made by Pritchett in 1941, when he defended the dating of the inscription in 223/2 against criticism by Robert Schlaifer.³⁸ So, whatever restorations are made in *I.G.*, II², 917, one must reckon with a council of thirteen phylai.

This is a dilemma. One has a choice of assuming some very irregular intercalation at the beginning of the twelfth Metonic cycle or of assuming something irregular in the calendar of 223/2 itself if it is to be taken as an ordinary year of twelve months. The equation in lines 2-4 can be restored for an ordinary year without irregularity, reading Ποσιδε[ῶνος ἐνεὶ καὶ νέαι, τρίτει καὶ δ]εκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας. The last day of Posideon thus equalled the thirteenth day of the seventh prytany:

³⁷ *The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes* (Diss., 1943), pp. 13-23.

³⁸ See Pritchett, *Hesperia*, X, 1941, pp. 391-397 (especially p. 396) in reply to Schlaifer, *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, LI, 1940, pp. 250-251.

Prytanies	Months
$28 + 28 + 27 + 27 + 27 + 27 + 13 = 30 + 29 + 30 + 29 + 30 + 29 = 177.$	

The equation in line 43, as written on the stone and now restored, seems inevitable:

$$\text{Prytany VII 2} = \text{Posideon 2}^{39}$$

If the year was ordinary the assumption has to be made that there had been a retardation of the festival date by 16 days, for normally the second day of Prytany VII would be the 166th day of the year, to agree with the hypothetical equation in line 4, and 16 days must be added to bring Posideon 2 up to this figure:

Prytanies	Months
$28 + 28 + 27 + 27 + 27 + 27 + 2 = 30 + 29 + 30 + 29 + 30 + 2 < + 16 > = 166.$	

Before Pritchett's studies of the calendar one would have been reluctant indeed to assume such a retardation, but we now know of a retardation of 13 days in the archonship of Antigenes (171/0) and of a retardation of 19 or 20 days in the archonship of Metrophanes (145/4).⁴⁰ Not to confine examples to the second century one may note the retardation by at least four days in the archonship of Pytharatos (271/0)⁴¹ and a retardation of eleven days in the archonship of Anaxikrates (307/6).⁴² These are only selected examples of a phenomenon not unduly rare, and make the decision to have 223/2 an ordinary year less difficult than it would have been twenty-five years ago. If the year 223/2 was ordinary the calendar anomaly was a retardation in Posideon. There is no need to assume any retardation or irregular intercalation in the early part of the year, and a vastly improved sequence of ordinary and intercalary years is achieved in the twelfth Metonic cycle:⁴³

O* I* O* I* O* O* I O I* O* O I O O I* O* O I O

This is far preferable to the alternative

I* I* O* I* O* O* O O I* O* O I O O I* O* O I O

though an arrangement equally anomalous is known to have existed at least once many years earlier (417/6-409/8).⁴⁴ On present evidence, therefore, one can only weigh probabilities; the calendar character of 223/2 remains in doubt.

³⁹ See *Hesperia*, IX, 1940, p. 116, line 42.

⁴⁰ Cf. Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars*, p. 86, for Metrophanes, and Meritt, *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, pp. 247-249, for Antigenes. Pritchett also discusses the year of Metrophanes in *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, IV, 4, 1963, pp. 330-332.

⁴¹ W. B. Dinsmoor, *Hesperia*, XXIII, 1954, p. 299, line 4; cf. Pritchett, *op. cit.*, pp. 340-341.

⁴² *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 13-15. See now 'Αρχ. 'Εφ., 1968, pp. 113-114.

⁴³ See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 234-235.

⁴⁴ See Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 218, and *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 210.

The case for the authorization of the phyle Ptolemais in 224/3 is very strong. This is especially true in view of the games in honor of Ptolemy in the archonship of Antiphilos (224/3) and the wish of the Demos to do him homage recorded in *I.G.*, II², 1303.⁴⁵ Definite mention of the Council of 650 occurs in the year of Menekrates (220/19) in this same inscription.⁴⁶ But, as Pritchett noted, the existence of the Council of 650 is known anyway earlier than this. And the representation of demes in the phyle Aiantis in 223/2 presupposes the functioning of the new phyle Ptolemais at some time within that year.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
PRINCETON

⁴⁵ This inscription must be read in the text as published in *Hesperia*, II, 1933, p. 448, with supplements suggested by Adolf Wilhelm in *Ans. Ak. Wien*, 1946, pp. 115-127.

⁴⁶ According to Wilhelm's restoration of lines 17-18: κ[αὶ] τήν [βο]ν[λὴν ὕ]πεδέξα[το τ]οὺς ἐξ[ακοσ]ίους [κα]ὶ π[ε]ντή[κο]ντα.