THE ARCHONSHIP OF CHARIKLES (196/5)

T HE archonship of Charikles (196/5) was intercalary in the festival calendar κατ' ἄρχοντα of Athens.[1] The evidence that it should be ordinary in the Metonic calendar κατὰ θεόν was set forth in 1964,[2] but the crucial evidence for the nature of the calendar κατ' ἄρχοντα was overlooked, and the assumption was made that the year was ordinary both κατ' ἄρχοντα and κατὰ θεόν. This, of course, is impossible in view of the explicit mention of the intercalated Posideon in *I.G.*, II², 785.

For a time I thought that the calendar equations of this year could all be restored for an ordinary year κατὰ θεόν, reading the date by month in *I.G.*, II², 785, as Ποσι-δεῶνος ἐμβολίμου ἔν[ει καὶ νέαι], and assuming a late start (late by one month) for the κατὰ θεόν calendar. But an examination of the stone in Athens, kindly undertaken for me by Malcolm McGregor, shows a trace of delta after the published letters epsilon nu. The date was Posideon II 11, and the prytanies were scaled to this inter-calary year κατ' ἄρχοντα. Such a relationship was frequent during the third and second centuries, diverging from the intercalations in the Metonic cycle. The three known equations of the year 196/5 are:

I.G., II², 785
Prytany VI 2⟨9⟩ == Posideon II 11 [3]

Hesperia, V, 1936, p. 422
Prytany IX 28 == Elaphebolion 13 with no date recorded after κατὰ θεὸν δέ.[4]

Hesperia, X, 1941, p. 276
Prytany [XI 28]== Thargelion 23 [5]

With 196/5 intercalary it is to be assumed that 197/6 was ordinary κατ' ἄρχοντα. If reference is made to the latest table of archons in the thirteenth Metonic cycle,[6] it will be seen that Dionysios after [– – – – –], surely of an intercalary year, must be

---

[1] *I.G.*, II², 785, reading Ποσιδεῶνος ἐμβολίμου in line 4.
[2] B. D. Meritt, *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, pp. 237-238.
[3] As restored in the *Corpus*: Ποσιδεῶνος ἐμβολίμου ἐν[δεκάτει, ἐνά]τει καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτα[νείας]. But the day of the month is now to be read ἐνδ[εκάτει].
[4] Reading Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος τρίτει ἐπὶ δέκα {κατὰ θεὸν δὲ} ὀγδόει καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας. The attempt to write a date κατὰ θεόν was abortive, for the prytanies (by hypothesis) were not scaled to the calendar κατὰ θεόν which in this year (9th in the 13th Metonic cycle) was ordinary. The year 196/5 should be eliminated from my table of years which show dates κατὰ θεόν in *T.A.P.A.*, XVC, 1964, p. 237.
[5] Restoring Θαργηλιῶνος ὀγδόει με[τ' εἰκάδας, ὀγδόει καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας], as in *Hesperia*, X, 1941, p. 276.
[6] *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 240.

moved up to 198/7 and restored as Dionysios after [...i]ppos. There is now no candidate for 197/6. The year 195/4 must also be taken as ordinary. The year 191/0, fourteenth year in the cycle, was ordinary both κατ' ἄρχοντα and κατὰ θεόν.[7]

Another oversight in my study of 1964 should be corrected here. In the table of the 14th Metonic cycle I gave the year of Nikosthenes (167/6) as ordinary.[8] As last year in the cycle it was indeed ordinary κατὰ θεόν, but the numismatic evidence shows that it was intercalary κατ' ἄρχοντα,[9] and should have been indicated as I.[10] I have already discussed the consequences of this divergence,[11] and shall discuss them more fully elsewhere.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

[7] With the text as restored in *Hesperia*, V, 1936, p. 428 (No. 16). See *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 1965, p. 89.
[8] See *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 239.
[9] *The Athenian Year*, p. 181.
[10] I am indebted to Alan Samuel for calling this to my attention.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 183-184.