

## GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

This is the fifth report on the inscriptions found in the American excavations of the Athenian Agora. The previous reports have appeared in *Hesperia*, II (1933), pp. 149–169 and pp. 480–513; in *Hesperia*, III (1934), pp. 1–128; and in *Hesperia*, IV (1935), pp. 5–107. The numbering of the documents here presented follows in consecutive order from the conclusion of the last report, which was published earlier this year.<sup>1</sup>

The critical marks employed in the editing of the present texts are those recommended by the Leyden conference and adopted in the seventh volume of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

**39.** Stele of Pentelic marble found on June 3, 1933 in Sector Θ at 15/ΚΓ, lying on the floor of (ancient) House F. Complete except that the acroteria have been cut away, and that the surface of the left side has been re-worked.

Height, 1.135 m.; width, 0.4 m.; thickness, 0.125 m.

Height of letters, 0.005 m.

Inv. No. 7341 I 918.

226/5 B.C.

NON CTOIX.

Θ                    ε                    ο                    ι  
'Επὶ Ἐργοχάρου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθων  
τίδος τρίτης πρυτανείας ἦν Ζωῖλος Διφί  
λου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευεν· Μεταγειτρι  
5 ᾶνος δευτέραι μετ' εἰκάδας, ἐβδόμει καὶ εἰ  
κοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεά  
τρῳι· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν Σπουδίας Μέ

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my thanks to Professor W. S. Ferguson for many valuable suggestions while this report was being prepared, to Mr. Sterling Dow for constant aid in verifying readings on the stones in Athens, and to Mr. Eugene Schweigert (a member of my epigraphical seminary at the Johns Hopkins University) for especial study of the problems connected with the date of the archon Polystratos.

μωνος Ἀφιδναῖος καὶ συμπρόεδροι· vacat  
 ἔδοξεν τεῖ βουλευῖ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ  
 10 Θούκριτος Ἀλιμιάρχου Μυρρινοῦσιος εἶπεν· ἐ  
 πειδὴ Πρύτανις εὐνοὺς ὦν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ πολ  
 λάκις τὴν ἀπόδειξιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πρότερον πεπο  
 ημένων ἀποφραγμένων τῶν στρατηγῶν παρα  
 κληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου καὶ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀπροφ[α]  
 15 σίστως εἰς τὴν κοινὴν χρεῖαν τῆς πόλεως ἀπ[ε]  
 δήμησεν [[ ca. 22 ]] οὔτε πό  
 ρον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑπολογισάμενος οὐθένα  
 τῶν ἐσομένων οὔτε δαπάνης οὐδεμίας φροντί  
 σας καὶ παραγενόμενος [[ ca. 9 ]] κα[ὶ] διαλ[ε]  
 20 χθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἢ χρησίμων μετ[ὰ] παρ[ρ]η  
 σίας ὡς ἂν ὑπὲρ ἰδιαγο[ς] τὴν πᾶσαν σπου  
 δὴν ποι(ο)ύμενος ἀπήγγελλεν τῷ δήμῳ περ[ὶ] τοῦ  
 των ἐν οὐθενὶ καιρῷ προθυμίας οὐθέν ἐν[δη]λόγ  
 ποτ' οὐδὲ τῶν καθικόντων εἰς τὴν τοῦ δήμου  
 25 χρεῖαν παραλείπων, ὅπως ἂν οὖν ὁ δῆμος ἐμ πρᾶν  
 τί καιρῷ μεμνημένος φαίνεται τῶν ἐκετεῶς  
 τὰς χρεῖας αὐτῷ παρεσχημένων ὡς ἀγαθεῖ τὴ  
 χει δεδῶχθαι τῇ βουλῇ τοὺς λαχόντας προ  
 ἔδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν χρηματί  
 30 σαι περὶ τούτων, γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς  
 βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι δοκεῖ τῇ βουλῇ ὡς  
 ἐπαινεῖσαι Πρύτανιν Ἀστυλείδου Καρύστιον  
 καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ κατὰ  
 τὸν νόμον εὐνοίας ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἣν ἔ  
 35 χων διατελεῖ περὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον  
 τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀνειπεῖν τὸν στέφανον τοῦ  
 τον Διονυσίων τῶν ἐν ἄστει τραγωιδῶ[ς] τῷ  
 καινῷ ἀγῶνι καὶ Παναθηναίων τῷ γυμνικῷ·  
 τῆς δὲ πόσεως τοῦ στεφάνου καὶ τῆς ἀναγο ὡς  
 40 ρεύσεως ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοῦ[ς] στρατηγῶς καὶ  
 [[ι]] τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν· εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶι  
 διατηροῦντι τὴν αἴρεσιν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ  
 δήμου καὶ ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν ὅτου ἂν δοκῆι ἄξιος εἶναι·  
 καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς τὸ πρυτα  
 45 νεῖον εἰς αὐρίον· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφισ  
 μα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στή  
 λῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀγορᾷ· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλω  
 μα τὸ γεγόμενον εἰς τὴν ἀνάθε[σ]ι[ν] καὶ τὴν ἀνα

50      γραφήν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ταμί [[      ]]  
           αν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν.

ἡ βουλή  
 ὁ δῆμος  
 Πρύτανιν

## TRANSLATION

Gods.

In the archonship of Ergocharēs in the third prytany of Hippothontis for which Zoilos, son of Diphilos, of Alopeke, was secretary; Metageitnion 29th, 27th of the prytany; assembly in the theater. The chairman of the proedroi Spoudias, son of Memnon, of Aphidnai, and his fellow-proedroi put the question to a vote. Resolved by the Council and Demos; Thoukritos, son of Alkimachos, of Myrrhinous, made the motion:

Inasmuch as Prytanis, being well disposed to the Demos and (the generals having often made their citation of him and of his former activities) having been summoned by the Demos and having given himself unreservedly to the common service of the city, went abroad [to the court of King Antigonos?] reckoning neither toil nor any future danger nor considering any expense, but having come to [the king?] and having discoursed on matters of public advantage without restraint (exercising all zeal just as if in his own behalf) reported to the Demos concerning these things that at no time did he ever fail at all in zeal or in what was suitable for the service of the Demos,—in order that the Demos may at all times appear as clearly mindful of those who have offered their services to it, with good fortune be it resolved by the Council that the proedroi who are chosen by lot for the next meeting of the assembly deliberate about these matters, and refer the resolution of the Council to the Demos, namely, that the Council votes to praise Prytanis, son of Astyleides, of Karystos, and to crown him with a golden crown according to the law for the good-will and zeal which he continuously holds toward the Council and Demos of the Athenians, and to proclaim this crown at the new contest of the Dionysia in the city and at the gymnastic contest of the Panathenaia; that the generals and the treasurer of the military funds care for the making of the crown and for the proclamation; that it be possible for him, preserving his policy, to gain any other good thing of which he may seem to be worthy, and to invite him also to dinner in the prytaneion on the morrow; that the prytany-secretary inscribe this decree on a stone stele and place it in the Agora; that the treasurer of the military funds apportion the expense incurred for the erection and inscription of the stele.

The Council  
 The Demos  
 Prytanis



No. 39

## COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

The inscription is not written stoichedon, but the lines regularly end in complete words or syllables.

Line 10: *Θούκριτος Ἀλκιμάχου Μυρρινούσιος*, as *στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν* in the archonships of -----, Kleomachos, Kallimedes, and Thersilochos, received a crown from the Council and Demos (*P.A.* 7261; cf. *I.G.*, II, 1194 and Kirchner, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXII [1907], p. 470). His services as general were also recorded in a decree of the soldiers under Timokrates (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1286), with mention of his appointment in the archonships of -----, Kleomachos, and Kallimedes (for the restorations cf. Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 174). His father Alkimachos was one of the *paredroi* of the archon Nikias Otryneus (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 668, line 19).

Line 11: Prytanis, whose full name is given in line 32 as Prytanis, son of Astyleides, of Karystos, was the peripatetic philosopher, appointed by Antigonos Doson as *νομοθέτης* for the Megalopolitans (Suidas, *s. v. Εὐφορίων*; Polybius, V, 93, 8).

Lines 16 and 19: The deep erasures show that the inscription contained originally mention of the house of Macedon, probably of Antigonos Doson. The excision must have taken place at the time of the *damnatio memoriae* of 201 B.C. The wording of the decree shows a strained relationship between Athens and Antigonos in 226-5. Prytanis, who was acting as intercessor for Athens at the Macedonian court, "reckoned neither trouble nor any future danger nor considered any expense," but "discoursed without restraint" for the interest of the Athenian Demos. The words erased in line 16 may have been *πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἀντίγονον*, and in line 19 *τῷ βασιλεῖ* or *Ἀντιγόνῳ*.

Lines 20-21: The form *παρησίας* appears on the stone.

Line 21: The end of the line is cut in an erasure. The form *ἰδιαγδος* is corrupt; a pi once stood where the second delta is now cut, and a tau once stood where the sigma is now cut.

Line 22: The form *ποιόμενος* appears on the stone.

Lines 37-38: The proclamation of the crown was to be made at the Dionysiac festival and at the subsequent Panathenaia in 225-4. The fact that the Panathenaia are not mentioned as *Παναθηναίων τῶν μεγάλων* (cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 682, line 77) is an argument *ex silentio* that the archonship of Ergochares does not belong in the second year of an Olympiad (e.g., 227-6).

Line 41: A mistake in cutting was made in the first letter space and the letter then erased. It seems to have been either iota or tau.

Line 49: An erasure occurs at the end of the line.

The equations of date given in lines 4-6 are particularly important, because they make possible a formal demonstration of the fact that the count of days with *μετ' εικάδας* in the third decade of the month was reckoned backward from the last day and not forward from the twentieth day of the month. Until quite recently it has been generally

assumed, and, indeed, considered to be an established fact, that the days after the twenty-first, which was always called *δεκάτη ὀστέρα*, were denominated as follows:

21	<i>δεκάτη ὀστέρα</i>
22	<i>δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας</i>
23	<i>τρίτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
24	<i>τετράς μετ' εικάδας</i>
25	<i>πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
26	<i>ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
27	<i>ἑβδόμη μετ' εικάδας</i>
28	<i>ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας</i>
29	<i>ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
30	<i>ἔτη καὶ νέα</i>

All the restorations in the decrees of the fourth century and later where the phrase *μετ' εικάδας* was employed have been given in the *editio minor* of the *Corpus* with the assumption that the forward count as indicated above was correct. But more recently Klaffenbach (*Gnomon*, VI, p. 216) and Kirchner (*Gnomon*, VIII, p. 457) have expressed themselves as believing that a backward count with *μετ' εικάδας* is possible. Usener (*Rh. Mus.*, XXXIV [1879], pp. 420 ff.) long ago argued for the backward count, but was severely criticised, particularly by Unger (*Philologus*, XXXIX [1880], pp. 476 ff.) and Schmidt (*Gr. Chronol.*, pp. 518 ff.). In the *editio minor* of the *Corpus* Kirchner still refused to accept the backward count (cf. commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 360, 361, 481, and 547). In spite of Klaffenbach's argument in *Gnomon* and Kirchner's partial recantation, Meritt was still unwilling to use the backward count in restoring one of the new documents from the Agora (*Hesperia*, III, no. 7). There is now no longer any uncertainty that the backward count was employed, for the evidence of the inscription here presented, when combined with the evidence of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 838, gives formal proof of it.

The preamble of II<sup>2</sup>, 838 as now restored reads as follows:

[Ἐπι] Ἐργ[οχάρου ἄρχοντ]ος ἐπι τῆς Ἰπποθωντ[ί]  
 δος τρί[της πρυτανείας] ἢ Ζωῖλος Διφίλο[υ]  
 Ἀλωπεκῆ[θεν ἐγραμμάτ]ευεν· Μεταγειτνια  
 νος ἐνάτ[η] καὶ δεκάτ[η] δ' ἐντέροι ἐμβολί  
 μωι, εἰκοσ[τῆ] τῆς πρυτανείας· - - - κλπ. - - -

The inscription is from the same year, the same prytany, and the same month as our present document. With forward count in both texts we have the equations:

$$\text{Metageitnion 22} = \text{Pryt. III, 27}$$

$$\text{Metageitnion 19} = \text{Pryt. III, 20}$$

Obviously both equations cannot be correct, for three days in the month cannot be the equivalent of seven days in the prytany. As a matter of fact the restoration of line 4

in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 838 is quite erroneous, for *ἐνάτη καὶ δεκάτη* is not the phrase to mean the 19th day of a month. The proper formula is *ἐνάτη ἐπὶ δέκα*, and in the Attic inscriptions is regularly employed when the 19th day is indicated. The only restoration for line 4 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 838 which is epigraphically possible is *ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας -]*.<sup>1</sup> When this phrase is restored, the complete record of the date by month appears as *Μεταγεινιώνος ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας δ]ευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι*. The significance of *δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι* has been correctly pointed out by Dinsmoor,<sup>2</sup> and we know that we have to deal with the day *ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας* in an intercalated month.

Again assuming that the count with *μετ' εἰκάδας* is forward, the two inscriptions now being studied give the equations:

$$\text{Metageitnion II } 29 = \text{Pryt. III, } 20$$

$$\text{Metageitnion (II) } 22 = \text{Pryt. III, } 27$$

A comparison of the two equations shows that the so-called forward count is impossible, and that the backward count is essential. The date *Μεταγεινιώνος ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας δ]ευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι* in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 838 must be the 22nd day of the intercalated month, and the date *Μεταγεινιώνος δευτέραι μετ' εἰκάδας* of the new decree must be the 29th day of the (intercalated) month. The equations may be written, with backward count for *μετ' εἰκάδας*, as follows:

$$\text{Metageitnion II } 22 = \text{Pryt. III, } 20$$

$$\text{Metageitnion (II) } 29 = \text{Pryt. III, } 27$$

The seven elapsed days in the lunar month correspond exactly (as indeed they must) to the seven elapsed days in the prytany. The proof is formal and complete; we must admit that the backward count with *μετ' εἰκάδας* was possible and that it was employed in the dating of Athenian inscriptions.

The days in the last decade of the Athenian month may now be designated according to the following table:

21	<i>δεκάτη ὄστερα</i>
22	<i>ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
23	<i>ὀγδόη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
24	<i>ἑβδόμη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
25	<i>ἕκτη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
26	<i>πέμπτη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
27	<i>τετράς μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
28	<i>τρίτη μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
29	<i>δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας</i>
30	<i>ἔτη καὶ νέα</i>

<sup>1</sup> Kirchner, in the commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 838, recognized the irregularity of *ἐνάτη καὶ δεκάτη* as a date for the 19th of a month. He now (*Gnomon*, VIII, p. 457) accepts the only possible restoration *ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας -]*.

<sup>2</sup> *Archons*, p. 378.

There still remain the question of whether backward count as here shown was invariably employed or whether the long accepted forward count may not still in some cases be necessary, and the question of which day in the reckoning was omitted in a hollow month. A study of the preserved inscriptions shows that the forward count is sometimes essential. The evidence is presented below (pp. 536-561), and it is disquieting to discover that we cannot now say with certainty just which day of the month was meant when the count was given *μετ' εικάδας*. The ancients themselves were probably no better off than we are, for only rarely (as in 307-6; see p. 539) did the scribe specify whether he was using the backward reckoning.

There is some evidence to indicate which date was omitted in the reckoning of the hollow months, but before studying it, the three systems of counting in the last decade may now be tabulated together:

	Old Style	Backward Count	Forward Count
21	<i>δεκάτη ὑστέρα</i>	<i>δεκάτη ὑστέρα</i>	<i>δεκάτη ὑστέρα</i>
22	<i>ἐνάτη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας</i>
23	<i>ὀγδόη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>τρίτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
24	<i>ἑβδόμη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>ἑβδόμη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>τετράς μετ' εικάδας</i>
25	<i>ἕκτη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
26	<i>πέμπτη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
27	<i>τετράς φθίνοντος</i>	<i>τετράς μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>ἑβδόμη μετ' εικάδας</i>
28	<i>τρίτη φθίνοντος</i>	<i>τρίτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας</i>
29	<i>δευτέρα φθίνοντος</i>	<i>δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας</i>	<i>ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας</i>
30	<i>ἔνη καὶ νέα</i>	<i>ἔνη καὶ νέα</i>	<i>ἔνη καὶ νέα</i>

In the archonship of Nikokrates (333-2 B.C.) there are two significant equations to be derived from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 338 and 339:

$$\text{Metageitnion } 9 = \text{Pryt. I, } 39$$

$$\text{Metageitnion } 24 = \text{Pryt. II, } 15$$

The restoration in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 339 is: [*Μεταγειτιῶ*νος ἕκ[τη φθίνοντος πέμπτη κα]ὶ δ[εκάτη τῆς πρυτανείας - -]. The restoration itself is inevitable, and may be accepted as correct. From the first equation it is evident that Hekatombaion was full, with 30 days, and that Pryt. I had 39 days (at least). The year was intercalary in the period of the ten tribes, and the normal length of the first prytany would naturally be 38 or 39 days. Assuming that the actual length of Pryt. I was exactly 39 days, we must interpret *ἕκτη φθίνοντος* as the 24th day of the month. Now this count is possible only if the second month, Metageitnion, was hollow (as we should expect anyway, since it follows a full month) and if the days were reckoned back successively from the 29th (or last) day of the month, according to the following scheme:

29	ἔτη καὶ νέα
28	δευτέρα φθίνοντος
27	τρίτη φθίνοντος
26	τετράς φθίνοντος
25	πέμπτη φθίνοντος
24	ἕκτη φθίνοντος

Whatever the day omitted from the count in the hollow month, it was one of the days earlier than ἕκτη φθίνοντος.

Of course, if Pryt. I had 40 days (irregularly), then ἕκτη φθίνοντος would have to be equated with Metageitnion 25. This is the normal correspondence for a full month, but we have observed that Metageitnion was probably hollow (because Hekatombaion was full) and that Pryt. I probably had its normal quota of 39 days. The probability is confirmed by the evidence of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 340, for if the normal length of prytany and month were continued from the beginning of the year to the fourth prytany, the equation given in the *Corpus* for that prytany is obtained:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{Hek. 30} \\
 \text{Met. 29} \\
 \text{Boe. 30} \\
 \text{Pyan 29} \\
 \hline
 \text{(Maim 11)}
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{r}
 \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Pryt. I 39} \\ \text{Pryt. II 39} \\ \text{Pryt. III 39} \\ \text{Pryt. IV 12} \end{array} \right\} \\
 \hline
 129
 \end{array}$$

This proof, however, is not yet formal, for variations in the length of the prytanies would allow the same equation in Maimakterion as that achieved with the regular prytanies.

A more convincing demonstration that Metageitnion must actually have been a hollow month is given by *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 358, now correctly assigned to the year of Nikokrates by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 357; see Kirchner in *Gnomon*, VIII, p. 451). Since the year was intercalary and Elaphebolion had a second intercalary ἔτη καὶ νέα, it follows that Elaphebolion was planned in the scheme of the year as a hollow month. The alternation of full and hollow months initiated with Hekatombaion, known to be full, was therefore (1) Hekatombaion (+), (2) Metageitnion (-), (3) Boedromion (+), (4) Pyanopsion (-), (5) Maimakterion (+), (6) Posideon (-), (7) Posideon II (+), (8) Gamelion (-), (9) Anthesterion (+), and (10) Elaphebolion (-). An extra day was added to Elaphebolion making it actually contain 30 days, and the alternation doubtless continued to the end of the year: (11) Mounichion (-), (12) Thargelion (+), (13) Skirophorion (-), thus giving a total of 384 days to the intercalary year (see Dinsmoor's table on p. 429 of the *Archons of Athens*). This proof that Metageitnion must have been hollow prevents any restoration of the calendar equations in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 338 and 339 on the assumption that

Pryt. I had more than 39 days, and necessitates the identification of *ἕκτη φθίνοντος* in II<sup>2</sup>, 339 as the 24th day of the month.

In the year 303–2 in the archonship of Leostratos, there is a calendar equation (*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 493, 494) showing that Skirophorion 21 fell on Prytany XII, 23. Other inscriptions of the same year (*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 495–497) show that Skirophorion 29 fell on Pryt. XII, 31. The date of Skir. 29 is given as *Σκίροφοριῶνος ἔτη καὶ νέα προτέραι* and the date of Skir. 21 is given as *δεκάτη ὑστέρα*. It is obvious that in the hollow month the date *δεκάτη ὑστέρα* was not omitted,<sup>1</sup> and since we have shown above that the date omitted with backward reckoning must have preceded *ἕκτη φθίνοντος*, it is legitimate to conclude that the omitted day was where the backward count with *φθίνοντος* began, or (when *μετ' εικάδας* replaced *φθίνοντος*) where the backward count with *μετ' εικάδας* began. The last days of Skirophorion in 303–2 may be shown in the following table.

Skir. 21	<i>δεκάτη ὑστέρα</i>	= Pryt. XII, 23
Skir. 22	<i>ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 24
Skir. 23	<i>ἑβδόμη μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 25
Skir. 24	<i>ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 26
	(this corresponds to the <i>ἕκτη φθίνοντος</i> of <i>I. G.</i> , II <sup>2</sup> , 339)	
Skir. 25	<i>πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 27
Skir. 26	<i>τετράς μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 28
Skir. 27	<i>τρίτη μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 29
Skir. 28	<i>δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας</i>	= Pryt. XII, 30
Skir. 29	<i>ἔτη καὶ νέα προτέραι</i>	= Pryt. XII, 31
Skir. 30	<i>ἔτη καὶ νέα ἐμβόλιμος</i>	= Pryt. XII, 32

Those instances in which the forward count with *μετ' εικάδας* can be demonstrated are so exceptional that no proof from the inscriptions can as yet be adduced to show which day of the last decade was omitted in the hollow months. My belief is that with forward count the day omitted was *ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας*, as was maintained by Mommsen (*Chronologie*, pp. 122–123) with some support from ancient authority, and as seems logical from the direction of the count.

The table on the following page shows the days in the last decade of the month, and how, in the various systems of reckoning, these days are designated in the Athenian inscriptions.

<sup>1</sup> It was Mommsen's view that it was (*Chronologie*, p. 120). But even if we grant that it was omitted when called *δεκάτη φθίνοντος* the 4th century inscriptions regularly give the form *δεκάτη ὑστέρα*, and the question has for our purposes mainly an academic interest.

Days of Month	Count with μετ' εικάδας			
	Count with φθίνοντος		Count with μετ' εικάδας	
	Always Backward		Backward	
	Full Month	Hollow Month	Full Month	Hollow Month
21	δεκάτη ὑστέρᾳ	δεκάτη ὑστέρᾳ	δεκάτη ὑστέρᾳ	δεκάτη ὑστέρᾳ
22	ἐνάτη φθίνοντος	ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας	δεδόμη μετ' εικάδας	δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας
23	ὀγδόη φθίνοντος	ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας	ἐβδόμη μετ' εικάδας	τρίτη μετ' εικάδας
24	ἐβδόμη φθίνοντος	ἐβδόμη μετ' εικάδας	ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας	τετράς μετ' εικάδας
25	ἕκτη φθίνοντος	πέμπτη φθίνοντος	πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας	πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας
26	πέμπτη φθίνοντος	τετράς φθίνοντος	πέμπτη μετ' εικάδας	ἕκτη μετ' εικάδας
27	τετράς φθίνοντος	τρίτη φθίνοντος	τετράς μετ' εικάδας	ἐβδόμη μετ' εικάδας
28	τρίτη φθίνοντος	δευτέρα φθίνοντος	τρίτη μετ' εικάδας	ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας
29	δευτέρα φθίνοντος	ἕνη καὶ νέα	δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας	ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας
30	ἕνη καὶ νέα		ἕνη καὶ νέα	ἕνη καὶ νέα

The attempt may now be made to apply the backward system of reckoning with the count *μετ' εικάδας* to the already published Attic inscriptions. The results show that many supposed irregularities in the arrangement and length of prytanies disappear, and that a more normal reconstruction of many of the calendar years is possible.

## 325-4 B.C.

The documents are *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 360 and 361. Kirchner (in the *Corpus*) interpreted the year as ordinary, and assumed an error in the text of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 360. Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 372) shows that the year was intercalary and that no assumption of error in the text is necessary. Kirchner (*Gnomon*, VIII, p. 451) now accepts Dinsmoor's reconstruction. The date *μετ' εικάδας* is involved in the equation given in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 361: Θ[αρχηλιῶ]νος ὀγδόηι μετ' εικάδας, πέμπτ[ηι τῆς πρυταν]είας. The prytany was the tenth. With forward count the last prytany must have had 36 days, with backward count 41 days. Since the normal length of prytany in the intercalary year was 38 or 39 days, the evidence of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 361 gives no preference either to the forward or the backward count.

## 324-3 B.C.

This year is now restored as ordinary (Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 373; Kirchner, *Gnomon*, VIII, p. 451). The two inscriptions now assigned to 324-3 (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 362 and 363) give no evidence of the count *μετ' εικάδας*, but Dow informs me that there is good reason for dating *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 547 in this year also.

The restoration of lines 2-4 of this inscription may well be [Θαρχηλιῶνος] δευτέρα[ι μετ' εικάδας πέμπτηι τῆς] πρυτανε[ίας]. A reconstruction with the backward count is thus shown to be possible, with the last prytany having 35 days as is normal in an ordinary year. But the restoration now proposed in the *Corpus* with forward count also gives a satisfactory calendar equation for an ordinary year. As was the case in 325-4, the evidence for backward count with *μετ' εικάδας* in 324-3 is inconclusive.

## 307-6 B.C.

The next year in which there is evidence for the direction of the count *μετ' εικάδας* is 307-6, the archonship of Anaxikrates, represented by an unusually large group of inscriptions: *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 455-465; *Hesperia*, II, p. 398; *S.E.G.*, III, 86; cf. also *S.E.G.*, III, 87-88. The reconstruction of the calendar in this year involves unusual difficulty, and has been the subject of two recent studies, one by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, pp. 377-385) which Kirchner (*Gnomon*, VIII, p. 451) has received with favor, and one by Broneer (*Hesperia*, II, pp. 398-402). Both attempts, however, have still left a calendar in which the lengths of prytanies are subject to almost unbelievable irregularities. It is possible, nevertheless, to arrange the known inscriptions of the year in such an order that the restorations proposed do no violence to the readings actually preserved on the stones, and so that the length of prytanies may fall into a perfectly normal pattern. The items

of fundamental importance are the equations of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 456 (which proves that the year began as an ordinary year with twelve tribes to hold the prytany in succession) and of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 458 (which shows that the year contained an intercalary Gamelion, and that the count  $\mu\epsilon\tau'$   $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\alpha\varsigma$  was reckoned backward). The proof that one of the latter months of the year was omitted (probably Mounichion) is afforded by the group of inscriptions (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 460-462; *S.E.G.*, III, 86) which show that the ninth of Elaphebolion must be equated with the ninth day of the tenth prytany.

The year began and ended, therefore, as an ordinary year of twelve months, in spite of the intercalation of Gamelion II. There is no evidence whatsoever that a second intercalated Anthesterion should be assumed to satisfy the restoration of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 459. In view of the complicated interplay of restoration and interpretation in the various documents of the year, perhaps the best way in which to demonstrate the calendar scheme is to commence with the first month and the first prytany and to assign each document to its proper date in chronological order.

Pryt. I, 1 = Hekatombaion 1

(Prytany I had 30 days and Hekatombaion had 29 days)

The name of the first prytany was either Leontis or Aiantis. This seems probable from a consideration of the space available in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1589 for the restoration of this name. The inscription belongs to the first prytany of 307-6.

Pryt. II, 1 = Metageitnion 2

(Prytany II had 30 days and Metageitnion had 30 days)

Pryt. III, 1 = Boedromion 2

(Prytany III had 30 days and Boedromion had 29 days)

Pryt. IV, 1 = Pyanopsion 3

(Prytany IV had 30 days and Pyanopsion had 30 days)

In this prytany should be dated *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 464, with the name of the prytany restored either as Aigeis or Oineis:

[θ            ε]            ο            [ι]  
 [Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους ἄ]ρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆ[ς]  
 [. . . .<sup>s</sup>. . . . τετάρτ]η[ς] πρυτανείας ἧ[ς] [Α]  
 [υσίας Νοθίππου Δι]ομειεὺς ἐγραμ[μά]  
 5 [τευεν· Πυανοψιώνος·] ὀγδόει καὶ ἐ[λίκο]  
 [στεῖ τῆς πρυτανεία]ς· ἐκκλησί[α τῶν π]  
 (for the rest of the text, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 464)

Pryt. V, 1 = Maimakterion 3

(Prytany V had 29 days and Maimakterion had 29 days)

To this prytany belongs *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 456, which can be restored only on the assumption of an ordinary year. The name of the prytany was Oineis or Aigeis, depending on which name belonged to prytany IV.

CTOIX. 41

[Ἐδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δ]ήμωι· ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους  
[ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς . . . . . π]έμπτῃς πρυτανείας ἦι  
[Ἀνσίας Νοθίππου Διομεεῶς ἐ]γγραμμάτευν· Μαιμακτ[η]  
[ριῶνος ἔνῃ καὶ νέαι· ἐβδόμῃι] καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς [πρυ]  
[τανείας· ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρία· τῶν π]ροέδρων -- κλπ.

(for the rest of the text, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 456)

This restoration gives the equation

Pryt. V, 27 = Maimakterion 29

The day is the 147th of the year. The restoration assumes no irregularity of spacing in line 4, as is done in the *Corpus*.

Pryt. VI, 1 = Posideon 3

(Prytany VI had 30 days and Posideon had 30 days)

This prytany was held by Antiochis (cf. commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 457).

Pryt. VII, 1 = Gamelion 3

(Prytany VII had 29 days and Gamelion had 30 days)

Here belongs the inscription published in *Hesperia*, II, p. 398:

CTOIX.

θ [ε ο ι]

Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικ[ράτους ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆ] (28)

ς Δημητρι[άδος ἐβδόμῃς πρυτανείας] (29)

[ἦ]ι Ἀνσία[ς Νοθίππου Διομεεῶς ἐγραμ] (29)

5 [μά]τευν· [Γαμηλιῶνος ἐβδόμῃι ἐπὶ δέ] (29)

[κα] πέντε[τη καὶ δεκάτη τῆς πρυτα] (27)

[νεία]ς· ἐ[κκλησίᾳ - - - - -]

This restoration gives the equation

Pryt. VII, 15 = Gamelion 17

The day is the 194th of the year.

The inscription is stoichedon, but with a tendency to divide the lines by words or syllables. At the end of line 2 an irregular division is made, and this led Broneer to assume throughout a line of 28 letters. The normal length of line, however, may be determined from line 4 as 29 letters (Broneer's restoration *Διομεύς* for *Διομεεύς*, with which I concurred at the time his article was written, is not really satisfactory). Line 6 is a short line of 27 letters because the addition of an extra syllable at the end of the line would have increased the length beyond the maximum of 29 letters.

Pryt. VIII, 1 = Gamelion II, 2

(Prytany VIII had 29 days and Gamelion II had 29 days)

In this prytany belongs the document *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 458. There is known to have been an intercalary Gamelion in this year, for it is mentioned in *I.G.*, II, suppl., p. 181, no. 733, lines 4–6: *ἐπ' Ἀναξικ[ράτους ἄρχοντος. Γ]αμηλιῶνος ὅστ[έρου --]*. The preamble of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 458 also shows an intercalary Gamelion, because of the record of date by month *δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι* (cf. p. 531). The restoration of this inscription is as follows:

Ἐπ' Ἀναξ[ικράτους ἄρχοντος] ἐ[π]ὶ  
 τῆς Ἀντιγονίδ[ος δγ]δ[οίη]ς [πρ]ο  
 ανέας ἤι Αυσίας Νοθ[ίππ]ου Διο  
 μεεύς ἔγρα[μμ]άτενεν· Γαμηλιῶν  
 5 ος δευτ[έ]ραι ἐμβολίμωι ὀγδόε[ι]  
 μετ' εικάδας ἡμερολογδόν, μιᾶ[ι]  
 καὶ εικοστῆ τῆς πρυτανε[ίας ἐ]  
 [κκλη]σ[ί]α κρῖα· τῶν προέδ[ρων ἐπ]  
 [εψήφριζεν· -----]

The count *μετ' εικάδας* is backward, and this inscription gives the equation

Pryt. VIII, 21 = Gamelion II, 22

For the date of *ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας* with backward count in a hollow month, see the table on p. 535. The significance of the much-debated word *ἡμερολογδόν* in the date by month is now also apparent. It means "as one counts days," i.e., it specifically warns the reader that the count *μετ' εικάδας* is backward, in the old fashion of the count of the last decade when *φθίνοντος* was used. It has nothing to do with a calendar count *κατ' ἄρχοντα*, which is a much later phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> Nor does it have any connection with the fact that Gamelion here is intercalated.<sup>2</sup> It is used solely for the purpose of specifying that the date *ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδας* was counted back from the end of the month in the traditional way in which days in the 20's were counted of old. It is tempting to believe that the backward count was introduced in 307–6 to replace the forward count that

<sup>1</sup> Kirchner, in commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 456 and 459.

<sup>2</sup> As may be inferred from Dinsmoor's argument (*Archons*, p. 382).

had held the field when Athens was subject to Demetrios of Phaleron. Certainly the definition of the backward count by the addition of this word occurs only, so far as we know, in 307–6, and in this year it occurs with both demonstrable instances of a calendar count *μετ' εικάδας* in the last decade of the month (see commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 459 on p. 541). From this year on, the backward count was the rule, and the scribes may not have felt called upon to specify that it was the usage they employed. The few exceptional cases that can be demonstrated for the forward count are perhaps to be attributed to the influence of popular usage, and to be regarded as forthright exceptions for which there is no other explanation than the disregard by the scribe of the official system.

Pryt. IX, 1 = Anthesterion 2

(Prytany IX had 29 days and Anthesterion had 30 days)

In this prytany must be dated *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 459, which I restore with a stoichedon line of 50 letters:<sup>1</sup>

CTOIX. 50

A P I Σ T [-----]  
 [Ἐπι] Ἀναξικρο[άτους ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος ἐνάτης πρυτ]  
 [ανεί]ας· Ἀνθε[στηριῶνος ἐνάτει μετ' εικάδας δευτέραι δὲ ἡμερο]  
 [λεγδό]ν· ὀγδ[όει καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας· κατὰ δῆμον ψήφισ]  
 5 [μα ἐκκλ]ησι[α ----- κλπ. -----]

The restoration gives the equation

Pryt. IX, 28 = Anthesterion 29

This document is of particular importance, for the date was given, apparently, by both forward and backward count.

The name of the month Ἀνθε[στηριῶνος-] is partially preserved in line 3. Broneer insists that the last preserved letter cannot have been an epsilon (*Hesperia*, II, p. 400). Dow has more recently informed me (by letter) that the letter epsilon seems to him possible. It is, I think, a possible reading even if the cross-bar at the top of the vertical bar was never cut at all (see the examples of epsilon without cross-bars in *Hesperia*, II, p. 150), but my own reading is that of a doubtful epsilon and I so restore the line. The date by month comes to its conclusion in line 4 just before the word ὀγδ[όει--], which must be the beginning of the date by prytany. Since the last letter in the date by month is nu, the only restoration is [ἡμερολεγδό]ν (cf. also *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 458).

<sup>1</sup> That the line contains at least 50 letters has been determined by Broneer on the basis of measurements made along the left slope of the pedimental top of the preserved fragment (*Hesperia*, II, p. 400). In Broneer's opinion line 2 began with [Ἐπ'] Ἀναξικ[ράτους ἄρχοντος, but even if we add one letter to the end of each line and remove one letter from the beginning of each line in our present restoration the only textual variation is that of reading [Ἐπ'] instead of [ἐπι] in line 2.

Since we have already found that Pryt. VIII, 21 = Gam. II, 22, and since we learn from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 460–462 that Pryt. X, 9 = Elaphebolion 9, it can be determined at once that this date in Anthesterion, now shown by the word *ἡμερολογδόν* to belong in the third decade of the month, must be equated with the 28th day of the 9th prytany. This restoration (*δγδ[όει καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας]*) is therefore essential in line 4. By means of the same equations listed here in Gamelion II and in Elaphebolion it is possible, furthermore, to determine that Pryt. IX, 28 should be equated with Anthesterion 29. These determinations are certain, unless there was some violent maladjustment of the prytany calendar for which we have no evidence at the beginning of prytany IX and a correspondingly violent correction which eliminated the maladjustment at the end of prytany IX. It would be perverse to assume such conditions. In its normal order Pryt. IX, 28 must be equated with Anthesterion 29.

The difficulty of restoring this date in lines 3–4 has given rise to the belief in an intercalated month, for the additional phrase *δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι* was used by Dinsmoor to fill the long lacuna in line 4. Broneer (*loc. cit.*), who quite correctly rejects the idea of an intercalated month, assumes an intercalated day and adds the words *δυστέραι ἐμβολίμωι* to fill the gap. My proposal is that the count was given first by forward count *ἐνάτη μετ' εἰκάδας* and then supplemented by the backward count *δευτέραι δὲ ἡμερολογδόν*. The scribe once again, as in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 458, specified the day of the month when the decree was passed so that all might understand.

In line 5 part of the letters **ΗΣΙ** are preserved. They were so read by Broneer (*Hesperia*, II, p. 400, note 1), and indeed are recorded also in the *Addenda* of the *Corpus*, *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, p. 661. My own readings from the stone and from the squeeze confirm them, and I offer the restoration above on the analogy of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 554.

Pryt. X, 1 = Elaphebolion 1

(Prytany X had 29 days and Elaphebolion had 29 days)

In this prytany belong four inscriptions: *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 460–462 and *S.E.G.*, III, 86 (cf. *S.E.G.*, III, 88). Their preambles are to be restored as follows:

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 460

CTOIX. 36 (37)

[Ἐπὶ Ἀνα]ξικράτο[υς ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθωντ]  
 [ίδος δε]κάτης πρυ[τανείας ἢ Ἀσσίας Νοθίππο]  
 [υ Διομ]ειδὸς ἐγραμ[μάτευεν Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος ἐ]  
 [νάτη] ἰσταμένον, ἐ[νάτη τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκ]  
 [λησί]α τῶν προέδρω[υ ἐπεψηφίζεν . . . !<sup>o</sup> . . . ]  
 [. . .]υ Ἀλωπεκῆθεν καὶ συμπρόεδροι - κλπ. -]

(for the rest of the inscription, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 460)

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 461

CTOIX. 28

[Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆ]  
 [ς Ἰπποθωντίδος δεκάτης πρυτανεί]  
 [ας ἦι Ἀυσίας Νοθίππ]ου Δ[ιομεεὺς ἐγ]  
 [ραμμάτευσεν Ἐλαφηβ]ολιῶν[ς ἐνάτη]  
 [ι ἵσταμένον, ἐνάτηι] τῆς πρυ[τανεία]  
 [ς ἐκκλησία τῶν προ]έδρων ἐ[πεψήφισ]  
 [εν . . . . .<sup>13</sup> . . . . .]υ Ἀλωπ[εκῆθεν κα]  
 [ὶ συμπρόεδροι - - - - κλπ. - - - -]

(for the rest of the inscription, see *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 461)

This fragment does not have the left margin preserved, as indicated in the *Corpus*, but is broken on all sides.

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 462

CTOIX. 26

[Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους ἀ]ρχοντος ἐπὶ τ  
 [ῆς Ἰπποθωντίδος δ]εκάτης πρυτα  
 [νείας ἦι Ἀυσίας] Νοθίππου [Δ]ι[ο]  
 [μεεὺς ἐγραμμάτευσεν] Ἐλα[φηβολιῶ]  
 [νος ἐνάτηι ἵσταμέν]ου . . .<sup>8</sup>. . .

*S. E. G.*, III, 88

[- - Ἐπὶ] Ἀναξικράτους ἀρχοντος, κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα  
 τοῦ δήμου. ἐπὶ τῆς [Ἰ]πποθ[ωντίδος δεκάτης πρυ]τανείας εἰ  
 Ἀυσίας Νοθ[ίππου Διο]μεεὺς ἐγρα[μμά]τευσεν Ἐλαφηβολιῶν[ος  
 ἐνάτηι ἵσταμένον - - - - κλπ. - - - -]

(for the rest of the inscription, see *S. E. G.*, III, 88)

These restorations give the equation

Pryt. X, 9 = Elaphebolion 9

After Elaphebolion the month Mounichion was omitted to compensate for the intercalated Gamelion, and the calendar equations continue as follows:

Pryt. XI, 1 = Thargelion 1

(Prytany XI had 30 days and Thargelion had 30 days)

Pryt. XII, 1 = Skirophorion 1

(Prytany XII had 29 days and Skirophorion had 29 days)

To this last prytany belongs *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 455, in which I follow the restoration proposed by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 381):

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 455

CΤΟΙΧ. 43

[Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδίου]ν <sup>νννννν</sup>  
 [ίδος δωδεκάτης πρυτανείας ἤι Ἀσίας Νοθί]ππου Διομ  
 [εὐς ἐγραμμιάτευεν· Σκιροφοριῶνος ἐβδόμη]ι ἴσταμέν  
 [ου ἐβδόμη τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία· τῶν περ]σέδρων ἐπ  
 (for the rest of the inscription, see *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 455)

This restoration gives the equation

Pryt. XII, 7 = Skirophorion 7

All the known decrees of the year of Anaxikrates have now been given their places in the calendar scheme of the year, which proves to be a perfectly normal year of 12 months in the period of the 12 tribes, except for the fact that Gamelion II was irregularly intercalated and Mounichion irregularly omitted. The character of the year as a whole can best be illustrated by the following conspectus:

PRYTANIES AND MONTHS IN 307-6

Pryt. I	30	Aiantis or Leontis	Hekatombaion	29
Pryt. II	30		Metageitnion	30
Pryt. III	30		Boedromion	29
Pryt. IV	30	Aigeis or Oineis	Pyanopsion	30
Pryt. V	29	Oineis or Aigeis	Maimakterion	29
Pryt. VI	30	Antiochis	Posideon	30
Pryt. VII	29	Demetrias	Gamelion	30
Pryt. VIII	29	Antigonis	Gamelion II	29
Pryt. IX	29	Akamantis	Anthesterion	30
Pryt. X	29	Hippothontis	Elaphebolion	29
(the month Mounichion was omitted)				
Pryt. XI	30		Thargelion	30
Pryt. XII	29	Pandionis	Skirophorion	29
TOTAL	354			354

This reconstruction of the calendar does not necessarily mean that the two new tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were in existence at the beginning of the year. In fact, there is evidence that they were not, for the decree now published as *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 466 mentions Antigonos and Demetrios and apparently Mounichia also, and was passed while the Council of the 500 was still in power. It is known that Demetrios did not capture Mounichia and abolish the garrison which Kassander had established there until the archonship of Anaxikrates (Dion. Hal., *de Dinarcho*, 2, 3, and 9; Diodorus, XX, 45; Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 10; Jacoby, *Marmor Parium*, 202; *I. G.*, XII, 5, 444, CXXII; *F. G. Hist.* [Jacoby], 239, B 21; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, IV<sup>2</sup>, 2, p. 244). It is the logical interpretation of *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 466

to assume that it refers to Demetrios' capture of Mounichia, and that consequently the Council of the Five Hundred was in office during part at least of the year of Anaxikrates. The calendar reconstruction offered here is possible even so, if it be assumed further that the capture of Mounichia and the creation of the two new tribes took place in the first prytany of the year, before the 30th day. If the year was commenced as an ordinary year in the period of the 10 tribes, the first prytany would normally be planned as one of 36 days. The necessity for shortened prytanies would be evident, however, as soon as the new tribes were created, and the last six days of the first prytany as planned thus became the first six days of the second prytany in actual practice.

The secretary of the year had, of course, already been chosen and had entered upon his duties of office. We may see one of the many attempts to honor Demetrios in the device by which the secretary's deme, Diomeia, was given to the new tribe Demetrias, so that this new tribe could begin the new cycle of secretaries, quite out of turn, in 307-6. By way of compensation, the tribe of Demetrias did not furnish a secretary in 303-2 when its regular turn came due.

The reasons for the irregular intercalation of Gamelion and the omission of Mounichion remain obscure. Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 383) has suggested that the disturbance in the calendar is to be associated with the hasty inauguration of Demetrios into the Eleusinian mysteries. But it is difficult to reconcile Plutarch's story of the initiation (*Demetrius*, 26) with the chronology of 307-6, and it is perhaps better to leave the question open until the discovery of further evidence.

Incidentally, the reconstruction of 307-6 as an ordinary year removes the irregular sequence of ordinary years from the last period of the seventh Metonic cycle as now given by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 375). The year of Euxenippos (305-4) must now be considered intercalary, and the complete cycle may be reconstructed as follows:

## SEVENTH METONIC CYCLE

318-7	317-6	316-5	315-4	314-3	313-2	312-1	311-0	310-09	309-8	308-7	307-6	306-5	305-4	304-3	303-2	302-1	301-0	300-299
I*	0	0	0	I*	0*	0	I	0*	0	I	0*	0*	I	0*	I*	0*	I*	0

An asterisk denotes those years of which the calendar character may be considered certain.

304-3 B.C.

The backward count with *μετ' ἐλλάδας* is essential for the proper reconstruction of the year of Pherekles. The inscriptions involved are *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 481-486. The year was ordinary, beginning with full Hekatombaion and ending with hollow Skirophorion, except

that the normal length of Skirophorion was raised from 29 to 30 days by the addition of an intercalated ἔνη καὶ νέα ἐμβόλιμος, thus giving to the year a total of 355 days. By the use of backward count in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 483 we may abandon the irregular scheme of prytanies suggested in the *Corpus* (29 29 29 30 29 24 33 30 30 30 32 30), in favor of a more normal scheme (30 29 29 29 29 31 29 30 30 30 29 30). The following restorations must be made in the published documents:

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 481

[Πυανοψι]ῶνος ὀγδόη ἐπ[ὶ δέκα, ἐνάτη καὶ δεκάτη τῆς πρυτανε]ίας

Pryt. IV, 19 = Pryanopsion 18

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 482

Ποσιδεῶν[ος ὀγδόη μετ'] εἰ[κ]άδας τετ[άρτη]ι κα[ὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς π]ρυτανείας

Pryt. VI, 24 = Posideon 22

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 483

Γαμηλιῶνος δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας, ἐνάτη καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας

Pryt. VII, 29 = Gamelion 29

The backward count is here essential. Dinsmoor came close to proposing it in his *Archons* (p. 386) when he suggested that the scribe had in mind δευτέρα φθίνοντος when he wrote δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας.

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 485

[Θαργηλιῶνος πέμπ]τει μετ' εἰκά[δας, πέμπτη καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτ]ανείας

Pryt. XI, 25 = Thargelion 26

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 486

[Σκίροφοριῶνος ἔνη καὶ ν[έα προτέρα, ἐν]άτη καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς π[ρυτανείας]

Pryt. XII, 29 = Skirophorion 29

302-1 B.C.

The calendar of the year of Nikokles is improved by the use of backward count. There is, however, one exceptional case where forward count is employed (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 504). The documents to be considered are: *Hesperia*, I, p. 45; *Hesperia*, III, 7; *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 499; *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 500-501; *Hesperia*, IV, 6; *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 502-505. The prytanies of this year, as now given in the *Corpus* (see commentary on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 499), have the following numbers of days: 29 29 29 29 29 30 27 32 32 28 30 30. For this series we may now substitute 29 29 29 29 29 30 32 29 29 29 30 30. The year was an ordinary year of 354 days, beginning with hollow Hekatombaion and ending with Skirophorion full.

The following restorations must be made in the published documents:

*Hesperia*, I, p. 45

[Μεταγειτνι]ῶνος δευτέ[ραι μετ' εικάδας, ἐνάτη καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆ[ς προτανείας]

Pryt. II, 29 = Metageitnion 29

*Hesperia*, III, no. 7

[Ποσ]ιδεῶ[νος δευτέρα μετ' εικάδας προ]ῶτ[η τῆς προτανείας]

Pryt. VII, 1 = Posideon 29

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 499

[Γαμηλιῶνος ἐν]δεκάτει, τρίτει καὶ δεκάτει τῆς προ]τανείας

Pryt. VII, 13 = Gamelion 11

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 500

(Ἀνθεστηριῶνος) τρίτη μετ' εικάδας, ἑβδόμη καὶ εικοστῆ τῆς προτανεία[ς]

Pryt. VIII, 27 = Anthesterion 28

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 501

[Ἀνθεστηριῶνος δευτέρα] μετ' εικάδας, ὀγδ[όμη καὶ εικοστῆ τῆς προταν]είας

Pryt. VIII, 28 = Anthesterion 29

This text effects a distinct improvement over that heretofore published, in which the day of the month was restored as [τετάρτη] μετ' εικάδας. The correct restoration should have been, with the old scheme, not τετάρτη but τετράδι. The restoration δευτεραι here given not only conforms to the calendar scheme with backward count, but is epigraphically necessary as well to occupy the available space on the stone.

*Hesperia*, IV, 6

[Μουνιχιῶνος δεκ]άτει [ἰσταμένον, δεκάτει τῆς προ]τανεία[ς]

Pryt. X, 10 = Mounichion 10

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 502

Μουνιχ[ι]ῶν[ος ἐνάτη μετ'] εικάδας, δευτέρα καὶ εικ[οστῆ τῆς προ]τανείας

Pryt. X, 22 = Mounichion 22

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 503

Θαργηλιῶνος] ὀγδοὺ ἐπὶ δέκα, ἐνάτει κα[ὶ] δεκά[τει τῆς προ]τανείας

Pryt. XI, 19 = Thargelion 18

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 505

Σκιροφοριῶνος δεκάτει ἑστέραι, μ[ι]ᾶ καὶ εικοστῆ τῆς προτανείας

Pryt. XII, 21 = Skirophorion 21

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 504

[Σκιροφ]οριῶνος δε[υτέρα (μετ') εικάδας, δευτέ]ραι καὶ εἰ[κοστῆ τῆς προτανείας]

Pryt. XII, 22 = Skirophorion 22

Although it must be assumed that the stone-cutter here omitted three letters from the record of date by month, there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that this item uses the forward count with *μετ' εικάδας*.

301–300 B.C.

In *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 640 it is possible to make an improvement in the text of line 6 by reading [μᾶι καὶ εἰκ]οστῆ instead of [ἔκτει καὶ εἰκ]οστῆ, which is too long by one letter space. The date by month [*Μεταγειτ*]μῶνος ὀγδόει μετ' εικάδ[ας] is to be interpreted as the 22nd or 23rd day of Metageitnion, depending on whether the month was hollow or full. In either case it was the 52nd day of the year, thus giving to Pryt. I a length of 31 days. There is the possibility, however, that the two full months which came together in this year (which was intercalary) were not in the middle of the year, as shown in Dinsmoor's table (*Archons*, p. 430), but at the very beginning of the year. If Hekatombaion and Metageitnion were both full, then [*Μεταγειτ*]μῶνος ὀγδόει μετ' εικάδ[ας] was the 53rd day of the year, and since it should be equated with the 31st day of the second prytany the first prytany may have had 32 days—as was normal in an intercalary year at this date. In either case the best interpretation of the evidence is that the count with *μετ' εικάδας* in the date by month was backward.

Ca. 300 B.C.

To this period should be assigned the inscription now published as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 585. The same orator Phileas, son of Philonautos, of Pallene appears in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 554, which also belongs in the period after 307–6. The reason for assuming an earlier date has been the fact that the *συμπρόεδροι* are not indicated in this inscription. This is, however, a mere matter of restoration and I propose that the document should read:

[. . . . . ἑνδεκάτης περ]υτα[ν]  
 [είας ἦι . . . . .<sup>12</sup> . . . . .]σάνδρου  
 [. . . . .<sup>9</sup> . . . . . ἐγραμμ]άτευεν· Θαρ  
 [γλιῶνος δευτέρ]αι μετ' εικάδ  
 5 [ας τρι]κοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας·  
 [ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέ]δρων ἐπεψή  
 [φίξεν . . . . .<sup>10</sup> . . . . .]ς Κεφαλῆθεν  
 [καὶ συμπρόεδροι· Φι]λέας Φιλο  
 [ναύτου Παλληνηδ]ς εἶπεν· ἐπει  
 10 [δὴ . . . . .<sup>8</sup> . . . . . ὁ παιδο]υρίβης εὐ  
 [τάκτως . . . . .<sup>8</sup> . . . . . τῶι δ]ήμωι . .

The name of the proedros in line 7 might have been, e.g., [*Βίων Κλέωνο*]ς. At any rate a restoration with name and patronymic is certainly possible. For the omission of the phrase *ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι*, compare *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 500 of the year 302–1. The principal

reason for transferring this decree to the period of the twelve tribes is, however, the fact that *τριακοστει* (with two letters crowded together as was done in two places where the stone is preserved) is a more satisfactory restoration for the date by prytany in line 5 than *δευτέρα*, which is too short a word for the space available.

The calendar equation requires backward count with the date by month and is suitable for an ordinary year in the period of the twelve tribes:

$$\text{Pryt. XI, 30} = \text{Thargelion 29}$$

299-8 B.C.

The evidence for the year of Euktemon is inconclusive (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 641, 642), but backward count is possible. The equation of date as now restored in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 642 is [*Θαργηλιῶνος ἐνάτει μετ' εἰκάδας ἐνάτει*{*ρα*}]*τει* καὶ εἰ[*κοστῆι τῆς προτα*]*νείας*. An alternative restoration is [*Θαργηλιῶνος ἐνάτει μετ' εἰ*{*μετ' εἰ*}]*κάδας τρί*]*τει* καὶ εἰ[*κοστῆι τῆς προτα*]*νείας*. In both cases it is necessary to assume dittography. According to either count, Thargelion was full (not hollow as shown by Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 431), and the equation Pryt. XI, 23 = Thargelion 22 is correct for an ordinary year at this period.

287-6 B.C.

The evidence for direction of count in the year of Diotimos is still ambiguous. The one correspondence so far published is that of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 654 and 655: *Σκίροφοριῶνος ἔκτει* [*μ*]*ετ' εἰκ*[*ά*]*δας, πέμπτει καὶ εἰ*(*ι*)*κοστ*[*ε*]*ῖ τῆς π*[*ρ*]*υτανείας*. If Skirophorion was a full month, the backward count yields the equation Pryt. XII, 25 = Skirophorion 25. If Skirophorion was a hollow month, the backward count yields the equation Pryt. XII, 24 = Skirophorion 25. If the count was forward, no matter whether Skirophorion was full or hollow, the equation is Pryt. XII, 26 = Skirophorion 25. All these equations are possible in an ordinary year of this period, though the feasibility of the latter implies the assumption that Skirophorion was full and that the last prytany had 29 days.

283-2 B.C.

There is definite evidence for the backward count in the year of Ourias. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 660 gives the equation [*Θαργηλιῶνος ἐνει καὶ νέαι, ἐνάτει καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς προ*]*υτανείας*], and shows that the year was an ordinary year, in which months and prytanies corresponded closely. The new inscription found in the Agora and published below as *Hesperia*, IV, 40 (see p. 562) gives the additional equation *Μεταγειτνῶνος δευτέρα μετ' εἰκάδας οὐδὲι καὶ εἰ*[*κο*]*στῆι τῆς προτανείας*. If Metageitnion was hollow (as shown by Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 431) the equation is

$$\text{Pryt. II, 28} = \text{Metageitnion 28}$$

The forward count in the interpretation of this document is not possible.

274-3 B.C.

The archon of this year is known only as [...<sup>8</sup>...]ος from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 704 (for the archon's name and the attribution of the inscription to this year, see p. 581), which gives the calendar equation [Ἐλαφ]ηβολιῶνος τετραδάδι μετ' εικάδας ἔ]κτει καὶ εἰκ[οστῆ τῆς πρωτανεία]ς. The year was ordinary, and with backward count the day of the month may be equated with the day of the prytany as follows:

Pryt. IX, 26 = Elaph. 26

273-2 B.C.

For the assignment of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B to this year, and the restoration proposed, see below, pp. 579-581. The date suggested in the restoration has been given with backward count.

268-7 B.C.

In the year of Nicias Otryneus the evidence for direction of count with μετ' εικάδας is ambiguous. The inscriptions *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 665 and 666 give the equations

Βοηδρομιῶ[ρος ἔκ]τει μετ' εικάδας, ἔκτει καὶ εἰκ[οστῆ τῆς πρωτανεία]ς  
Ποσιδεῶνος ἐν[δεκ]άτει, δω[δεκά]τει τῆς π[ρ]υτανείας

No conclusions as to the count can be drawn from this evidence.

266-5 B.C.

The year of Philokrates was intercalary, and the prytanies should have contained normally 32 days each. We know from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 685 that the last prytany actually did contain 32 days. Evidence for the direction of the count μετ' εικάδας is found in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 684, but the interpretation is made difficult because much depends on the nature of the restorations proposed. Wilhelm's text of the inscription is given in *S.E.G.*, III, 94, where he proposes for the upper part of the stone a stoichedon line of 34 letters (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 684) and for the lower part of the stone (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 752b) a stoichedon line of 35 letters. The restorations in the *Corpus* call for a stoichedon line of 35 letters in the opening lines of the inscription, and, indeed, this length of line is necessitated by the known name of the secretary and the date of the decree within the prytany. Wilhelm's restoration, when plotted on cross-section paper, has actually 34 letters in line 1, 35 letters in line 2, 34 letters in line 3, 35 letters in line 4, and 34 letters in lines 5-13. Of these last lines only lines 5 and 8-11 are significant. It must be admitted, however, that the restorations in these lines are convincing, and I am disposed to accept a length of line of 34 letters for them. It remains a question whether lines 2 and 4 shall be given the same length of 34 letters by assuming that in each case some two letters occupied one letter space, or whether lines 1-4 may have had each 35 letters, as did the lines in the lower part of the document.



In *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 795 there cannot have been less than 41 letters in a line, for then no tribal name would be possible in line 1; and there cannot have been more than 41 letters in a line, for then no restoration of date would be possible in line 3. The restoration of the text should be given as follows:

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 795

CTOIX. 41

Ἐπὶ Θεοφύμου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῆς . . . .<sup>s</sup>. . . . τετάρτης]  
 πρυτανείας ἤμιν Προκ[λ]ῆς Ἀπ[. . . . .<sup>15</sup>. . . . . ἔγραμ]  
 [μᾶ]τενεν· Πυανοψιδῶνος ἕκ[τει ἐπὶ δέκα, τετάρτη καὶ]  
 [δεκ]άτει τῆς πρυτανε[ίας ὅ ἐκκλησία κρηία· τῶν προε]  
 [δρων εἰ]πεψήφισεν Ἀ - - - - -  
 [καὶ συμπ]ρόεδροι· - - - - -

The character of the writing is similar in both documents, and in both documents an unscripted letter space was left before the word ἐκκλησία. The year was an ordinary year, commencing with hollow Hekatombaion, in which the first six prytanies contained 30 days each and the last six prytanies 29 days each.

Since 251–0 was an ordinary year, it follows that 252–1 was intercalary (see the table in Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 24), and also, to avoid undue disturbance in the Metonic cycle, that 249–8 was intercalary and 248–7 ordinary. In order that 248–7 may be construed as an ordinary year, *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 775, lines 29–30 (year of Lysiades) must be restored with the calendar equation:

Μουνιχιῶνος ἐνάτει ἐπ[ὶ δέκα, μιᾷ καὶ εἴκο]στῇ τῆς πρυτανείας

In this year Mounichion was hollow, Thargelion full, Skirophorion hollow, and the last three prytanies contained 30 days each.

The inscription now published as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 774 was assigned to the archonship of Lysias by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, pp. 180–181) and to the archonship of Eurykleides by Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 24); but it also probably belongs to the year of Lysiades. The suggestions of date which have been made for this document depend on the demotic of the secretary in line 3, which is now restored in the *Corpus* as *Εἰτ[εαῖος]*. This reading is incorrect, for with any demotic restored at this point on the stone no reconstruction at all is possible for the preamble. The lines are known to have contained about 40 letters each, and the disposition of the preserved letters would then compel us to assume a name and patronymic for the secretary of about 30 letters in lines 2–3. In the publication given in *I.G.*, II, 5, 371c the letters recorded in lines 1–3 are these:

Ι Ο Ι Α Ρ Ι  
 Π Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν  
 ⚡ Ο Υ Σ Ε Ι ⚡

The restoration *Εἰτ*[εαῖος] is certainly suspect. Today the letters which may be read on this part of the stone are

- Ο Ι Α Ρ Ι  
Π Ρ Υ Τ Α Ν  
Ι Ε Υ Σ Ε Ι ∥

Those letters formerly read as the end of the patronymic must be read as the end of the demotic, and those letters formerly read as the beginning of the demotic must now be read as the beginning of the verb *ἐργ*[αμμάτευν].

When Wilhelm first discussed the connection between fragments *a*, *b*, and *c* of this inscription (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVI [1891], pp. 150–151) he remarked that fragment *a* made a direct join with fragments *b* + *c*. The stones themselves are now set in a bed of plaster in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, and (although I have not dismantled the monument to test the join myself) I assume that they have been correctly placed. Since the left margin of fragments *b* + *c* is preserved, it is possible to estimate at once the number of letters in the name of the archon in line 1. According to my measurements the archon's name may have had a maximum of nine letters or a minimum of seven letters (the writing is not stoichedon); the probability is in favor of an archon's name of eight letters. Dinsmoor's suggestion that the archon was Lysias, and Ferguson's assumption that he may have been Eurykleides must both be rejected. The one known available archon in the period in which the inscription can be dated (249–8 to 241–0; see Dinsmoor, *op. cit.*, p. 181) is Lysiades, and the number of letters in the name of his secretary, known approximately from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 775, is admirably suited to the restoration of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 774. The opening lines may now be restored as follows:

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 774

[Ἐπὶ Λυσιάδῳ]ρον ἄρχ[οντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθωντίδος δω]  
[δεκάτης] πρυτανε[ίας ἦι Ἀριστόμαχος Ἀριστο . . .]  
[- - -]ιεὺς ἐργ[αμμάτευν· Σκιροφοριῶνος ἐνδε]  
[κάτη δω]δεκάτη [τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία κυρία]  
5 [τῶν προέδ]ρων ἐπε[ψήφισεν - - - - -]  
[- - - - -]ος καὶ σ[υμπρόεδροι - - - - -]  
[- - - - -] Ἀλαιεύς [εἶπεν - - - - -]

(for the rest of the text, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 774 and *S.E.G.*, III, 98)

In line 1 there is no trace of a vertical stroke before the first partially preserved omicron; the squeeze shows rather a low horizontal bar, as of the letter delta. The demotic in line 3 may be restored either as [Ἀνακ]ιεύς, [Λιομε]ιεύς or [Θορα]ιεύς. In line 6 the phrase *ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμῳ* was omitted (see also above, p. 547). I have restored the date in the twelfth prytany because the proper length of line is not obtained unless the ordinal numerals, the name of the tribe, and the name of the month are all long words. The calendar equation is in agreement with the determination already made (p. 551) from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 775.

263-2 B.C.

A decree of *θιασῶται* of the year of Antipatros (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1282) was passed on the date *Ἐκα[το]νβαιῶνος ὀγδόει μετ' εἰκάδας*. If this date is to be interpreted with forward count, it appears that the meeting of the *θιασῶται* fell at the time of the Panathenaic festival. It is better to read *ὀγδόει μετ' εἰκάδας* with backward count (Hekatombaion 22 or 23) and so avoid conflict between the meeting of the *θιασῶται* and the celebration of the Panathenaia.

257-6 B.C.

The decrees of the year of Antimachos are *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 768 and 769. The equations show that the year began as an ordinary year, and then was changed to an intercalary year at some time after the fourth prytany. The one calendar equation with a date *μετ' εἰκάδας* favors slightly the forward count, but is not decisive (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 769):

*Πυανοψιδῶνος [ἐκτ]ει μετ' εἰ[κάδας, πέμπ]τει καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας*

255-4 B.C.

There are two equations in the year of Polyuktos which show that a forward count *μετ' εἰκάδας* was employed (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 679 and 680). The year is known to have been an ordinary year, for the year immediately following it, that of Hieron, was intercalary (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 683). The correspondences in the published inscriptions are

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 679

*[Πυανοψιδῶνος ἕκτει ἐπὶ δέκ]α, ἕκτει καὶ δεκάτει τ[ῆς πρυτανείας]*

Pryt. IV, 16 = Pyanopsion 16

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 680

*Ἐλαφηβολιδῶνος ἐνάτει μετ' εἰκάδας, τριακο[σ]τεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας*

Pryt. IX, 30 = Elaphebolion 29

There is no escape from the conclusion that in this instance the forward count *μετ' εἰκάδας* was used.

250-49 B.C.

The inscriptions which belong to this year (the archonship of Kydenor) are much in need of study. Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 24) considers that the Athenian decrees to be assigned to this year are *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796 and 797. In this attribution I agree with him, but would also include *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703. The character of the lettering is quite similar to that of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796, and the inscriptions may have been cut by the same hand. In *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 the alpha is regularly cut without the cross-bar, and so epigraphically cannot be distinguished from lambda. This same omission of the cross-bar of alpha occurs in the later lines of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 797 is obviously by a

different hand, but the name of the secretary shows that it belongs to the same year with *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796. All three documents are written stoichedon, and all record votes of honor for foreign states, 703 for  $\delta \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma \delta \text{Μυρλεανῶν}$ , 796 for  $\delta \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma [\delta \text{---}]$ , and 797 for  $[\delta \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma \delta \text{Μυ}] \tau\iota\lambda\eta\nu\alpha[\iota\omega\nu]$ . *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 and 797 are also brought together by the fact that both have across the top headings in larger letters than the body of the



Drawing showing probable right margin  
of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703

decre. Certainly *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 must be separated from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702, with which it has nothing in common except the length of the secretary's name, and which it in no way resembles. The name of the secretary in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 has the same length as the name in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796 and 797 and should be identified with it. The initial letter of this name is preserved on *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 as lambda (or alpha, since the alphas have no cross-bar in this inscription). After the lambda the stone is damaged and readings are difficult. Wilhelm thought he read two vertical strokes in the fourth place after the lambda (cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703, Addenda, p. 665), thus making possible a reading  $\Lambda[. . .]?$ , which could be identified with the name in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702. There is in the sixth letter space of the name, however, part of one vertical stroke—centrally spaced—and the reading should be iota (or upsilon, according to Dow, by letter) rather than mu (of *Μιλτιάδου*). The identification of the name should be made with reference to *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796 and 797; but no conjecture can be hazarded because it is not even certain that the initial letter was lambda.

The name of the archon had nine letters in the genitive case (as is clear from the stoichedon arrangement of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796 and 797), and this restoration should be made in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703. If the inscription is plotted on paper, it will be found that the same natural edge of the stone is determined on the right by restoring the final nu of  $[\text{Μυρλε}] \alpha\nu\omega[\gamma]$  in line 1, and by restoring lines of text with two less letters at the right than are now shown in the *Corpus*. This means, of course, that two more letters should be restored at the beginning of each line and that the archon's name must have nine letters in the genitive case. It is desirable for one other reason to have as much of the restored text as possible to the left of the preserved portion, for no trace of the E

of *Μυρλε* in [*Μυρλε*]ανῶ[*ν*] now appears on the stone. With a shorter restoration at the left some trace of this E should now be visible.<sup>1</sup>

The letters NT in the name of the tribe holding the prytany are clear in line 2. Wilhelm's suggested reading (cf. *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703, Addenda, p. 665) gives HM and he restores [*Α*]η[*μητριαδος*] in spite of the fact that the name is too long for the lacuna and violates the stoichedon order. The name of the tribe in prytany was Antiochis, and no violation of the stoichedon order need be assumed.<sup>2</sup>

The text of *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703 may now be read as follows:

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703

CTOIX. 31

[*Μ υ ρ λ ε*] α ν ῶ [*ν*]  
 [Ἐπὶ Κυδήρορος ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀ]ντ[ιο]  
 [χίδος ἐνάτης πρ]υτανείας ἦι Α[. . . .]ν[. ο]  
 [ς Ἀύκου Ἀλωπεκῆ]θεν ἐγ[ραμμ]άτ[ε]νε ν Ἐ[λα]  
 5 [φηβολιῶνος δε]υτέρα[ι με]τ' εἰκ[άδ]ας τρ[ι]  
 [ακοστῆι τῆς πρ]υτανε[ίας] ἐκκλη[σ]ία τ[ῶν]  
 [προέδρων ἐπεψή]φι[ζεν Θε]οτέλη[ς] Σ . κ . .  
 (for the rest of the text, see *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703)

There are three calendar equations now available for the year of Kydenor:

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 796

[*Μεταγειτνιῶνο*]ς δεκάτει ὑστέρα, [μῦαι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρ]υτανε[ίας]  
 Pryt. II, 21 = Metageitnion 21

The year was evidently an ordinary year in which months and prytanies corresponded closely.

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 797

[Ἐπὶ Κυδήρορος ἀρχοντο]ς ἐπὶ τῆς Δημητριά[δος τρίτης]  
 [πρυτανείας ἦι Α . . . . ν .]ος Ἀύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθ[εν ἐγ]ραμμά  
 [τευεν· Βοηδρομιῶνος ἐν]ει καὶ νέαι, τριακοσ[τῆι τῆς πρ]  
 [υτανείας· ἐκκλησ]ία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζ[εν· . . . . .]  
 (for the rest of the text, see *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 797)

Pryt. III, 30 = Boedromion 30

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703

Ἐ[*λαφηβολιῶνος δε*]υτέρα[ι με]τ' εἰκ[άδ]ας, τρ[ι]ακοστῆι τῆς πρ]υτανε[ίας]  
 Pryt. IX, 30 = Elaphebolion 29

<sup>1</sup> Dow (in Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 67, note 1) has already shown that the archon's name had a *minimum* of eight letters.

<sup>2</sup> Dow (in Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 66) seems to favor reading HM rather than NT. To me, however, the letters NT seem perfectly clear, and Dow now reports (by letter) that he favors the same reading.

The backward count with  $\mu\epsilon\tau'$  *εικάδας* is essential for the reconstruction of the calendar in this year.

The inscription now published as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702 has now to be assigned to a different year from *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 703. The date which Ferguson has given to it most recently in his *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 22, is 292-1 B.C. For many years this inscription has been lost, but it was recently recovered, in a somewhat damaged condition, in the excavations of the Athenian Agora. The writing is not stoichedon, but the letters of the opening lines are fairly evenly spaced, and one may say with some assurance that the archon's name contained seven letters. The context of the inscription, however, is the surest key to its date. The document is one of the long series of "prytany" decrees, which Sterling Dow will discuss in a subsequent number of *Hesperia*. Now, the earliest datable prytany decree which we possess (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 674) is from the archonship of Glaukippos (275-4), and it has a form earlier than that preserved in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702. The decree proper starts with the words  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$   $\delta\omega\nu$ , etc. instead of the later stereotyped  $\delta\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\delta\omega\nu$ , etc. which appear in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702. It contains also the phrase  $\delta\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$   $\delta\omega\nu$   $\xi\theta\nu\omicron\nu\omicron$  instead of the customary formula  $\delta\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\theta\nu\sigma\iota\omega\nu$   $\delta\omega\nu$   $\xi\theta\nu\omicron\nu\omicron$  of the later decrees (including *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702). It mentions no sacrifice to Artemis Boulaia, which is a regular part of the text in the decrees of later date, and which is mentioned in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702. When it is borne in mind also that the writing of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702 is not stoichedon, it becomes evident that the date of this document must be later than 275-4.

Now that Charikles has been dated in 196-5,<sup>1</sup> the year 239-8 is available for Lysias,<sup>2</sup> and the archon of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702 (with seven letters in the genitive of his name) may be assigned to 238-7. This is the only available and appropriate year for the inscription, as required by the secretary-cycle.

The second line of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702 should therefore be restored:

[*Ἐπὶ . . . ? . . . ἄ]ρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδιονίδος ἑκτης πρυτανείας*  
(for the rest of the text, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702)

Perhaps the restoration should be made with the name of the archon Philoneos.

From these determinations it follows that the name of the secretary in the year of Philippos (292-1) is unknown. Since the calendar equation of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 702 shows that the year was intercalary, the immediately preceding year of Lysias must be restored as ordinary.

227-6 B.C.

In the year of the archon Theophilos, there is one inscription to be considered (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 837). The year must have been an ordinary year of twelve months, for the year of Ergochares immediately following was intercalary (see pp. 529-531). The correspondence given in the inscription is as follows:

*Βοηδρομιῶνος ἔκτει μετ' [εικάδας, τρίτ]ει καὶ εικοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας*

<sup>1</sup> The attribution depends on a new document from the Agora, which will be published soon.

<sup>2</sup> R. Treves, *Athenaeum*, XII (1934), p. 401, indicates other possible reasons for dating Lysias in 239-8.

With Hekatombaion hollow, Metageitnion full, and Boedromion hollow, and with 30 days in each of the first two prytanies the equation derived from this correspondence (with backward count) is correct for an ordinary year in the period of the twelve tribes.

Pryt. III, 23 = Boedromion 24

226-5 B.C.

The importance of the year of Ergochares in determining the backward count with *μετ' εικάδας* has been discussed fully above (pp. 529-531).

212-1 B.C.

The year of Archelaos was made intercalary by the addition of a second Anthesterion (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 844, line 33), but the calendar equations given in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 848 show that it began as an ordinary year and that the forward count *μετ' εικάδας* was employed.

I am indebted to Sterling Dow for a set of very excellent squeezes which permit a better reading than any hitherto published of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 848, lines 28-29. The text is as follows:

*Βοηδρομιῶνος ἑβδό[ό]μει [μετ' ε]κ[άδα]ς, [τε]ίτηι τῆς πρυτανείας*

The twenty-seventh day of Boedromion is thus equated with the third day of the (fourth) prytany. It appears that two of the first three prytanies had twenty-eight days each, and that one had twenty-seven days, as was normal in an ordinary year during the period of the thirteen tribes.

No certain restoration is possible for the calendar equation given in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 848, lines 2-4, but (since the forward count was obviously employed in line 29) it may be assumed that Prytany III had twenty-eight days and that the equation may have been:

*Βοηδρο[μι]ῶνος τετράδι μετ' εικάδας, ὀγδόει καὶ ἐλικοστ[εῖ τῆς π]ρυτανεί[ας]*

The twenty-fourth day of Boedromion is thus equated with the twenty-eighth day of the (third) prytany.

188-7 B.C.

There are four published inscriptions of the year of Symmachos (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 890-893), and the calendar correspondences which they exhibit show the use of forward count *μετ' εικάδας*:

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 890

*Ποσι[δεῶ]νος [ε]κ[τ]ει μετ' εικάδα[ς, τρίτηι καὶ δεκάτηι τῆς πρυταν]είας*

Pryt. VI, 13 = Posideon 26

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 891

*[Μουνιχιῶνος ἐνδε]κάτηι, ὀγδόει καὶ δεκάτηι τῆς πρυ[τανείας]*

Pryt. X, 18 = Mounichion 11

This equation shows that the year was intercalary, and prevents restoring the second equation given here from the month Mounichion with backward count:

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 892

[Μου]νιχιῶ[ρο]ς δευτέραι μετ' [εικάδας, ἐνάτει] καὶ εἰ[κ]οστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας]

Pryt. X, 29 = Mounichion 22

In an intercalary year, the forward count is here essential.

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 893

[Σκιρ]οφοριῶνος ἕκτε ἐπὶ [δέκα, ὀγδόει καὶ δεκάτ]ει τῆς πρυτανείας

Pryt. XII, 18 = Skirophorion 16

169–8 B.C.

The calendar correspondences given in the documents of the archonship of Eunikos are as follows:

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 910

Γαμηλι[ῶνος ἕ]κτε μετ' εικάδας, δευτέραι [καὶ εἰκοστῆ] τῆ[ς πρυτανείας]

*Hesperia*, III, 18 and *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 911

Σκιροφοριῶνος ἑνὲ καὶ νέαι, ἐνάτει καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας

Since the year was ordinary, beginning with hollow Hekatombaion, the use of backward count in the first correspondence makes possible the equation

Pryt. VII, 22 = Gamelion 25

The first six prytanies had 30 days each and the last six prytanies 29 days each.

163–2 B.C.

The two published documents of the year of Erastos (*Hesperia*, III, 20 and *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 783; cf. *Hesperia*, III, p. 30) show the necessity of backward count μετ' εικάδας:

*Hesperia*, III, 20

Ἀνθεστηριῶνο[ς ὀγδ]όη[ι ἐπὶ δέκ]α, ὀγδόη καὶ δεκάτῃ τῆς πρυτανείας

Pryt. VIII, 18 = Anthesterion 18

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 783

[Σκιροφοριῶν]ος ὀγδόει μετ' εικάδας, τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῆ τῆς πρυτανείας

Pryt. XII, 23 = Skirophorion 23

The year was ordinary, and the months and prytanies corresponded closely throughout.

160-59 B.C.

The year of Tychandros is represented by one inscription (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 953) which gives clear indication of the forward count. The correspondence is *Ποσιδεῶνος δευτέραι μετ' εικάδας, ἐ[νάτηι τῆς πρυτανείας]*

Pryt. VI, 9 = Posideon 22

The year was intercalary, and the prytanies had regularly 32 days each.

155-4 B.C.

It is known that the year of Mnesitheos was an ordinary year, for a new inscription found in the Agora (*Hesperia*, III, 21; cf. also *Hesperia*, III, p. 35) gives the equation

Pryt. II, 4 = Metageitnion 4

The document now published as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 979 also belongs to this year (cf. *Hesperia*, III, p. 34), but it yields no evidence as to the direction of the count *μετ' εικάδας*. The 24th day of the month was equated with the 24th day of the prytany, but whether the date by month should be restored as [*τετράδι με*]τ' εικάδας (with forward count) or as [*ἐβδόμη με*]τ' εικάδας (with backward count) remains uncertain.

146-5 B.C.

The evidence for the calendar of the year of Epikrates comes from Delos, and has been presented by Dinsmoor in his *Archons of Athens*, pp. 405-406. Dinsmoor assumed that the year began as an ordinary year and ended as an intercalary year, but the use of the backward count reconciles the evidence from the two calendar correspondences which have been preserved, and shows that the year was ordinary.

*B.C.H.*, 1889, p. 415*Ποσιδεῶνος ἐνάτη(ι) ἐπὶ δέκα, ἐνάτη(ι) [καὶ δεκάτη τῆς πρυτανείας].*Homolle restored *ἐνάτη(ι) [ἐπὶ δέκα τῆς πρυτανείας]*

Pryt. VI, 19 = Posideon 19

*B.C.H.*, 1892, p. 372*Θαργηλιῶνος [δ]ευτέραι μετ' εικάδας, ἐνάτει καὶ [ε]λκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας*

Pryt. XI, 29 = Thargelion 29

144-3 B.C.

The decree of this year, in the archonship of E or EP published in *B.C.H.*, 1892, pp. 375-6 admits of no determination as to the direction of the count *μετ' εικάδας*. Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 417) argues for an ordinary year and restores [*τρίτ*]ει μετ' εικάδας

as the date by month; but, as he points out, any restoration of the ordinal between [τρίτ]ει and [ένάτ]ει is possible except [τετρά]δι. The possibilities of restoration do show, however, that the year was ordinary (Dinsmoor, *l. c.*).

137-6 B.C.

The calendar of the year of Herakleitos is much improved by the use of backward count. Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 417) has changed the restorations of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 974 proposed in the *Corpus*, and has demonstrated that with the 11th prytany and the month Thargelion the equation is suitable to an intercalary year when forward count is employed. His reconstruction presupposes, however, that Thargelion and Skirophorion each had 30 days.

If backward count is employed, the restorations in the *Corpus* may be retained and the months and prytanies show the perfect correspondence of an ordinary year.

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 974

[Γαμη]λιῶνος τρίτει μ[ε]τ' εικάδας, έβδόμει και εικοστ[ε]ι τῆς πρυτανείας]

Pryt. VII, 27 = Gamelion 27

134-3 B.C.

The one published decree of the year of Epikles (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 977) gives a calendar correspondence which is best explained by assuming that the year was intercalary and that backward count was employed.

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 977

[Ἐπι] Ἐπικλέους ἀ[ρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀνταλίδος ένδεκάτ]ῆς πρυτανείας ἦι  
[Γοργ]ίλος Γοργίλον / [- - - έγραμμάτευεν ὁ Θαρρηλι]ῶνος ὀγδόει μετ' εἰ  
[κά]δας, έκτει και εικοστει τ[ῆς πρυτανείας· έκκλησία έν τῶι] θεάτρῳ ἢ μεταχθει

(for the rest of the text, see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 977)

Pryt. XI, 26 = Thargelion 22

Thargelion was hollow and Skirophorion full, and one of the last two prytanies contained 32 days.

52-1 B.C.

In the archonship of Lysandros, the one published decree shows that the backward count with μετ' εικάδας is essential.

*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1046

Σκίροφοριῶνος ὀγδόη μετ' ικάδας, τρίτη και εικοστη τῆς πρυτανείας

Pryt. XII, 23 = Skirophorion 23

116-7 A.D.

In the archonship of Titus Koponius Maximus, the one published decree shows the backward count with *μετ' εικάδας* still employed.

*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1072

*Βοηδρο[ομιῶνος] ὀγδόη μετ' εικάδα, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος τρίτης πρυτανείας, πεντεκαιδέκτῃ τῆς πρυτανείας*

Pryt. III, 15 = Boedromion 22

Boedromion was a hollow month and the first two prytanies contained each 33 days. The year was intercalary.

The years in which there is evidence for the count *μετ' εικάδας* in the last decade of the month may now be summarized in the following table:

Year	Type	Direction of Count	Year	Type	Direction of Count
325-4	I	Inconclusive	257-6	0	Forward (?)
324-3	0	Inconclusive	255-4	0	Forward
307-6	0	Backward	250-49	0	Backward
304-3	0	Backward	227-6	0	Backward
302-1	0	Backward (but Forward in Skirophorion)	226-5	I	Backward
301-300	I	Backward	212-1	I	Forward
<i>ca.</i> 300		Backward	188-7	0	Forward
299-8	0	Inconclusive	163-2	0	Backward
299-8	0	Inconclusive	160-59	I	Forward
287-6	0	Inconclusive	155-4	0	Uncertain
283-2	0	Backward	146-5	0	Backward
274-3	0	Backward	144-3	0	Inconclusive
273-2	I	Backward	137-6	0	Backward
268-7	0	Inconclusive	134-3	I	Backward
266-5	I	Inconclusive	52-1	0	Backward
263-2	?	Backward	116-7	I	Backward

The only conclusion which can legitimately be drawn from the evidence so far at our disposal is that the usual direction of count with *μετ' εικάδας* was backward, but that sporadic cases of the forward count from time to time did appear. The ordinal of date given with *μετ' εικάδας* may have for us now one of three meanings: so many days counted from the end of a full month, so many days counted from the end of a hollow month, or so many days counted forward from the 21st day of any month. The count in every case was with inclusive reckoning.

40. Stele of Hymettian marble, complete except for the acroterion, found on May 25, 1933 built into the wall of a pit in Sector Z at 52/IE.

Height, 0.93 m.; width, 0.473 m.; thickness, 0.085 m.

Height of letters, *ca.* 0.006 m.

Inv. No. 7010 I 863.

For a previous notice of this document see Ferguson, *A.J.P.*, LV (1934), p. 320, note 14.

	283/2 B.C.	CTOIX. 32 (33, 34)	
	Ἄρχων Οὐρίας· ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδο[ς δ]εϋ[τ]έρ	32 letters	
	ας πρυτανείας ἦι Εὐξενος Καλλι[ου] Αἰξω		
	νεὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν· Μεταγειντιῶνος δε		
	υτέραι μετ' εἰκάδας, ὀγδόει καὶ ε[ἰκο]στε		
5	ἰ τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέδρω		
	ν ἐπεψήφισεν Διοκλῆς Ἐσχυρίου Πτελεά		
	σιος καὶ συμπρόεδροι· ἔδοξεν τε[ἰ β]ουλε		
	ἰ καὶ τῶι δήμωι· Λέων Κιχησίου Αἰξωνέως		
	εἶπεν· περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ ἀποσταλέντε		
10	ς τ(ῶ)ν ταξίαρχων εἰς τὰ Βασίλεια ὑπὲρ τῆ		
	ς θυσίας ἧς ἔθυσαν ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθ		
	αι τεῖ βουλευῖ τοὺς πρόεδρους οἳ ἂν λάχω		
	σιν προεδρεύειν ἐν τῶι δήμωι εἰς τὴν πε		
	ρίαν ἐκκλησίαν π[ρ]οσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς κα		
15	ὶ χρηματίζειν, γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλε[σ]θαι τ		
	ῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον διὸ δοκεῖ [τεῖ] βο		
	υλεῖ τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι ἅ [φ]ασ[ιν] γεγο		
	νῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐφ' ὑγιείαι καὶ σωτ		
	ηρίαι τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, ἐπαινέσ		
20	αι δὲ τοὺς ταξίαρχους τοὺς ἀποσταλέντ		
	ας εἰς [Β]οιωτοὺς Δεινόστρατον Δεινίδ ὁ		
	ου Χολλείδην Εὐκλείδην Λυσιστράτου Π		
	ειραιέα Ἀντί[αν] Ἀντοκλέους Ἀχαρνέα ὅ		
	ἄβρωνά Ἐπιγένου Ἀλαιέα ὁ Ἀριστόδη[μο]ν		
25	Ἀριστοφῶντος Στειριέα Θεόφαντον Νι[κ]ο	33 letters	
	στράτου Γαργήτιον φιλοτιμίας ἕνεκα ὁ		
	τῆς πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον· ἀναγρᾶ		
	ψαι δὲ [[τόδε]] τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέ		
	α τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνει		
30	καὶ στήσαι πρὸς τῶι στρατηγίωι· εἰς δὲ τὴν	34 letters	
	ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ ὅ		
	τῆι διοικήσει Ἀδραχμάς.		



No. 40

## TRANSLATION

Archon Ourias. In the second prytany of Aiantis for which Euxenos, son of Kallias, of Aixone was secretary; Metageitnion 28th, 28th of the prytany; assembly. The chairman of the proedroi Diokles, son of Eschyrios, of Ptelea, and his fellow proedroi put the question to a vote. Resolved by the Council and Demos; Leon, son of Kichesias, of Aixone made the motion: Concerning what those of the taxiarchs say who were sent as envoys to the Basileia about the sacrifice which they offered, with good fortune, be it resolved by the Council that the proedroi who are chosen by lot to preside in the Demos introduce them at the first meeting of the assembly and deliberate (about their report); that the resolution of the Council be submitted to the Demos that the Council resolves to accept the benefits which they say took place in the sacrifices for the health and safety of the Council and the Demos, and to praise the taxiarchs who were sent to the Boeotians Deinostratos, son of Deinides, of Cholleidai, Eukleides, son of Lysistratos, of Peiraeus, Autias, son of Autokles, of Acharnai, Habron, son of Epigenes, of Halai, Aristodemos, son of Aristophon, of Steiria, and Theophantos, son of Nikostratos, of Gargettos, for their zeal toward the Council and the Demos; further, that the prytany-secretary shall inscribe this decree on a stele of stone and place it by the strategion; and that the administrative board shall apportion for the inscription of the stele the sum of ten drachmai.

## COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

The inscription is written stoichedon with 32 letter spaces in each of lines 1–24. The tapering sides of the stele increased the width of the stone toward the bottom, and lines 25–29 have 33 letter spaces, while lines 30–31 have 34 letter spaces.

Lines 1–3. The archon's name is here given in the nominative, and proves to be Ourias, not Ourios as previously supposed. The archon and secretary both appear in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 660.

Lines 3–5: The calendar count *μετ' εικάδας* must have been backward, so that *δευτέραι μετ' εικάδας* (with Metageitnion a hollow month) was the 28th day of the month. The year was an ordinary year, as is proved also by the calendar equation in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 660. See above, p. 548.

Line 6: *Διοκλῆς Ἐσχυρίων Πτελεάσιος* was probably a grandson of the prytanis of 360–59 B.C. (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1745).

Line 8: The orator was *Λέων Κιχησίου Αἰξωνεύς*, who also appears in another decree honoring taxiarchs of the archonship of Olbios (*Hesperia*, II, no. 5, pp. 156–158). Olbios is thus associated in point of time with Ourias, and should be assigned to the year 277–6.<sup>1</sup> See Ferguson, "Polyeuktos and the Soteria," *A.J.P.*, LV (1934), p. 320, note 14.

<sup>1</sup> The archon Olbios appears also in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 792, where the restoration of line 5 should be *σιτώνας [τοῦς κατασταθέντας ἐπὶ Ὀλ]βίου ἀρχοντος*. The lettering resembles closely that of *Hesperia*, II, no. 5.

Line 10: The Basileia were founded at Lebadeia after the battle of Leuktra (Diodorus, XV, 53). See also Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, s. v. Basileus (2).

From the date at which this decree was passed it may be inferred that the taxiarchs—evidently those of the current year—had just returned from the festival and that the festival itself was celebrated in the late summer. The decree indicates friendly relations between nationalistic Athens and Boeotia in 283 B.C.

Lines 21–22: *Δεινόστρατος Δεινίδου Χολλείδης* = P. A. 3196.

Line 23: *Αντίας Αντοκλέους Ἀχαρνεύς* was evidently the son of the secretary of 327–6. Cf. *Hesperia*, III, no. 5, pp. 3–4.

Line 25: *Ἀριστόδημος Ἀριστοφάντος Στειριεύς* was the son of *Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοδήμου Στειριεύς* who was Councillor in 335–4 (Sundwall, *Nachträge*).

The six taxiarchs sent as the Athenian delegation to the festival of the Basileia belong to different tribes, and were evidently chosen in the proportion of one delegate for every two Athenian tribes.

Lines 31–32: The expense of erecting the stele was borne by the plural board of administration, which we know to have been one of the distinguishing features of the constitution of Nationalistic Athens between 288–7 and 263–2, during the period of freedom from Macedonia.<sup>1</sup>

**41.** Fragment of a stele of Pentelic marble found on May 4, 1934 in Sector Γ. The left side, mainly because of the text, seems to have been original; the full thickness is preserved.

Height, 0.33 m.; width, 0.136 m.; thickness, 0.08 m.

Height of letters, 0.006 m.

Inv. No. 12221 I 1918.

- - - - N - - - - -

*vacat*  
*vacat*  
*vacat*

5 [ΤΑ]ΔΕΚΑΤΑΒΕΒ[ΛΗΜΕΝΑ - - - - -]  
[ΕΡ]ΙΟΥΡΙΟΥΑΡΧΟ[ΝΤΟΞΕΡΙΤΗΣ - - - - -]  
[ΔΕ]ΚΑΤΗΣ ΠΡΥΤΑ[ΝΕΙΑΣ - - - - -]  
[ΟΙ]ΚΙΑΣ ΑΓΡΥΛΗΣ [ΙΝ - - - - -]  
[ΣΟ]ΥΝΙ: ΤΗΣ ΠΡΑΘΕ[ΙΣΗΣ - - - - -]

10 [.] ΠΡΟΥΑΡΧΟΝΤΟ[Ξ - - - - - Ε]  
[ΓΕ]ΝΕΤΟ ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ [Ξ - - - - -]  
[ΤΑ]ΥΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΟΙΚΙΑΣ [Ξ - - - - -]  
[ΧΑ]ΙΡΟΝΤΙΔΗΣ ΕΡ[ - - - - -]  
[ΥΡ]ΟΤΩΝ ΔΙΚΑΣΤΩΝ [Ν - - - - -]

<sup>1</sup> See Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 65.

15 [.]ΙΕΡΙΤΗΛΟΚΛΕ[ΟΥΞΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΞΕΡΙΤΗΞ . . . .<sup>8</sup>. . . .]  
 [ΔΕ]ΚΑΤΗΞΠΡΥΤΑΝ[ΕΙΑΞ -----]  
 [.]ΗΗ<sup>Π</sup>ΔΔΔΗΗ<sup>ν</sup> [------]  
 [ΕΠ]ΙΤΗΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΞ[ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΞΕΡΙΤΗΞΙΠΡΟΘΩΝΤΙ]  
 [ΔΟ]ΞΟΓΔΟΗΞΠΡΥΤ[ΑΝΕΙΑΞ -----]  
 20 [.]ΚΛΟΥΕ[Υ]ΡΥ: Ο[ΙΚΙΑ -----]  
 -----

The document here presented is evidently a record of the poletai dealing with receipts of money involved either directly or indirectly in the sale of houses. This much is clear from the introductory words [*τά*]δε καταβεβ[λημένα -] and the appearance of [οί]κίας in line 8, of οίκί[ας] in line 12, and of ο[ικία] - - -] in line 20. The necessary restoration of lines 6-7, 15-16, and 18-19 show that the record was cut in a relatively narrow column of about 36-38 letters, characteristic of the records of the poletai (cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1582, 1584, 1585, 1589). The importance of the inscription, however, lies in its association of the archons Telokles and Ourias, and in the inferences that may be drawn from it as to the date of Telokles.

At first glance it seems that Ourias must be a predecessor of Telokles, for the record concerned with the house in Agryle (line 8) seems to extend from line 6 to line 17, where the sum of money received by the poletai is listed. This record appears to be dated [ἐπ]ὶ Οὐρίου ἄρχο[ντος] in line 6. The record concerned with the second house appears in lines 18 ff. and seems to be dated [ἐπ]ὶ Τηλοκλέους [ἄρχοντος] in line 18. We must assume, with this interpretation of the document, that the record of receipts covered more than one year and that the archon Telokles followed Ourias.


There is, however, a fatal objection to the interpretation just given. If the first payment (listed in line 17) was made in the archonship of Ourias the transaction was thereby closed. Yet we find mention of a legal action in the archonship of Telokles (lines 14-15) which was connected in some way with the house in Agryle and the payment made when Ourias was archon. The conclusion is inescapable that Telokles must have preceded Ourias, for only thus could mention of Telokles appear in the history of a case which was closed when Ourias was archon.

If we wish to assume that the history of the case began when Ourias was archon (line 6) and that payment was made in the archonship of Telokles (line 15), we discover that the chronological order of the payments in Telokles' year is violated, for the first date mentioned in his archonship is at least as late as the tenth prytany (line 16) and the second date is in the eighth prytany (line 19). Apart from this difficulty it does not seem possible that the history of the case involving the house in Agryle could have begun when Ourias was archon. The history commences with the sale of the house by the poletai (line 9), and this sale occurred in the archonship of [- -]ππος (line 10). The possible restorations are [ἐπὶ Φιλί]ππου ἄρχοντος (292-1) or [ἐπὶ Γλανί]ππου ἄρχοντος (275-4). With the latter date for the sale no interpretation of the date [ἐπ]ὶ

*Οὐρίου ἄρχο[ντος]* in line 6 is possible, for Ourias preceded Glaukippos by eight years. With the earlier date for the sale of the house, the date [*ἐπ*]ὶ *Οὐρίου ἄρχο[ντος]* in line 6 can be explained; it was the year in which the amount of money recorded in line 17 was received by the poletai. This involves, of course, the conclusion that Telokles, who is mentioned in line 15, precedes Ourias in date, and this conclusion now seems to me inevitable.

It is in any case *a priori* probable that the record belongs to only one board of poletai. Above the better preserved part of the inscription there is an unscribed space of three lines which separated the present record from some record inscribed above, only one letter of which is still preserved. Whether this upper record belonged to the preceding board of poletai, or whether (more probably) it recorded receipts of the poletai of Ourias' year in an earlier prytany it seems impossible to state with certainty. But the record with which we have to deal must have recorded receipts by the poletai in the eleventh prytany(?) of the year of Ourias (lines 5-7). The introductory lines which give the date of all payments listed below are, therefore:

[*τά*]δε καταβεβ[λημέια ἦν πρὸς  
 πωλητὰς τοὺς]  
 [*ἐπ*]ὶ Οὐρίου ἄρχο[ντος ἐπὶ τῆς  
 Δημητριάδος ἐν]  
 [*δε*]κάτης πρυτα[νείας - - - - -]



No. 41



## TRANSLATION

..... These amounts were paid down [to the poletai] of the archonship of Ourias [in the eleventh] prytany [of Demetrias].

[Chairontides, son of Her - - -] of Sunion [went bond on a] house in Agryle, the one that had been sold [by the poletai of Philippos'] archonship [after it had been confiscated. The purchaser] was Diokles, [son of - - - -, of - - - -, and he did not pay the price] of this house [to the public treasury]. Chairontides, son of Her[- - -, of Sunion, was adjudged] by the dicasts [to have forfeited his bond on the house] in the [archonship] of Telokles [in the] tenth prytany [of Aigeis (or Oineis)] [4]83 Drachmai.

In the [archonship] of Telokles [in the] eighth prytany [of Hippothontis - - - -, son of - - -]klos, of Eupyridai [bought] a house [in - - - -, etc. The second payment - - - - -] [sum of money]

-----

## COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

The inscription is not arranged stoichedon, and the number of letters in the lines varies slightly. It may be observed, however, that every line begins with a complete word or syllable. Line 15 must have contained at least 38 letters, for the shortest possible tribal name (*Αίληρίς* or *Οβήρίς*) contains eight letters in the genitive case. In line 18 as long a tribal name as possible should be restored. I have supplied *Ἰπποθωντίδο*ς, giving to the line a total of 36 letters. The restoration of line 6 with the tribal name Demetrias and the eleventh prytany requires also 36 letters.

We learn from Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 47, 3) that the poletai were responsible for the sale of houses that were confiscated by the state, and that the price to be paid by the purchaser had to be paid in five years. The house in Agryle which was sold in the archonship of Philippos (292-1) should therefore have been paid for completely in the archonship of Diokles (288-7) in the eleventh(?) prytany.<sup>1</sup> It is my assumption that this was not the case, and the restorations of lines 10-12 record the fact that Diokles, the purchaser, did not make his necessary payments. The words *τὴν τιμὴν οὐκ ἀπέδωκεν* of the restoration are supported by the phrase in Aristotle's *Ath. Pol.*, 47, 3: *ἀνάγκη τὴν τιμὴν ἀποδοῦναι*. Action in the courts was probably taken first against Diokles directly. How long this action may have been delayed after 288-7 we can only guess. Evidently the state did not receive full satisfaction, for action was also taken against the bondsman. The date of this is given as in the archonship of Telokles (line 15) and in the tenth prytany (line 16). The decision of the court was against the bondsman, and in the course of the following year (that of Ourias) the poletai booked the money that he was compelled to pay.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 568.

The implications of the document are that Telokles was the immediate predecessor of Ourias, for otherwise too long a time must have elapsed between the court action and the payment of the bond. As a matter of fact, the only year earlier than Ourias which is available for Telokles is actually the year immediately preceding.<sup>1</sup> Telokles may therefore be assigned definitely to the year 284-3 B.C.

The second item in the record of this inscription begins in line 18, and records a payment made on a house bought in the archonship of Telokles.

The rubric still falls, however, under the general heading of receipts in the eleventh prytany of the year of Ourias (lines 5-7). Since Telokles must be dated in the year preceding Ourias, it is evident that the payment recorded was the second one in the necessary series of five installments indicated by Aristotle. Presumably a down-payment of one fifth the value of the house was made in the eleventh prytany of Telokles' year. The second payment (of the year of Ourias) is here recorded. The records of the poletai must have continued to show receipts from the sale of this house for the three years following Ourias, if indeed the purchaser fulfilled his obligations and continued the installments until the house was paid for. In each year, the record probably commenced with the history of the sale *ἐπὶ Τηλοκλέους ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰπποθωντίδος ἀγῶνης πρυτανείας ἐπρίατο* ----- κλου *Ἐδπν: οἰκίαν* ----, as in lines 15-20 of the present document. The name of the archon Telokles in line 18 of this inscription does not, therefore, give the date of the record; it merely gives the date of the sale of the house on which payment is now being made.

A document with rubrics similar to that of lines 18-20 has been preserved, and is now published as *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1579. It will suffice here to quote the record of sale of one house (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1579, lines 8-15):

	⟨Α⟩ενκόλοφος ἐξ Σαλα[μῖνος τάδε]	
	ἀπέγ: Θεομένος Ξυπ[εταιῖωνος οἰ]	
	κίαν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ἐ[γ . . . . <sup>9</sup> . . . .]	10
[Η]ΗΗΗΔ	ι, ἦι γείτωμ βορρᾶθ[εν . . . ? . . . , ν]	
ἐπώ	σότηεν δὲ Νικόδικ[ος· ἐπρίατο Σ]	
ΠΤΤΤΤ	ωσίνομος Ἀριστονό[μο . . . ? . . .]	
	ς: ἐγγύ.	
	καταβολ(ῆ) ΠΔΔΔΤΤ.	15

The interpretation given to this document in the *Corpus* is quite erroneous in that *ἀπεγ*: in line 9 is completed to read *ἀπεγ(ράφατο)* rather than *ἀπέγ(ραψεν)* and that *ἐγγυ* in line 14 is joined with *καταβολή* in line 16 to read *ἐγγύ(ης) καταβολή*. There is no question here of an *ἐγγύης καταβολή* in the sense in which this is defined by *Et. Mag.* (p. 340), *s. v.* *ἐγγύης καταβολήν: εἰ μέντοι γε παρίστων ἐγγυητᾶς τοῦ μὴ ἂν διαψεύσασθαι περὶ τοῦ δανείσματος,*

<sup>1</sup> Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 22-23.

τοῦτο ἐγγύης καταβολὴν ἔλεγον (see Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, p. 934, note 17).<sup>1</sup> It has been assumed that Leukolophos made a claim against the house that was to be sold, deposited with the poletai a sum amounting to one fifth the value of the property, and forfeited this when he failed to substantiate his claim and the house was sold.

But the manner in which the words ἐγγυ and καταβολή are inscribed makes it impossible to associate them with this interpretation. The entire line after ἐγγυ has been left uninscribed, and καταβολή appears alone on the following line. The house was bought by Sosinomos at the price stipulated in the left margin (plus the ἐπάμιον) and the poletai of the year of the sale received a down payment from the purchaser to the amount of 82 drachmai, one fifth the value of the property. The procedure followed is exactly that attested for the purchase of such houses by Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, 47, 3) when he says that the price had to be paid in five years and that the payments were made in the ninth prytany. Aristotle says: καταβάλλουσιν δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας; the technical word for each payment was καταβολή. The word ἐγγυ in the preceding line should be completed, of course, to ἐγγυ(ητής), just as in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1590–1593. The fact that the stone was left uninscribed after the abbreviation shows probably that in this case Sosinomos furnished no bondsman, but it also attests the practice employed by the poletai of requiring a bondsman to guarantee that the purchaser could, over the five-year period, fulfill his obligations. The property was confiscated property, and the verb in line 9 should be restored ἀπέγ(ραψεν). Lipsius (*op. cit.*, p. 308, note 28, and p. 944, note 7) recognized this fact, though he followed Koehler's interpretation of ἐγγύ(ης) καταβολή.

In line 20 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1579 the abbreviation ἐγγυ should again be expanded to ἐγγυ(ητής). In line 6 of the same document I question that any mention of the bondsman should be restored at all. This document helps to explain the complicated transactions involving the house in Agryle now published in lines 7–17 of our present text. The purchaser did not make good his obligations; and the bondsman was compelled by court action to pay in his stead.

It is of the utmost importance for the chronology of the third century to have determined thus the date of the Archon Telokles. There is now no possibility of placing the archon Gorgias in the year 284–3. Gorgias is dated in the tenth year before Pytharatos (271–0) by an explicit statement of Plutarch in the *Lives of the Ten Orators* (*Demosthenes*, 847 D–E). He should, therefore, be assigned either to 281–0 (exclusive reckoning) or to 280–79 (inclusive reckoning). The former date has been most recently preferred by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 45) and the latter date by Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 23). The only legitimate way of removing Gorgias from one of these two years was to adopt a doubtful manuscript reading δεκάτω Δ' ἔτει<sup>2</sup> in the text of Plutarch, and to assume that it was a corruption from δεκάτω δ' ἔτει = ιδ' ἔτει, thus placing Gorgias

<sup>1</sup> Suidas, who gives the same lemma *s. v.* ἐνεπισκήψασθαι, has the reading ἐγγύην καταβολῆς.

<sup>2</sup> Parisinus 1672.

in 284–3, fourteen years earlier than Pytharatos.<sup>1</sup> Now that the year 284–3 is occupied by Telokles, even this escape is shown to be impossible. Gorgias must be dated either in 281–0 or in 280–79.

The correct literary tradition for Gorgias is thus confirmed, but when he is thus correctly dated in either one of the two possible years, it is impossible to date the two archons Menekles and Nikias Otryneus (who go together) in 281–0 and 280–79. Their secretaries and the secretary cycle demand that they be dated in 269–8 and 268–7 as was proposed by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, pp. 81–85) and accepted by Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 23). The objections raised against this later date by Kirchner (*Gnomon*, VIII [1932], pp. 452–453) and by Tarn (*J.H.S.*, LIV [1934], pp. 26–39) can no longer be considered valid, and indeed Ferguson has again only recently pointed out the possibility of the later date (*A.J.P.*, LV [1934], p. 320, note 15). The new evidence here presented for the year of Telokles proves that the later date for these two archons in 269–8 and 268–7 is correct.

The date of Telokles also affects the argument for the much disputed archon Polyeuktos. He must follow the archons Menekles and Nikias Otryneus (Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 102; *A.J.P.*, LV [1934], p. 320, note 15), and consequently must be dated, along with the other archons of the so-called Polyeuktos group, later than the Chremonidean war.<sup>2</sup> A further discussion of the archons of Athens in the period from 292–1 to 263–2 is given in the following commentary, which deals first of all with another inscription in which the name of the archon Ourias should be restored.

At some time near the middle of the third century B.C., a certain Salaminian who had been *ἐπιμελητής* was praised by his fellow Salaminians for performing properly the sacrifices during his term of office. This information, relatively unimportant in itself, is preserved on a broken stele of Hymettian marble found at the Peiraeus (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290). The stone is badly broken, but mentions also the goddess Aphrodite and the festival of Adonis. The date can be estimated only approximately on the basis of letter forms, for the name of the Athenian archon, which once appeared in the formula of date, has been lost by the fracture of the stone. It is known, however, that the decree was passed in mid-winter, in the month Posideon of an intercalary year. Köhler's restoration of lines 1–2, adopted in the *Corpus*, reads: *Ποσιδε[ῶνος ἐστέρου ἔκτ]ει ἰσταμένον*. The restoration seems certain, especially since the length of line so determined agrees with the certain restoration of lines 4–5 and the almost certain restoration of lines 6–7.

The fracture of the stone has caused also the loss of the name of the archon in whose year the *ἐπιμελητής* served (line 6). But the stoichedon order of letters in the

<sup>1</sup> This was originally proposed by Beloch, *Hermes*, 1903, p. 131; *Gr. Gesch.*, IV, 2, pp. 67–69. It has again been favored by Tarn, *J.H.S.*, LIV [1934], p. 38, in spite of his earlier decided conviction that Gorgias in 280–79 should be considered a fixed date (*J.H.S.*, XL [1920], pp. 147–148).

<sup>2</sup> A chronology for the archons of the third century, such as is given by Kolbe, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1933, p. 511, cannot be considered correct. The new evidence for Telokles adds to the proof already adduced by Ferguson in his article "Polyeuktos and the Soteria," in *A.J.P.*, LV (1934), pp. 318–336.

document shows that the archon in whose year the decree was passed and the archon in whose year the service was rendered both had names of six letters in the genitive case. It might, of course, be assumed that the same archon's name should be restored in both lacunae,<sup>1</sup> but in this particular document the mention of the festival of Adonis precludes this possibility. The festival of Adonis was celebrated in Athens in the spring or early summer.<sup>2</sup> This fact will be emphasized again in the course of this discussion, and it is important here because the *ἐπιμελητής* cannot be praised in mid-winter for the celebration of a festival which occurred in the spring of the same Attic year. The conclusion must be that the festival belonged to the preceding year and that the archon of line 6 was the immediate predecessor of the archon of line 1.

We now have the names of two archons who form a closed sequence, each with six letters in the genitive of his name, and the second of the two to be dated in an intercalary year.

A glance at the table of archons in Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles* (pp. 22-23) shows that the possibilities for fitting this combination into the chronological framework of the third century are decidedly limited. In other words, there is a good chance of identifying the archons themselves and of giving to them definite dates in the table.

The association of Aphrodite and Adonis in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290, and the fact that the decree was passed by a religious organization of Cypriote Salaminians in the Peiraeus honoring their *ἐπιμελητής* make plausible a close connection between this inscription and *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1261, which also was found in the Peiraeus and which honors the *ἐπιμελητής* of a religious organization and mentions both Aphrodite and Adonis. Though the *θιασῶται* of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1261 are not specifically described as Salaminians, and though the religious organization of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290 is not specifically called a *θίασος*, the probability is that both decrees emanated from the same religious order.<sup>3</sup> The *ἐπιμελητής* Stephanos was praised in the archonship of Nikokles (302-1) for his good stewardship and for superintending the festival procession of the Adonia (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1261). It may be that he was *ἐπιμελητής* in the same year in which he was praised; if so, the date of the first decree of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1261 was late in the year after the festival of Adonis. But it is significant that two further decrees appear on the same inscription, one of 301-300 honoring Stephanos for his services in a preceding year, and one of 300-299 honoring Stephanos for his services in 301-300. This is the time relationship between the tenure of office and the honorary decree which we have found necessary also in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290.

The close connection between Aphrodite and Adonis has long been known. As Nock has pointed out,<sup>4</sup> the contacts of the Adonis cult with Cyprus are certain and with Syria dubious. I wish to suggest also that the association of Adonis in Attica was with the Cyprian rather than with the Syrian Aphrodite. The association is attested for Cyprus

<sup>1</sup> This assumption was made by Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. Nock, rev. of Deubner's *Attische Feste* in *Gnomon*, X (1934), pp. 290-292.

<sup>3</sup> Deubner, *Attische Feste*, p. 222, speaks of the *θίασος* as honoring the Syrian Aphrodite.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 291.

itself (Nock, *op. cit.*, p. 292), and Broneer (*Hesperia*, I [1932], p. 53) has called attention recently to the importance in Cyprus of the cult of Aphrodite ἐν Κήποις, and to the fact that this cult was introduced into Athens from Cyprus. The very word Κήποι is a strong connecting link between Adonis and Aphrodite at Athens, and in the newly discovered sanctuary of Aphrodite ἐν Κήποις on the north slope of the Acropolis we learn that the festival day for Eros was Mounichion 4, exactly at that time of year at which we are constrained by other evidence to place the festival of Adonis. Furthermore, the rites associated with the worship of Eros and Aphrodite ἐν Κήποις had to do with the growth of vegetation and the fertility of the soil, just as did the rites of the Adonia. The fact that Broneer has now shown the name Ἀφροδίτη ἐν Κήποις to depend on the ceremonial practices of the cult rather than on the geographical location of the shrine in Athens seems to me to leave little room for doubt that it was this Aphrodite, whose cult came from Cyprus as did that of Adonis, who is to be associated in Attica with Adonis, in whose cult-worship the Ἀδωνιδος Κήποι (cf. Deubner, *op. cit.*, p. 221) played such an important part. The well-known confusion between Eros and Adonis makes it all the more appropriate to associate the date of the festival of Eros in the rock-cut inscription on the Acropolis with the celebration of the Adonia.<sup>1</sup>

The fundamental evidence for a date for the Adonia in the spring comes from the passage in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (lines 389 ff.) in which the motion of Demostrotos in the ekklesia favoring the expedition to Sicily is synchronized with the lament of the women from the housetops for Adonis. Nock (*op. cit.*, p. 290) has given a clear statement of the case, as against Deubner's view that the festival was at the beginning of autumn, and from his conclusions I see no escape. Now, we know also that in 415 B.C. the first payment to the generals to enable them to prepare the expedition was made late in the eighth prytany of the year (*I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302; cf. Meritt, *Ath. Fin. Doc.*, p. 168). If the reconstruction of the calendar which I have proposed for this year is sound, we have the fundamental equation between the Julian calendar and the civil and conciliar calendars of Athens (Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 172):

$$\text{Skirophorion 1} = \text{June 8} = \text{Pryt. X, 9.}$$

If Thargelion had 29 days and Pryt. IX had 36 days, we may reckon back one month to the derivative equation:

$$\text{Thargelion 1} = \text{May 10} = \text{Pryt. IX, 16.}$$

And with further backward reckoning, if Mounichion had 30 days and Pryt. VIII had 36 days, we arrive at a second derivative equation:

$$\text{Mounichion 1} = \text{April 10} = \text{Pryt. VIII, 22.}$$

<sup>1</sup> Boehlau, "Ein neuer Erosmythus," *Philologus*, LX (1901), pp. 321-329, emphasizes this confusion, and publishes an Attic lecythus of the fifth century showing the winged Eros suffering the death of Adonis from a wild boar, and nymphs with pots (κῆποι?). This reference was called to my attention by A. D. Nock. There are other representations on vases showing Eros participating in the ritual of the Adonia (see Deubner, *op. cit.*, p. 221).

The festival of Eros in the sanctuary of Aphrodite ἐν Κήποις on the north slope of the Acropolis fell on Moun. 4, which should be equated with Pryt. VIII, 25 (or perhaps with Pryt. VIII, 26 or 27, for either Pryt. VIII or IX or both may have had 37 instead of 36 days). It is, I believe, more than a coincidence that the first payment to Alkibiades, Nikias, and Lamachos was made for their expedition to Sicily at just this time. The possibilities of restoration in *I.G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 302 (cf. Meritt, *Ath. Fin. Doc.*, p. 168) lie between the 22nd and 36th days of the eighth prytany. It is to be presumed that the initial payment for the fleet was made soon after the final vote in the assembly favoring the expedition, when the wailings of the women who mourned Adonis mingled with the words of the orator who proposed the decree.

The evidence is largely circumstantial, but the cumulative effect of it is to make highly probable a date for the Adonia on or near Mounichion 4, to attest the close connection in Attica between Adonis and the Cyprian Aphrodite ἐν Κήποις, and to substantiate the fundamental calendar equation for 415 B.C.

Skir. 1 = June 8 = Pryt. X, 9,

which I determined by the use of other evidence several years ago.

But, whatever our judgment may be on the more exact date of the Adonia as determined in this way, the fact that the festival came in the spring of the year is established, and this proves that two different archons were mentioned in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290. We have already noted that they form a closed sequence and that the second of the two served in an intercalary year. Both archons had names of six letters in the genitive case. It so happens that the only place in our archon-table where such a combination can be dated is the archonship of Ourias in 283-2 and that of his immediate successor, who also had six letters in the genitive of his name.

These two years are, however, available; and Kirchner has shown that the latter of the two was probably intercalary (cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670, Addendum, p. 663). The restoration in line 1 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290 should be [Ἐπὶ Λυκίου ἄρχον]τος and in lines 5-6 [ἐπὶ Οὐρίου ἄρχοντο]ς; the restoration in line 1 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 A should be [Ἐπὶ Λυκίου ἄρχον]τος. In this inscription the number of letters available for the archon's name in the genitive is given in the *Corpus* as seven, but this determination is probably too long by one letter space. This question of how many spaces were here available has been much discussed (cf. Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 68). One significant observation is that a slightly tapering width of the stele is indicated by the fact that the stoichedon letters of the second decree are placed under the interspaces of the first decree. Since there were 50 letters in each line of the first decree, there must have been 51 letters in each line of the second decree.<sup>1</sup> Neither right nor left edge of the stone is preserved, and an exact determination of the length of names of the archons in lines 1 and 19 is not immediately possible. The determination that can be made, however, is that the name

<sup>1</sup> This determination was made by Dow on the stone in Athens.

in line 19 contained five more letters than the name in line 1. If the name in line 19 had twelve letters, then the name in line 1 may have had seven letters, but this combination is possible only if line 19 be restored as [Ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους] ἄρχ[χ]οντος. No other known archon's name of the period occupies twelve letter spaces in the genitive, but there is some reason to believe (see below, p. 580) that the date is later than 279-8.

On the other hand, if a name of only ten letters is restored in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B, then the name in line 1 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 A could have had only five letters. We know of no such archon's name in the third century, and are forced to the conclusion that the correct restoration calls for an archon's name of six letters in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 A and an archon's name of eleven letters in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B. This determination is necessary, in any case, in order to provide the sequence of two six-letter archons, the latter of whom belonged to an intercalary year, as demanded by *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1290. The Eleusinian secretary of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 A (line 2) falls into place in the secretary cycle in 282-1, and the opening lines may now be restored as follows:

[Ἐπὶ Ἀνκίου ἄρχον]τος ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰα[ντίδος δωδεκάτης προτανεία]  
 [ς ἦι . . . ? . . . Ἐὐφο]ρίωνος Ἐλευσίν[ιος ἐγραμμάτευεν· Σκιροφορ]  
 [ιῶνος ἐνδεκάτη]ι τρ[ι]τει καὶ δεκά[τει τῆς προτανείας· ἐκκλησί]  
 [α κωρία· τῶν προέδ]ρων ἐπεψήφισεν . . . . .<sup>23</sup> . . . . .]

The year began and ended with a full month of 30 days and the prytanies contained regularly 32 days each.<sup>1</sup>

There is, of course, no reason why the second decree of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 should be dated in the year immediately following the first decree.<sup>2</sup> The year to which it should be assigned ought, on prosopographical grounds, to be not far removed from the year of Lykeas, for the same orator Sosias, son of Hippokrates, proposed a decree for the orgeones of Bendis in the year of Lykeas (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1284 B) and again in the year of Polystratos (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1283). So, whether or not Polystratos is the name to be supplied in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B, an early date, not long after Lykeas, seems desirable for him. If Gorgias is to be dated in 280-79 (as by Ferguson), then one might date Polystratos in 281-0.

But there are difficulties in the way of this determination. Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 81-83) shows that the context of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1283 demands a year for Polystratos when the Peiraeus was in Athenian control. The fact that in the year of Polystratos the Athenian orgeones were just establishing their relations with the parent society in the Peiraeus seems to me to indicate further that the date of Polystratos should come soon after the recovery of the Peiraeus from Macedon. The date of this recovery has been much disputed, but the Peiraeus was separated from Athens and under Macedonian

<sup>1</sup> This scheme differs slightly from that offered by Kirchner in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670, Addenda, p. 663.

<sup>2</sup> This seemed desirable to Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 35, note 1.

control in 281-0 and again in 268 (cf. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 72, and *A.J.P.*, LV [1934], p. 321, note 15).

The recovery of the Peiraeus, which was counted one of the great exploits of the Athenian general Olympiodoros, has been most recently dated by Tarn<sup>1</sup> in the year of Nikias of Otryne whom he dates in 280-79. We have found that Nikias of Otryne must still be dated (as by Dinsmoor) in 268-7, but Tarn's date for the recovery of the Peiraeus in 280 need not on that account be incorrect; for slightly different reasons, Ferguson (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 72) also arrived at a date for the recovery in 280-79.

After the death of Lysimachos on the field of Kouros in July, 281 B.C.,<sup>2</sup> the Peiraeus was still in the power of Antigonos with Krateros as its governor.<sup>3</sup> Mithres, Lysimachos' minister of finance, was captured in Corinth by Krateros and despatched to the Peiraeus to be held for ransom. At this same time Olympiodoros is known to have been an Athenian general. The incident of Mithres' ransom places no constraint on the dating of the recapture of the Peiraeus by Olympiodoros in the latter part of the Athenian year 281-0. In all probability Mithres fled from Seleukos after the battle of Kouroupedion in the summer of 281. His ransom may have taken place in the early winter of 281 after the preliminary negotiations were finished. Thereafter at any time and still within the year 281-0 Olympiodoros could have performed his brilliant feat. Tarn rightly, I believe, postulates 279 as a *terminus ad quem* for the recovery of the port<sup>4</sup> by demonstrating that, if Athens employed her navy as one of the principal weapons of offence against the Gauls in 279, those operations are easier to conceive after the conquest of Olympiodoros. Again, his interpretation of the Philodemos fragment seems correct: the phrase *παρέχοντ' αἱ σπονδαί* seems to indicate a dictation of terms, presumably by Ptolemy Keraunos and the victorious Greek states. Athens, in the possession of the Peiraeus, especially after Antigonos' naval defeat at the hands of Ptolemy, could easily dictate terms.<sup>5</sup> One other bit of evidence has been more or less neglected. Memnon, the Heracleiot historian, records the history of the war between Ptolemy and Antigonos. After the assassination of Seleukos,<sup>6</sup> instigated by Ptolemy, Antigonos assembled his forces on land and sea and hastened to Macedonia to prevent Ptolemy from being declared king.<sup>7</sup>

The war ensued immediately; i.e., in the early spring of 280. The declaration of war was followed by a general coalition of the Greek states against Antigonos.<sup>8</sup> Antiochos

<sup>1</sup> Tarn, "The New Dating of the Chremonidean War," *J.H.S.*, LIV (1934), pp. 33 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Justin XVII, 1; Trog. *Prol.* XVII; Memnon *ap.* Phot., 8 (= Mueller, *F.H.G.*, III, 532), Porph. Tyr., 4, 4 (= Mueller, *F.H.G.*, III, 698); Paus. I, 10, 5. For the date see Tarn, *J.H.S.*, LIV (1934), p. 32, n. 32; *Antig. Gon.*, p. 128, n. 37; Kolbe, *Syr. Beitr.*, pp. 22-4.

<sup>3</sup> Pap. Herc., no. 1418, col. xxxiii = Vogliano, *Riv. di Fil.*, 1926, p. 322; 1927, p. 501. For Mithres as *διοικητής* of Lysimachos see Diog. L., X, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Tarn, *J.H.S.*, LIV (1934), p. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Philodemos, for text see *Philologus*, LXXI (1912), p. 226; Memnon, 14.

<sup>6</sup> Seleukos lived seven months after the death of Lysimachos. See Justin, XVII, 2, 4.

<sup>7</sup> Memnon, 13.

<sup>8</sup> Justin XXIV, 1.

himself, although involved, did not directly participate in the hostilities: Bithynia was keeping him too much occupied. After his severe naval defeat Antigonos retreated to Boeotia.<sup>1</sup> With the Peloponnesos, led by the Spartans, preventing Krateros from lending aid, and with the Peiraeus in Athenian hands, Antigonos (his army dispersed) might well have been forced to retire to Boeotia. If the Peiraeus were still his, he would probably have preferred to seek refuge in it, and use it as a base for further offensives. As it was, he was finally compelled to withdraw to Asia<sup>2</sup> (Philodemos; see *Philologus*, LXXI [1912], p. 226). The events here outlined seem best explained if the Peiraeus was recaptured (Paus. I, 26, 3) by Olympiodoros in 281-0, a year in which he is known to have been general, and in which Antigonos' fortunes were at a very low ebb.

Since the decree of the orgeones of Bendis (*I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1283) was passed on the eighth of Hekatombaion in a year when Athens controlled the Peiraeus, it is obvious that it cannot be dated in 281-0, but the establishment of relations between the city and harbor town implied in the decree fall into place admirably when the document (with archon Polystratos) is dated in 280-79. It follows, of course, that Gorgias must be dated in the earlier of the two years available for him (281-0).

Some further evidence for the date of the archonship of Polystratos can be derived from the decrees honoring the hipparch Komeas, now published as *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 672, and attributed to the year of Anaxikrates.

This inscription consists of three sections, the first (lines 1-17) being an Athenian decree passed on Mounichion 19, and the second and third being decrees of the Athenian klerouchs on Lemnos. The Athenian decree merely takes cognizance of the Lemnian decrees, ratifies their votes of honor and privilege, and bestows a crown with vote of commendation upon the hipparch Komeas. There is more of substance in the two Lemnian decrees. Apparently Komeas arrived in Lemnos ([πα]ραγενόμενος εἰς Ἀἴ[μινον], lines 19-20) to take up his duties as hipparch in the year of freedom from Lysimachos (cf. *δημοκρατία*, line 18, and *δημοκρατουμένην τὴν νῆσον*, line 28). This year is known to be that following the death of Lysimachos in the summer of 281 B.C.; it was the Athenian year 281-0.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, the services of Komeas as ambassador to Seleukos (lines 39-40) cannot be dated later than early spring of 280, when Seleukos was murdered.<sup>4</sup> The vote of the Lemnians honoring Komeas was made before he had passed the euthyna for his term of office, for the decree carries the provision (line 35) [ἐπειδὴν τὰς εὐ]θύνας δῶν.

<sup>1</sup> Memnon, 13, 3.

<sup>2</sup> That is, to Antiochos who in name at least was an ally. The war between Antigonos and Antiochos mentioned by Justin, 25, 1, can be dated after the defeat of Antigonos in Macedonia and is very likely to be explained by Antigonos' interference in Bithynian affairs, for we find Nikomedes and his allies fighting for Antigonos against Antiochos (Memnon, 18).

<sup>3</sup> The Lemnians were *πικρῶς ἐπιστατουμένους ὑπὸ Λυσιμάχου* (Athenaeus, VI, 255).

<sup>4</sup> There was doubtless a lapse of some time between the death of Lysimachos and the establishment of democracy, so that Komeas could not have been hipparch for the entire Athenian year 281/0. His embassy to Seleukos should probably be dated during this interim of organization in the late summer or early fall of 281.

It is clear, therefore, that the Athenian decree of Mounichion 19 belongs to the year following the tenure of office by Komeas as hipparch in Lemnos. When it was voted, Komeas had passed his euthyna, and the Athenians proceeded to ratify the provisions of the Lemnian decrees. Thus, with Komeas as hipparch in 281-0, the Athenian decree must be dated in 280-79.

The mention of his "arrival" in Lemnos in close association with the "democracy" which Seleukos accorded the island in 281-0 makes it seem improbable that he became hipparch only in 280-79. It may be objected that he was hipparch for two years (281-0 to 280-79), and that the Athenian decree should be dated in 279-8. But in this case it is highly improbable that this fact should not be stated explicitly in the decree or that so deserving a man should have received only one crown. If the rewards here voted by the Lemnians were given at the end of a second year in office, some mention of the earlier crown or of the earlier tenure should have appeared in the preserved decrees.<sup>1</sup>

Irrespective of the name of the archon in line 1, the probable date of the Athenian decree in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 672 seems to be 280-79. To this year we have already assigned the archon Polystratos, and his name is exactly suited to the lacuna where the archon's name must be supplied. If the date of the honorary decree for Komeas is thus correctly determined, there is, in fact, no other available archon who can be dated in this year.

There remains the problem of the name of the archon to be supplied in line 19 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B, and the solution—in so far as any solution is possible—depends upon the demotic of the secretary in line 20.

Lines 19-22 have been much in need of study, and my own examination of the stone and squeeze gives the following letters on which I believe a restoration must be based:

. A P X O N T O Σ E Π I  
 I Δ H [Σ] N . . . . O Σ E 𐀀  
 . T E I . A . . . Δ E Y .  
 . . . T . . . . O . ^ P .

Between the word ἄρχοντας and the left edge of the stone fourteen letters are to be supplied (see p. 576), and each line contained a total of 51 letters (cf. p. 575). This stoichedon line of 51 letters is further confirmed by the restoration possible in lines 21-22:

[ - - - - - με ] τ' εἰ [ κ ] ἀ [ δ α σ ] δ εν τ [ ἔ ρ α ι καὶ εἰ κο σ τ εῖ τ ῆ ς π ρ ο ν τ α ν ε ]  
 [ ἰ α ς · ἐ κ κ λ η σ ῖ α κ υ ρ ῖ α · ] τ [ ὦ ν π ρ ] ο [ ἔ ] δ ρ [ ὠ ν ἐ π ε ψ ῆ φ ῖ ζ ε ν - - - - - ]

<sup>1</sup> See Hypereides, *Pro Lycophrone*, 17, for successive grants of a crown to a hipparch at Lemnos, and, e.g., the Rhamnousian inscription of Ekphantos' archonship published in *B.C.H.*, LIV (1930), pp. 269-270, for mention of previous crowns in an honorary decree of this character. For successive terms as hipparch (designated as such) see *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1224 *ab*, lines 10-11. A two-year term for the hipparch at Lemnos was rare (see Hypereides, *loc. cit.*: καὶ ἡρξά μὲν ἀντόθι δὲ ἔτη τῶν πάποθ' ἐπαρχηκότων μόνος).

The first letter of the demotic in line 20 has never been read before, but the strokes still visible in spite of the broken condition of the surface conform perfectly to the letter Ε. The second letter of the demotic should be read as Ι, as has been customary hitherto. The lower half of a vertical stroke (centrally spaced) is well preserved. The surface of the stone probably does not allow absolute certainty in the determination of the two letters here discussed, but I state it as my own conviction concerning them that they are epsilon and iota, and that the demotic must have been either *ΕΙτεαῖος* or *ΕΙρεσιδης*.

The demotic *ΕΙτεαῖος* has a tribal affiliation with either Antiochis (XII) or Antigonis (I), and since the archon's name contained 11 letters (or 12 letters with the preposition *ἐπ'*) the years 280-79 (*ἐπὶ Πολυστράτου*) and 279-8 (*ἐπ' Ἀναξικράτους*) are both theoretically available. The complete name of the secretary in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 672 contained 21 letters, but in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B so short a name cannot be restored without assuming the difficult form [.]ιδης in line 20 and leaving too great a space for any possible restoration of the name of the tribe and number of the prytany in line 19. The two inscriptions *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B and 672 cannot belong to the same year. If our assignment of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 672 to the year of Polystratos is correct, then *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B may belong to the year of Anaxikrates. Or, if *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 672 should in reality belong to the year of Anaxikrates, then *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B may belong to the archonship of Polystratos. In either case the demotic of the secretary should be restored as *ΕΙ[τεαῖος]*.

But there is also the possibility that the demotic should be restored as *ΕΙ[ρεσιδης]*, with a tribal affiliation with Akamantis (VII), and that the inscription should be assigned to the year 273-2. A possible archon's name for this year (with eleven letters in the genitive) is Sosistratos, who was generally dated in this period before Ferguson suggested that he be placed in 261-0 (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 24).

This later date for the document, I am informed by Dow, seems well suited to the character of the writing, which has similarities with that of documents of the year of Menekles (269-8). This is true even of the lettering in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 A of the year of Lykeas (282-1), and the late character of the lettering is explained, of course, by the fact that both decrees were inscribed on stone at the time of the second decree. When we assign the document to the year 273-2 (with a secretary whose demotic was *ΕΙρεσιδης*) and restore [*ἐπὶ Σωσιστράτου*] *ἄρχοντας*, there is indicated an interval of nine years between the first and second decrees cut on the one stone. The analogy for such divergence in date is found in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 844, where three decrees appear at widely different dates, two honoring a certain Eumaridas and one honoring his son Charmion.

The alternation of ordinary and intercalary years in the Metonic cycle shows that 273-2 was probably intercalary, and if *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 670 B is assigned to this year the restorations must conform to a year of thirteen months. The following restoration is suggested as possible:

[Ἐπὶ Σωσιστράτου] ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῆς . . . . .<sup>11</sup>. . . . . τρίτης πρυταν]  
 [εἰας ἦι . . . ? . . .] ἰδη[ς] Ν[ίκων]ος Εἰ[ρησίδης ἐγραμμιάτευεν· Βοηδρο]  
 [μῶνος τρίτη με]τ' εἰ[κ]ά[δας] δευτ[έραι καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανε]  
 [ίας· ἐκκλησία κυρία·] τ[ῶν πρ]ο[έ]δρ[ων ἐπεψήφισεν - - - - -]  
 [. . . . .<sup>18</sup>. . . . .] | [- - - - -]  
 [. . . . .<sup>18</sup>. . . . .] Σ [- - - - -]

If Hekatombaion was hollow, Metageitnion full, and Boedromion hollow, then *Βοηδρομιῶνος τρίτη μετ' εἰκάδας* was the twenty-seventh day of the month (with backward count), and the equation is correct for the twenty-second day of the prytany of an intercalary year.

Other archons between Euthios (285-4) and Philokrates (266-5) have been given more definite dates as the result of recent studies. Olbios must be dated in 277-6 (see p. 564). Ferguson (*A.J.P.*, LV [1934], pp. 332-333) shows good cause for dating Xenophon in 276-5, now that the archon Π - - of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1534 has been proven to be Peithidemos and to belong in 267-6 (Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 330-331). This transfer of Xenophon from 274-3 is necessary in any case, for his name cannot legitimately be restored in line 1 of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 704, as was done when Ferguson drew up the table on p. 23 of his *Athenian Tribal Cycles*. Ferguson's assumption was that the name *Ξενοφώντος* should be supplied in line 1, and the name [Γλανκίππ]οῦ in line 12. The *ἀστυνόμοι* of Glaukippos' year were honored, on this interpretation, in the year of his immediate successor Xenophon. But the honors conferred upon them were not for general good conduct during a year's term of office; they were rather for the successful performance of their duties on the specific occasion of the festival of Asklepios. The decree was passed on Elaphebolion 26 (*τετράδι μετ' εἰκάδας* with a hollow month and backward count) and we know that the date of the festival was Elaphebolion 8. It is evident that the *ἀστυνόμοι* were praised at a meeting of the assembly sixteen days after the good services for which they were cited, and that the year in which they held office was the same as the year in which the decree was passed. We do not know the name of the archon, except that it ended in - - οῦ and had ten letters in the genitive case. The fact that the secretary was from Sounion dates the decree in 274-3, and to this year must now be assigned the archon [. . . .<sup>8</sup>. . . .]ος. Entirely aside from the desirability of dating Xenophon in 276-5 for other reasons, he cannot belong in 274-3. It may be observed that there is nothing to connect *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 704 with Glaukippos, for his name can no longer be restored in line 12, but within the period to which the decree must belong, the only available year is 274-3. There is no other vacancy for a secretary from the 6th tribe where the archon's name may have contained 10 letters.

The evidence for dating Euboulos in 276-5 has been dissipated by a new reading of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1534 (Ferguson, *A.J.P.*, LV [1934], p. 333) and we merely know that he must be dated before the death of Epicurus (Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 80). This archon Euboulos must not be confused with the archon of the same name now known to have been in office soon after the end of the Chremonidean war (Ferguson, *A.J.P.*, LV [1934], p. 319).

The well-known decree (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 682) honoring Phaidros of Sphettos is now known from the appearance of the single officer of the administration (lines 79–80 and 90–91) to have been passed after the year 263–2 (Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 65). So long as the only known archon in the third century with the name Euboulos was the one mentioned in the letters of Epicurus, it was necessary to assume (even giving to Euboulos the most favorable date, 272–1) a lapse of at least ten years between the last public service of Phaidros and the date of the decree in his honor. The Euboulos mentioned in the decree for Phaidros is in reality the same as the Euboulos mentioned in *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 678, and since he is to be dated later than 263–2, the decree finds its proper setting shortly after the agonesia of the younger Thymochares, son of Phaidros. Phaidros himself, according to Dinsmoor (*op. cit.*, pp. 82–83), was agonesites in 296–5 B.C.

It is now possible to date the Euboulos mentioned in the letters of Epicurus in 272–1, the only year before the death of Epicurus to which an archon has not already been assigned. There is no evidence that (Apel)laios,<sup>1</sup> who is also mentioned in the letters of Epicurus, was an Athenian archon, and his name should be deleted from our lists (see Kirchner, *Gnomon*, VIII [1932], p. 452; Ferguson informs me [by letter] that Crönert has reaffirmed to him the judgment earlier given to Kirchner).

The archon Diogeiton, who is mentioned in two inscriptions (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 771 and 772), should be assigned to the year 270–69. The inscription *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 772 is inscribed with 30 letters in each line; the lines are of equal length (notwithstanding the comment in the *Corpus*); and, though there is some variation from a true checker-board stoichedon arrangement of the letters, the lines preserve all the advantages of this order. The lettering of the inscription is almost identical with that of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 665 and may well be by the same hand. The secretary of Diogeiton's year falls into place in the secretary-cycle in 270–69. The proof given above that the year of Theophemos was ordinary (p. 551) would necessitate an intercalary year for Diogeiton if he were to remain in 252–1. Since the inscriptions of his archonship require an ordinary year, there is this additional and compelling reason for changing his date to 270–69.

The convenience of calendar reconstruction may also be used to date *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 477 in the year of Eurykleides in 249–8 rather than in 261–0. The archon's name in this inscription contained eleven letters, and the calendar equations indicate that the year was intercalary. This combination is suitable for the year of Eurykleides (249–8), after the two known ordinary years of Theophemos and Kydenor, while a normal reconstruction of the Metonic cycle requires that 261–0 be an ordinary year.

It may also be noted here that *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 798 can be given a much more satisfactory restoration than that now proposed in the *Corpus*, and that it may be assigned definitely to the year 256–5. The first three lines are crowded (line 1 particularly so), and line 4 is widely spaced. But from line 5 to the end of the inscription the arrangement is

<sup>1</sup> See Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 74.

stoichedon, with 42 letters in each line except in line 9 where an erasure and correction caused a slight disturbance. The archon's name in lines 10–11 must be restored as Ἀ[ντιμάχου]. This is the only name of proper length beginning in alpha which occurs in the period during which the inscription may be dated. It appears now that the ἐπίδοσις mentioned in line 19 was the same as that mentioned in a document already known to belong to the year of Antimachos (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 768 and Addenda).

The text of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 798 should be read as follows:

[Ἐπὶ Κλεομάχου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς -- -]τίδος ἑβδόμ[ης πρυτανείας ἤμ' Ἀφθό]  
 [ρητος Ἀρχίνου Κήτιος ἐγραμμάτε]νεν· Γαμηλιῶν[ος· ἐκκλησία κυ]  
 [ρία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπειψήφιζεν Ἀ]ρχίλοχος Ἀρχενί[κου - - - - -]  
 [- - καὶ συμπρόεδροι vacat ἔδ]οξεν τῷ δήμω[ι vacat ]  
 5 [.....<sup>16</sup>..... Κυδαθ]ηραιὸς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ [πρόδ] CTOIX. 42  
 [τερόν τε οἱ πρόγονοι οἱ Χα]ρίου διετέλεσαν φιλο[τιμι]  
 [οῦμενοι εἰς τε τὴν βουλή]ν καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθη[ναίω]  
 [ν καὶ αὐτὸς Χαρίας εἰς δσ]ας ποτὲ ὁ δῆμος ἐπιμελε[ίας]  
 [κατέστησεν αὐτὸν λελει]τούργηκεν φιλοτιμῶς καὶ [χει]  
 10 [ροτονηθεὶς ἀγωνοθέτης] εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπ' Ἀ[ντι]  
 [μάχου ἄρχοντος τὰς τε θ]υσίας πάσας ἔθυσεν δσα[ς προ]  
 [οσῆκεν .....<sup>14</sup>.....]ι τῶν Διονυσίων βοῦς πέν[τε]  
 [...<sup>7</sup>... τοῖς τε Ἀθηναί]οις καὶ Ἀιτωλῶν τοῖς ἐπι[δημι]  
 [ήσασιν καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας] πάντας ἐποίησεν καλῶς [καὶ φ]  
 15 [ιλοτιμῶς, ἀρέθηκεν δὲ κ]αὶ τοὺς τρίποδας τοὺς τε [...]  
 [- - - - - [[- - - - -]] - - - - -] ἔδωκε [δ]ὲ κα[ὶ ...]  
 [...<sup>15</sup>..... ἐπεμ]ελήθη δπως ἂν πάντες λάβ[ωσι]  
 [...<sup>7</sup>... ἀναλώσας εἰς τ]ὴν ἀγωνοθεσίαν ἐκ τῶν ἰδ[ίων]  
 [...<sup>17</sup>..... τάλ]αντα ὦ καὶ τῆς ἐπιδόσεω[ς γε]  
 20 [γενημένης εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν τ]ῆς χώρας ἐπέδωκεν [...]  
 [...<sup>11</sup>..... καὶ τῆς ἐπιμελε]ίας λόγον καὶ εὐθύ[νας]  
 [ἔδωκεν ὦν δπως ἂν οἶ]ν καὶ τοῖ[ς] ἄλλοις τοῖς εἰς τὸ [λοι]  
 [πὸν χρησίμοις ἐσομένοις ἐφ]άμιλλον εἶ τὸ φιλο[τιμιε]  
 [ῖσθαι εἰδόσιν διτι παρὰ τοῦ δή]μου ἀξίας κομοῦ[νται]  
 25 [χάριτας ὦ ἀγαθεὶ τύχει δεδόχ]θαι τεῖ βουλεῖ το[ῦς προ]  
 [οέδρους οἱ ἂν λάχωσιν προεδ]ρεύει[ν] ἐν τεῖ πρώτ[ει ἐκ]  
 [κλησιαί χρηματίσαι περὶ το]ύτων, γνώμην δὲ ξυ[μβάλλ]  
 [εσθαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆ]μον διτι δοκεῖ τεῖ β[ουλευ]  
 [ἐπαινέσαι Χαρίαν ...<sup>6</sup>...]γίου Κυδαθηραιέα κα[ὶ στε]  
 30 [φανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῶι στε]φάνωι κατὰ τὸν νόμον [...]  
 [- - - - -]

The new determinations in the archon-list of the third century made in this report may best be illustrated by a chronological table:<sup>1</sup>

Year	Type	Archon	Secretary	Tribe	Evidence
292-1	I	Philippos		12	
291-0	0*	Aristonymos	-----ς Αἰθαλίδης	I	II <sup>2</sup> , 669, 671
290-89	0	Charinos	[..... <sup>18</sup> .....]υς Θοορα[τεύς]	II	II <sup>2</sup> , 697
289-8	I	Kimón		3	
288-7	0*	Diokles	Ξενοφῶ[ν Ν]ικέου Ἀλαιεύς	IV	II <sup>2</sup> , 650, 651, 662-3
287-6	0*	Diotimos	Ἀντιστρατος [Ἀ]ριστο[μ]άχου Παιανεύς	V	II <sup>2</sup> , 653-655
286-5	I	Isaios		6	II <sup>2</sup> , 656
285-4	0*	Euthios	Νασιμένης Νασικῶδου Χολαργεύς	VII	II <sup>2</sup> , 657-659
284-3	I	Telokles		8	<i>Hesperia</i> , IV, no. 41
283-2	0*	Ourias	Εὐξενος Καλλίου Αἰξωνεύς	IX	II <sup>2</sup> , 660, 1290; <i>Hesperia</i> , IV, nos. 40, 41
282-1	I*	Lykeas	[... <sup>17</sup> ... Εὐφο]ρίωνος Ἐλευσίν[ιος]	X	II <sup>2</sup> , 670 A, 1290
281-0	0	Gorgias		11	Plutarch, <i>Vitae X Or.</i>
280-79	0*	Polystratos	[..... <sup>21</sup> .....]	12	II <sup>2</sup> , 672, 1283
279-8	0	Anaxikrates		1	Pausanias X, 23, 14
278-7	I	Demokles		2	Pausanias X, 23, 14; II <sup>2</sup> , 673
277-6	0*	Olbios	Κυδίας Τιμωνίδου Εὐωνυμεύς	III	<i>Hesperia</i> , II, no. 5; II <sup>2</sup> , 792
276-5	0	Xenophon	Κλειν[ένης] ----- Ἀλαιεύς]	(IV)	II <sup>2</sup> , 1534 A
275-4	I*	Glaukippos	Εὐθων[ος] . . . κ]ρίτου Μυρρινοῦσιος	V	II <sup>2</sup> , 674-676
274-3	0	(. . . . <sup>8</sup> . . . .) os	[..... <sup>16</sup> .....]ου Σοννιε[ύς]	VI	II <sup>2</sup> , 704
273-2	I	Sosistratos	[-- --]ίδη[ς] Ν[ικων]ος Ἐλ[ρεσίδης]	VII	II <sup>2</sup> , 670 B
272-1	0	Euboulos		8	Epicurus
271-0	I	Pytharatos		9	Diogenes Laertius
270-69	0*	Diogeiton	Θεόδοτος Θεοφίλου Κειριάδης	X	II <sup>2</sup> , 771, 772
269-8	I	Menekles	Θεόδωρος Ἀνσιθέου Τ[ρ]ι[κ]ο[ρ]ύσιος	XI	II <sup>2</sup> , 661, 664
268-7	0*	Nikias Otryneus	Ἴσοκράτης Ἴσοκράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	XII	II <sup>2</sup> , 665, 666
267-6	0*	Peithidemos	(uninscribed)	(1)	II <sup>2</sup> , 687
266-5	I*	Philokrates	Ἡγήσιππος Ἀριστομάχου Μελιτεύς	II	II <sup>2</sup> , 684, 685
265-4	0*	(Philipp)ides?		3	II <sup>2</sup> , 689
264-3	0	Diognetos		4	II <sup>2</sup> , 688; Parian Marble
263-2	I	Antipatros		5 (then 11)	
262-1	0*	Arrheneides		12	Diogenes Laertius, VII, 1, 9
261-0	0	Philostratos		1	
260-59	I	Euboulos		2	II <sup>2</sup> , 678, 682
259-8	0	Phanostratos		3	

<sup>1</sup> An asterisk signifies that the calendar character of the year may be considered certain.

Year	Type	Archon	Secretary	Tribe	Evidence
258-7	0*	Pheidostratos	[... <sup>8</sup> ... Κηφι]σοδώρου Ἰκ[αριεύς]	IV	II <sup>2</sup> , 734
257-6	0I*	Antimachos	Χαιρ[ι]γένης [Χαι]ριγένου Μυρρινοῦσιος	V	II <sup>2</sup> , 768 and 802, 769 and 441, 798
256-5	0*	Kleomachos	Ἀ[φ]θόνητος Ἀρχίνου Κήτιος	VI	II <sup>2</sup> , 770, 798
255-4	0*	Polyeuktos	Χαιρεφῶν Ἀρχεστράτου Κεφαλήθεν	VII	II <sup>2</sup> , 679-681
254-3	I*	Hieron	Φαινύλος Πανφίλου Ὀῆθεν	VIII	II <sup>2</sup> , 683
253-2	0*	Diomedon	Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένου Δ[αιδαλίδης]	IX	II <sup>2</sup> , 791
252-1	I	-----		10	
251-0	0*	Theophemos	Προκλῆς Ἀπ[..... <sup>15</sup> .....]	11	II <sup>2</sup> , 795, 799
250-49	0*	Kydenor	Δ[...] <sup>1</sup> υ[.]ος Λύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθε[ν]	XII	II <sup>2</sup> , 703, 796, 797
249-8	I*	Eurykleides	[... <sup>9</sup> ... Φ]ανοπόν[πο]υ Π[ο]τά[μος]	I	II <sup>2</sup> , 477
248-7	0	Lysiades	Ἀριστόμαχος Ἀριστο[μάχου] Ἀνακα[ιεύς]	(II)	II <sup>2</sup> , 774, 775
247-6	0	-----		3	
246-5	I*	Kallimedes	[Καλ]λίας Καλλιᾶδου Πλωθεύς	IV	II <sup>2</sup> , 777, 780
245-4	0	Lysitheides?		5	
244-3	0*	Thersilochos	Δ[ι]όδωτος Διογνήτου Φρεάριος	VI	II <sup>2</sup> , 778, 780-782
243-2	I	Thymochares?	Σώστρατο[ς] Ἀ[ρι]στ - - - - -	7	II <sup>2</sup> , 700
242-1	0	Alkibiades?		8	
241-0	I	Philoneos?		9	II <sup>2</sup> , 765, 766
240-39	0*	Athenodoros	Ἄρκετος Ἀρχίου Ἀμαξαντεύς	X	II <sup>2</sup> , 784
239-8	0	Lysias		11	
238-7	I*	(... <sup>7</sup> ...)	[...] <sup>7</sup> ων Μιλτιάδου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	XII	II <sup>2</sup> , 702
237-6	0	Kimon		1	
236-5	I*	Ekphantos	[... <sup>7</sup> ...]ος Δημητρίο[υ] Ἰπποτ[ο]μ[ά]δης	II	II <sup>2</sup> , 787; <i>B.C.H.</i> , LIV, 268-282; <i>A.J.A.</i> , XXXVII, 46-47
235-4	0*	Lysanias	Ἐὔμηλος Ἐμπεδίωνος Ἐδωννμεύς	III	II <sup>2</sup> , 788, 790
234-3	0	-----		4	
233-2	I	Jason?		5	
232-1	0	-----		6	
231-0	0	-----		7	

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

## ADDENDUM

This article was already in page-proof when Dinsmoor's discussion of the year 307-6 appeared in *Hesperia*, IV (1935), pp. 303-310.

B. D. M.