

## THE HADRIANIC YEAR OF THE COUNCIL AT ATHENS

THE preamble of one of the prytany texts of the early third century after Christ has for a long time been something of a puzzle both in its reconstruction and in its interpretation.<sup>1</sup> A new text has now been given by Meritt and Traill with a promise of more nearly complete treatment to come and of justification for the departure from accepted versions.<sup>2</sup> This article is in fulfillment of that promise and is dedicated to Oscar Broneer in memory of a difficult text once published by him which helped in the solution of an earlier chronological problem in the late fourth century B. C.<sup>3</sup>

I begin with the assertion that the hitherto accepted text is impossible. The date by month has been read in *I.G.*, III, 10 as Ποσειδεῶνος τῆς Δ'. This curious expression of date has no parallel. The date by day belongs in the dative case, not in the genitive. Moreover, no intelligible calendar reconstruction can be made with the once accepted equation of the 23rd day of the prytany with the 30th day of Poseidon. The possibility of some calendar irregularity has always to be borne in mind and this has here clouded the issue. Were the equation true the calendar must have been irregular indeed. More serious is the fact that Dittenberger's text does not reflect the better readings from the stone made by earlier editors. Nothing new can now be gained from a study of the original. It has stood for years in a corner of the court of the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, where exposure to wind and weather has rendered large parts of the obverse face almost illegible with the passages here in question completely obliterated. The stone has now been moved to a more sheltered location but the crucial text is lost. We have to depend on Pittakys, Pococke, Fourmont, and Koehler.

Fortunately the date within the prytany is secure (the 23rd), represented on the stone by ΚΓ. We have Koehler's assurance, given to Dittenberger, that the gamma is certain. Kappa has been the only reading for the first letter. Dittenberger thought it somewhat doubtful because it depended solely on the authority of Pococke. Pococke, indeed, did read ΚΟ in place of ΚΓ, but the kappa has also the independent authority of Pittakys, whose reading ΚΕ confirms the kappa and shows that he already had discarded the Ο for Koehler's gamma, which he evidently mistook for a square

<sup>1</sup> *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1077 = W. Dittenberger, *I.G.*, III, 10. The date is A.D. 209/10.

<sup>2</sup> B. D. Meritt and John S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora*, XV: *Inscriptions, The Athenian Councillors*, 1974, no. 460, pp. 320-321.

<sup>3</sup> *Hesperia*, II, 1933, pp. 398-402, no. 18. See the discussion in 'Αρχ. Ἐφ., 1968, pp. 109-115 and references there cited.

epsilon.<sup>4</sup> The date as 23rd of the prytany may be considered fixed. The best evidence confirms it.

This lifts part of the obscurity which troubled Boeckh (*C.I.G.*, 353): *Dolendum quod prytaniae numerus et dies tum prytaniae tum mensis aboliti sunt: qui si servati essent, et prytaniarum ea aetate, qua tredecim tribus fuerunt, ratio et anni Attici initium quando tum fuerit, definiri posset.* The day of the month can, however, be determined by studying and comparing the transcripts of Pococke and Fourmont. Fourmont, according to Boeckh, read  $\text{H}\epsilon\text{N}\text{I}\text{OY}\Lambda\text{.CYN}$ ; Pococke read  $\text{THCB}\wedge\text{BOY}\text{-}\wedge\text{HCYN}$ .<sup>5</sup> The beta was written twice by error, and Dittenberger made the necessary correction by eliminating the first beta from his published text. There is now a one-to-one correspondence between the copies of Pococke and Fourmont. Fourmont does not read tau, and Pococke does; Fourmont has two uprights where Pococke completes the eta; Fourmont has a round epsilon where Pococke gives an ungrammatical and unintelligible sigma. This latter confusion between a lunate sigma and a round epsilon was easy. Pococke now has lambda where Fourmont gives only an upright stroke. In Boeckh's copy the stroke is the right half of lambda; in Dittenberger's copy the same stroke is the left half of lambda. Dittenberger's choice of reading Pococke's complete lambda was made reluctantly: "id quod posui minime certum est." I suggest that the upright seen by Fourmont did not slope either to the right or to the left but that it was in reality the iota to complete the numeral  $\epsilon\iota = 15$ . The fifteenth day could be expressed either as  $\epsilon\iota$  (as here) or as  $\iota\epsilon$ . Both versions, for example, occur in prytany lists of A.D. 138/9.<sup>6</sup> Fourmont now records only the upright of beta which Pococke gives in full. In this inscription iota adscript in the dative was frequently omitted; hence the letters TH are followed immediately by the numeral of date.

If the fifteenth day of Posideon fell on the 23rd day of the prytany, then that prytany was the fourth and the year must have been the Hadrianic year which commenced with the month Boedromion. In an ordinary year of 354 days the first three prytanies could have been of 27 days each.<sup>7</sup> This was one quite normal disposition when there were thirteen phylai. Hence the count of days by prytany was  $27 + 27 + 27 + 23 = 104$ , the same as the count of days by month  $30 + 29 + 30 + 15 = 104$ . The existence of this Hadrianic year is already known from the preambles of two prytany inscriptions of A.D. 138/9.<sup>8</sup> Gustav Hirschfeld, who was among the first to demonstrate the existence of this year of the Council, refrained from speculation as to the time of its origin.<sup>9</sup> I would date it to the time of creation of the phyle

<sup>4</sup> K. S. Pittakys, *L'ancienne Athènes*, 1835, p. 513.

<sup>5</sup> R. Pococke, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Graec(arum) et Latin(arum) Liber*, I, 1752, p. 60, no. 68.

<sup>6</sup> Meritt and Traill, *op. cit.*, p. 252 (no. 331) and p. 253 (no. 333).

<sup>7</sup> See B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 167-179.

<sup>8</sup> Meritt and Traill, *op. cit.*, p. 252 (no. 331) and p. 253 (no. 333) and Introduction, p. 24.

<sup>9</sup> *Hermes*, VII, 1873, p. 58: "Wann die Neuerung stattgefunden, scheint allerdings mit den vorhandenen Mitteln nicht näher bestimmt werden zu können."

Hadrianis. F. K. Ginzel, in his summary of the evidence known to him, thought that the Hadrianic year could have been only short-lived.<sup>10</sup> It is evident now from this inscription that it lasted at least into the beginning of the third century.<sup>11</sup>

However aptly the interpretation just given fits the requirements of the Hadrianic year one must nevertheless explore the possibility that there may have been, as Ginzel surmised, a return to the earlier calendar. If the attempt is made to scale the year to a beginning in Hekatombaion the closest equation would yield 161 days for the prytanies ( $3 \times 28 + 2 \times 27 + 23$ ) and 162 days for the months ( $2 \times 30 + 3 \times 29 + 15$ ). As we now know, the month date could, and frequently did, lag behind the prytany date, but there is no evidence, in spite of anything that I or others have written to the contrary,<sup>12</sup> that it ever outstripped it. And the variance here in the wrong direction would have to be taken as even greater if any of the short prytanies came at the beginning of the year or if three of the first five months were of thirty days. If one assumes an initial date in Hekatombaion the festival year, therefore, would seem to have outstripped the prytany year by an interval of one to five days. This, together with the continued naming of the intercalary month as Hadrianion, argues against a return to the pre-Hadrianic beginning of the prytany year.

The probabilities, moreover, outweigh the unlikely assumption that the first four prytanies may have been of 28 days to give an ordinary year of 355 rather than of 354 days. Where the matter can be tested during the period of the thirteen phylai from 224 to 201 B.C., the fourth prytany to have 28 days in a year of 355 days was not the fourth prytany of the year in orderly sequence but a prytany at (or near) the end of the year rather than at its beginning.<sup>13</sup> Usually not even the necessary three prytanies of 28 days all came together at the beginning of the year.<sup>14</sup>

We know more about the calendar now than we did when Pritchett and Neugebauer wrote *Calendars of Athens* (1947) and when I wrote *The Athenian Year* (1961). It might have been argued that a prytany count of 161 days and a festival count of 162 days would be a matter of small consequence, to be explained by the omission of a day somewhere in the early part of the year in the festival calendar, thus advancing the count. But the idea of omitted days in the festival calendar except by way of compensation for earlier retardation is to be rigorously denied. We have all sinned, thinking that the sovereign Demos could speed up the festival calendar if it saw fit. There is no evidence that this power was ever exercised. This fact must

<sup>10</sup> *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, II (Leipzig, 1911), p. 350: "Die Massregel, welche tief in dem vieljahrhundertjährigen Gebrauch, das Jahr mit dem *Hekatombaion* anzufangen, einschnitt, konnte sich in offiziellen Dokumenten nur einige Zeit erhalten."

<sup>11</sup> The name of the intercalated month Hadrianion is known to have persisted at least to the very late second century (*I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2103, line 17 and *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 2112, restored in line 30).

<sup>12</sup> See *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, pp. 253-254.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 170, for the year 218/7.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 167-169.

be made quite clear, for we have all, at one time or another, maintained the contrary. Some of the evidence must be sifted again. Two documents, in particular, must be subjected to review.

The first case in point is the calendar equation of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 974 of the year 137/6. I have recently treated this elsewhere<sup>15</sup> to show that the calendar equation as published in the *Corpus* is correct for an ordinary year which was made intercalary (as the evidence of the coins demands) by the addition of a second Gamelion. There is no need to assume any omission of days from the festival calendar.

The second case where preliminary omission has been assumed is more complex. Years ago Pritchett and Neugebauer proposed for *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 448B of the year 318/7 the calendar equation

$$\text{Maimakterion (V) [16] = Prytany [IV]{2}5 = 133\text{rd day.}^{16}$$

It was their belief that the year was ordinary and that the first three prytanies, as would have been normal, were of 36 days each. The count of days, therefore, down to the time of the equation, was  $36 + 36 + 36 + 25 = 133$ . To make this possible they assumed an error on the part of the stonemason, who wrote the date within the prytany as 35 rather than 25. But even so the equation cannot stand, for the count in the festival calendar yields 134 days, and not 133, according to their restoration.<sup>17</sup> Four months plus 16 days in the fifth month make 134, no matter how the first four months were distributed. To reduce this figure to the 133 required by the prytany count one must assume that three of the first four months each had only 29 days. This is a calendrical solecism which reflects the erroneous tenet of Pritchett and Neugebauer that the lengths of the months were determined empirically, each individually by the visibility of the new crescent moon.<sup>18</sup> There is no Athenian year in which two, or perhaps three, hollow months of 29 days followed consecutively, though in their restoration of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 448B Pritchett and Neugebauer must tacitly have made this assumption.

I have dealt with this year elsewhere, unsuccessfully as I now believe, for I was finally forced to suggest the omission of days in the festival calendar which had to be compensated by additions later.<sup>19</sup> This is the type of solution which I here combat. The calendar equation of this inscription must be studied again, as also indeed the calendar of the whole year, with better attention to the ascertainable epigraphical facts. It is helpful to know that the date by month can now be read as ε[ν]η[ι καὶ νέαι]. My examination of the stone in 1958 was directed solely to the decipherment

<sup>15</sup> *Αρχ. Έφ.*, 1973, pp. 243-244.

<sup>16</sup> *Calendars of Athens*, 1947, p. 64.

<sup>17</sup> For the impossibility of this direction of variance see above.

<sup>18</sup> Pritchett and Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

<sup>19</sup> *The Athenian Year*, p. 56, note 29, and finally *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 254.

of what could be seen in this critical passage, and I was assisted by Chr. Karouzos, the Director of the National Archaeological Museum, who kindly made the stone available to me in the unfinished rooms of the upper museum and by my colleague M. Mitsos, the Director of the Epigraphical Museum.<sup>20</sup>

So it is best to go back to the text as inscribed and to assume no stonemason's error in it. This is a return, essentially, to Eugene Schweigert's publication of 1939, in which he argued for an intercalary year.<sup>21</sup> The evidence, indeed, leaves no alternative. The equation for Maimakterion comes to the 149th day and calls for regular prytanies of 38 days each, one of the normal arrangements in an intercalary year. The count by month falls one day short, and it must be assumed that somewhere before the time of the equation a day had been added to the festival calendar with the resultant retardation of one day. This is a common direction of variance, quite permissible, and directly the opposite of the variance of one day tacitly assumed by Pritchett and Neugebauer and of four or five days assumed by me when we thought that the year was ordinary. The text of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 448B, lines 35-38 is to be read as follows:

Ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκ[αμαντίδος τετάρ]  
της πρυτανείας ἢ Θέρσιππος Ἴππο[...<sup>6</sup>... Κολλυτε]  
ὺς ἐγραμμάτευε· Μαιμακτηριῶνος ἔ[ν]η[ι καὶ νέαι πέν]  
πτεὶ καὶ τριακοστὴ τῆς πρυτανείας[ς· τῶν προέδρων]

The other inscriptions of the year now fall into place in the intercalary year. Oliver's text of *Hesperia*, IV, 1935, pp. 35-37, no. 5 could read as follows (lines 1-3), with a stoichedon line of 87 letters and with syllabic division at the ends of the lines:

Ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππου ἄρχοντος [ἐπὶ τῆς Κεκροπίδος ἕκτης πρυτανείας  
ἢ Θέρσιππος Ἴππο...<sup>6</sup>... Κολλυτεὺς ἐγραμμά]  
τευεν· Γαμηλιῶνος ἔνει [καὶ νέαι ἐβδόμει καὶ δεκάτει τῆς  
πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν <sup>υ υ υ</sup>  
Γλαύκιππος Δεκελεὺς [καὶ συμπρόεδροι <sup>υ</sup> ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι <sup>υ</sup>  
.....<sup>27</sup>..... εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ]

If the spelling *πρυτανείας* instead of *πρυτανείας* be allowed in line 1, as it was in fact used in the inscription from the same day which appears here immediately below, then the stoichedon line may have been of 86 letters and only two uninscribed spaces need to be assumed at the end of line 2. I know of no way to decide between these alternatives, as other lines of the inscription offer no compelling evidence.

The day was the 207th day of the year. The inscription published in *Hesperia*,

<sup>20</sup> The report of my reading is in *T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, p. 254.

<sup>21</sup> *Hesperia*, VIII, 1939, p. 34.

VIII, 1939, pp. 31-32 was passed on the same day and should be restored with the same calendar equation, as follows, with a stoichedon line of 23 letters:<sup>22</sup>

Ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππ[ου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τ]  
 ἦς Κεκροπίδ[ος ἕκτης υυ πρυταν]  
 έας ἦι Θ[έ]ρ[σιππος Ἴππο. . . . .]  
 [. Κ]ολλυ[τ]ε[ὺς ἐγραμμάτευε· Γα]  
 5 μηλι[ῶνο]ς [ἔνει καὶ νέαι, ἐβδό]  
 [μ]ει καὶ δε[κάτει τῆς πρυτανε]  
 [ίας· ἐκ]κλ[ησία· τῶν προέδρων ἐ]  
 [πε]ψήφισ[εν Γλαύκιππος Δεκε·]  
 ἔδοξεν τῶ[ι δήμωι· . . . .<sup>8</sup>. . . . Π]  
 10 [ο]λυκρίτο[υ . . . .<sup>9</sup>. . . . εἶπεν·]  
 etc.

It has been suggested that these last two inscriptions could not have been passed on the same day because the chairmen of the proedroi were different.<sup>23</sup> This need not have been the case. In the latter decree no letters of either the name or the demotic of the chairman have been preserved, and it is quite possible that the demotic was abbreviated, as was frequently done in this period.<sup>24</sup> It will be noticed that even the orators of the two texts may have been the same, and I have accordingly indicated the length of the orator's name in the wider text as 27 letters.

The text of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 350 was assigned by Schweigert to the year 318/7 and accepted by Pritchett and Neugebauer as for the 227th day of the year,<sup>25</sup> though they warn that the decree may possibly belong in 331/0 or even in some year in the period from 318 to 308. I too have accepted this text as of 318/7,<sup>26</sup> but in view of the fact that 318/7 is now determined to be an intercalary year and in view of the span of the political activity of its orator, Polyuktos son of Sostratos of Sphettos, the better date is 331/0, as indeed Kirchner, following Ferguson, suggested in his publication in the *Corpus*.<sup>27</sup> The removal of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 350 from 318/7 eliminates the necessity of assuming that the year, though begun as intercalary and with full knowledge from the beginning that it was to be so, failed to intercalate a second Posideon and

<sup>22</sup> An instructive comment on line 2 will be found in Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1968, p. 113. See also *The Athenian Year*, pp. 126-127.

<sup>23</sup> Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, p. 64.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 332, 336, 360, 383, 502 (ten times), and twice in *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 431.

<sup>25</sup> Pritchett and Neugebauer, *Calendars of Athens*, p. 65.

<sup>26</sup> *The Athenian Year*, p. 127.

<sup>27</sup> The text of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 363, which I had assigned to 331/0 (*The Athenian Year*, pp. 88-90) belongs in 335/4 (*T.A.P.A.*, XCV, 1964, pp. 213-217). Hence its date in the month Anthesterion offers no conflict with Anthesterion of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 350.

delayed its intercalation (irregularly) until, as Schweigert thought, a second Gamelion.

The calendar of the year may be restored with a regular progression of months and prytanies, as follows:<sup>28</sup>

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

Other examples of calendar irregularity attributable to supposed omission of days have in the course of time been eliminated. The epigraphical texts and an alleged testimonium from Aristotle (*'Aθ. Πολ.*, 40, 1) have been treated by me, with a general discussion, elsewhere.<sup>29</sup>

The way is now clear to accept as valid the evidence of the prytany inscription with which this present discussion started that the Hadrianic Year was still in effect at that date in the third century to which the inscription has been assigned (A.D. 209/10). Of incidental interest is the observation that in this text two early epigraphists, Pittakys and Fourmont, whose evidence has often been disparaged, have provided the most reliable readings and made possible the solution of a difficult chronological problem.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN, TEXAS

<sup>28</sup> For all the long prytanies at the end of the year see the example of *I.G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 449 (Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 130 with note 78).

<sup>29</sup> *'Αρχ. Έφ.*, 1973, pp. 243-244.