

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

February 1937

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by Malcolm Francis McGregor entitled Kleon and the Athenian Calendar.

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

W. T. Seawright

KLEON AND THE ATHENIAN CALENDAR

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School

of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1947
UNIVERSITY
by

Malcolm Francis McGregor

B. A. University of British Columbia 1930

M. A. University of British Columbia 1931

UMI Number: DP15922

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform DP15922

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

FOREWORD

The idea of a dissertation of this type was first suggested to me by the late Allen Brown West, professor of ancient history at the University of Cincinnati. It was through Dr. West that I became interested in the chronology and inscriptions of the fifth century B. C., and with him I discussed, at one time or another, most of the problems treated in this thesis. The first part of the dissertation, indeed, was prepared for publication under his eye. The second half, though not actually written before Dr. West's death, grew out of our work together and should therefore be regarded as produced under his direction. My debt to Mr. West, not only for the training and experience gained during the preliminary stages of this dissertation, but also for the many advantages, academic and otherwise, that I enjoyed through the privilege of his friendship, is beyond estimation.

In the actual composition of part two I constantly received valuable help and advice from my friends John L. Caskey and Cedric G. Boulter, both of whom were generous enough to read my work carefully and suggest many corrections and improvements. To Aline Abaecherli Boyce I am also grateful for her constructive criticisms.

It happens that in both parts of this study it is

with the views of Professor Benjamin D. Meritt that I differ chiefly. Yet without his brilliant reconstruction of the pertinent inscriptions, and his consequent convincing analysis of the Athenian calendar and the chronological problems of the latter half of the fifth century, such studies as mine would scarcely be possible. It is with full realization of my obligations to Meritt, therefore, that I venture to combat his views concerning various details of a general scheme with which I am in substantial agreement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Page
Foreword.....	ii
List of Abbreviations.....	vi
Attic Months and Tribes.....	viii
1 Kleon, Nikias, and the Trebling of the Tribute.	1
2 The Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C. and the Last Campaign of Kleon.....	34
I. The First Cycle of Meton.....	34
II. The Problem of 422/1 B. C.....	38
III. The Evidence from Antiphon.....	43
IV. Kleon's Last Campaign.....	50
V. The Two First Secretaries.....	65
VI. Aristophanes and the Calendar.....	72
VII. The Julian Dates for Armistice and Peace	78
VIII. Chronological Tables.....	79
Bibliography.....	84

KLEON AND THE ATHENIAN CALENDAR

List of Abbreviations

A. F. D.	-	Athenian Financial Documents.
A. J. A.	-	American Journal of Archaeology.
A. J. P.	-	American Journal of Philology.
Ar.	-	Aristophanes.
Ach.	-	Acharnenses.
Ekkles.	-	Ekklesiastousai.
Equit.	-	Equites.
Nub.	-	Nubes.
Ran.	-	Ranae.
Vesp.	-	Vespaee.
Archons	-	Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age.
'Αρχ. 'Εφ.	-	'Αρχαιολογική 'Εφημερίς
Ath. Ass.	-	The Athenian Assessment of 425 B. C.
Ath. Cal.	-	The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century.
'Αθ. Πολ.	-	'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία.
C. P.	-	Classical Philology.
Cyr.	-	Cyropaedia (Xenophon).
F. H. G.	-	Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.
I. G.	-	Inscriptiones Graecae.
Monatsb. der Berlin Ak. d. W.	-	Monatsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.

- P. - Prytany.
- Plut. - Plutarch.
- Rev. Ét. Gr. - Revue des Études Grecques.
- Sitzungsb. d. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin - Sitzungsbe-
 richte der Königlich Preussischen Aka-
 demie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-
 historischen Classe,
- Thuc. - Thucydides.
- Xen. - Xenophon.

For further bibliographic information see the biblio-
 graphy, pp. 84-88.

Attic months

Hekatombaion
 Metageitnion
 Boedromion
 Pyanepsion
 Maimakterion
 Posideion
 Gamelion
 Anthesterion
 Elaphebelion
 Mounichion
 Thargelion
 Skiropherion

Attic tribes (in official order)

Erechtheis
 Aigeis
 Pandionis
 Leontis
 Akamantis
 Oineis
 Kekropis
 Hippothontis
 Aiantis
 Antiochis

PART ONE

1

Kleon, Nikias, and the Trebling of the Tribute

The Attic year 425/4 B.C., in which Athenian hopes were raised to great heights by the naval success at Pylos, and Spartan morale touched its lowest point, has always been of particular interest to students of Greek history. For it was during these months that the power of Kleon the demagogue, ever a fascinating figure even to his most scathing critics, reached its zenith. Nowhere is his policy better exemplified for us than in the contemporary document which provides for the trebling of the allied² tribute. In seeking an explanation for this tremendous increase in the obligations of the subject states, scholars have not been slow to grasp the significance of Kleon's whirlwind campaign at Pylos in the late summer of 425 B.C.

-
1. An abstract of this paper was read at the meeting of the American Philological Association at New York in December, 1935. It was later published in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXVI (1935), 146-164. Since that time has appeared a reply, "Pylos and the Assessment of Tribute," by H.T.Wade-Gery and B.D. Meritt, in A.J.P., LVII (1936), 377-394.
 2. Plut. Aristides 24. 3.

A detailed chronological study of the events of the first few months of the Attic year 425/4 B. C. is important, therefore, for the light it may shed on the successive political manoeuvres which resulted in such radical changes in the administration of the Athenian empire.

Such studies have, of course, been made, but renewed interest in the chronological complexities of that summer has been aroused by the recent publication of Meritt and West's restoration of the two assessment decrees and the appended list of the cities subject to tribute.³ As a result, both De Sanctis and Cavaignac have made subsequent contributions towards a solution of the puzzle presented by the dating of the decrees. In this paper, I shall attempt to show that, although certain of their conclusions cannot be reconciled with the evidence at our disposal, they have illuminated the problem with concrete suggestions, which, with a new interpretation of a passage in the second decree, lead to a happier solution than has heretofore been advanced.

The great stele bearing the assessment of 425/4 B. C. (I. G. 1². 63) includes, prefixed to the catalogue of the cities, two decrees. The first provides for the complicated

3. B. D. Meritt and A. B. West, The Athenian Assessment of 425/4 B. C. (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1934). For the text of the decrees cf. pp. 44-47; for the treatment of the problems discussed in this paper cf. pp. 52-57. I use this text throughout for references to the inscription.

procedure preliminary to the assessment, which must culminate in Posideion after representatives of each city had journeyed to Athens in Maimakterion, the previous month, to discuss the question of the tribute.⁴ There is also the stipulation that the measure shall be introduced into the assembly in the prytany ofís (Oineis or Aigeis), two days after the return of an expedition.⁵ But the prefix of the decree, on the other hand, shows that the probouleuma was ratified in the prytany of ...7... (Aiantis or Leontis).⁶ The second measure, prescribing the religious obligations of the allies, was passed in Aigeis.⁷

To complete our data, we must recall from the famous logistai inscription an item which is of paramount importance to our problem. A payment was made to Demosthenes in the fourth prytany of the year 425/4 B. C., and although the prytany name is missing, the spacing on the stone shows clearly that the tribe in office must have been Oineis or

4. Lines 18-19 χρεματίζεν δὲ περὶ τὸ φόρο εὐθύς ἀπὸ νομεύ[ας
κατὰ ταῦτα ἵνα ταχθῆ[ι] ἡ φόρος ἐν τῷ Ποσειδειῶνι μενί.

Lines 6-7 ἡούτῳι δὲ ἀνειπόντων ἐν τῷ κοινῷ ἡ[ε]κάστας τῆς
πόλεως παρῆναι πρέσβες τῷ Μαίμακτεριῶνος μενός.

5. Lines 33-35 ἐχρενεγκέτο δὲ ταῦτα ἐς [τὸν] δέμον [ἡ ...] ἡς
πρυτανεῖα ἐπάναγκες ἐπέδαν ἡέκει ἡ[ε] στρατιᾷ ἐς τρίτην ἡμέ-
ραν [πρῶτον] μετὰ τὰ ἰσρά.

6. Line 3.

7. Lines 54-58.

Aigeis, the only two names which satisfy the epigraphical demands.⁸

The problem to be discussed in these pages involves the dating of the documents within the year, the order and exact placement of the prytanies concerned, and consideration of the discrepancy betweenís, the stipulated date, and ...7..., the actual date of ratification of the first decree. There remains then the further question, whether the expeditionary force of the inscription can be identified.

Meritt and West, without attempting to identify this expedition,⁹ decide that its tardy return caused postponement of action by the demos from Oineis or Aigeis to Aiantis or Leontis, the following prytany. By adopting this explanation they are forced, by chronological demands, to the conclusion that Oineis, in which the probouleuma was drafted

8. For the most recent text of this important document (I. G. 1². 324) cf. Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1932), pp. 136-143. For Oineis or Aigeis cf. lines 18-19. Cf. also Meritt, The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1928), pp. 26, 91.

9. They prove, however, that it was not, as was once thought, the expedition of Demosthenes around the Peloponnese. Cf.

I. G. 1². 324. 18; Meritt, Ath. Cal. (see note 8 above), p. 91.

and should have been ratified, held the second prytany; that the unforeseen delay prevented the bill from reaching the ekklesia until the third prytany, Aiantis or Leontis; and that Aigeis, in which the second decree was passed, held the fourth prytany (cf. I. G. ² 1 . 324. 18-19 and see note 8 above).

10

De Sanctis ¹⁰ has offered a new interpretation of the evidence. He identifies the elusive expedition with Kleon's flying trip to Sphakteria ¹¹ and argues that the discrepancy in the dating of the first decree is due, not to a late arrival in Athens, but to Kleon's unexpectedly early return, ¹²

10. "La τάξις φόρου del 425 a. C.," Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione classica, XIII (1935), pp. 52-60.

11. Thuc. 4. 28. 4 (κλέων) ἔφη... ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν εἴκοσιν ἢ ἄξειν Λακεδαιμονίους ζῶντας ἢ αὐτοῦ ἀποκτενεῖν "Cleon gave his word that within twenty days he would either bring the Lacedaemonians alive or kill them on the spot" (Jowett).

12. Ibid. 39. 3 ἐντὸς γὰρ εἴκοσιν ἡμερῶν ἤγαγε τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὥσπερ ὑπέσθη "...for he did bring back the prisoners within twenty days as he had said" (Jowett). Here we have an exact limit for Kleon's absence from Athens (see note 11 above). It is to be noted that Thucydides does not record how many days Kleon had to spare when he sailed triumphantly into the Peiraeus with his captives. This is a natural omission, after all, when we consider the feelings which Thucydides obviously entertained towards Kleon, whom

which allowed the ratification of the probouleuma to take place in the prytany of its drafting, instead of in the succeeding prytany (Oineis or Aigeis), as originally scheduled. His reconstruction of events pictures the assessment decree rushed through the assembly in the first prytany, Aiantis Mr Leontis, on a wave of enthusiasm created by Kleon's astonishing but timely success and his consequent early reappearance in Athens before the end of the first prytany. De Sanctis then places the second decree, passed in Aigeis, in the fourth prytany (see p. 3 f. above).

The most recent discussion of the question, as far as I know, is that by Cavaignac,¹³ who, without knowledge of De Sanctis' paper, adopts the order of prytanies proposed by De Sanctis, though he numbers them differently. He argues further

he had no reason to admire or aggrandize. The historian does, however, give a day-by-day account of events in the region of Pylos after the arrival of Kleon, a study of which makes me fairly certain that the Athenian demagogue was actually on the spot for six days. We can estimate three days each way for the voyage between Athens and Pylos, for Kleon had every motive for unusual haste. This gives a total of twelve days during which Athens waited and wondered.

13. "L' Augmentation du Tribut des Alliés d' Athènes en 425," Rev. Ét. Gr. XLVIII (1935), pp. 245-249.

that the σφαριά of the decree was that which proceeded to the Korinthia under the command of Nikias, immediately after the affair of Pyles.¹⁴ Cavaignac denies that the word ταῦτα (i. e. the business which was to be submitted to the assembly by the prytany ofίς)¹⁵ refers to proposals embodied in the probouleuma (lines 4-33). Instead he believes that ταῦτα, used in the sense of τάδε, looks forward to the paragraphs of the decree (lines 40-51) which provide for action by the demos on certain matters not covered by the bill. In this way he is able to affirm that the probouleuma was drafted and ratified in the second prytany (Aiantis or Leontis); that the supplementary measures were approved by the demos according to schedule in the third prytany (Aigeis, possibly Oineis) after the return of Nikias; and that Oineis, possibly Aigeis, held the fourth prytany (see p. 3 f. above). He prefers Aigeis to Oineis as the third prytany because he thinks that the second decree, passed in Aigeis, followed closely upon the first. Thus, by giving to ταῦτα a proleptic meaning, he removes all the perplexity which has arisen from the mention of two different prytanies in the same decree.

De Sanctis' explanation of the difficulty is preferable to that proposed by Meritt and West, but in assigning the bill to the first prytany he has failed to note that the sec-

14. Thuc. 4. 42. 1.

15. Lines 33-35. For the text see note 5 above.

retary in office when the bill was passed wasov (line 3), whereas the secretary of the first prytany of 425/4 B. C. was Pleistias (line 59).¹⁶ This objection in itself, however, does not invalidate De Sanctis' identification of the expedition, since it is on totally inadequate grounds that he assigns the Pylos episode to the first prytany. In his chronological calculations he accepts the date P. VIII. 10, 425/5 B. C.,¹⁷ as that on which the final payment was made to Eurymedon and Sophokles on the eve of their departure for Sicily at the beginning of the summer,¹⁸ and places the capitulation of the Spartans beleaguered on Sphakteria a little more than three prytanies later,¹⁹ about P. I. 20-25. But these generals sailed during the Spartan invasion of Attika, before the grain was ripe,²⁰ a date which is usually and

16. Cf. also I. G. 1². 324. 17. De Sanctis, in his *Μετέπειτα φρονιδές*" Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione classica, XIII (1935), 508-510, has now recognized this difficulty. He therefore places the return of Kleon from Pylos and the passage of the bill in the second prytany. Otherwise, his views remain essentially unchanged.

17. I. G. 1². 324. 11-12. I use P. for Prytany, throughout this study.

18. Thuc. 4. 2. 2.

19. An estimate of something over three prytanies is probably quite accurate. See note 33 below.

20. Thuc. 4. 2. 1

reasonably placed in May, whereas P. VIII. 10 fell approximately March 21.²¹ In other words, De Sanctis' date for Kleon's return is well over a month too early. Thus, even though the assessment decree is dissociated from the first prytany, Kleon's expedition is equally so removed, and De Sanctis' identification remains to be tested. I shall now try to show that Kleon's Sphakterian success was actually an event of the past when the probouleuma was drafted and that for this cogent reason De Sanctis' thesis must be abandoned.

Despite the meagre nature of our chronological information concerning the crucial events of this summer, it may nevertheless be possible to obtain an approximate date for Kleon's triumph at Sphakteria and his subsequent return to Athens to enjoy the plaudits of his ultra-democratic sup-

21. Meritt's reconstruction of the Athenian calendar from 426 to 422 B. C., which De Sanctis deliberately disregards, is certainly correct within a very small margin of error. For all chronological synchronisms used in this paper cf. Meritt, A. F. D. (see note 8 above), pp. 176-179. It may be observed that, if the payment in the eighth prytany was actually made for the Sicilian enterprise, Pythodoros, who sailed before his colleagues (Thuc. 4. 2. 2; cf. 3. 115), must have been the recipient. A vanguard sailing early in March, about the time when navigation opened, would furnish proof to Athens' Sicilian friends that Athens meant to keep its promises (ibid. 3. 115. 3).

porters.

In the first place, since Nikias was general²² at the time of Kleon's well-known boast in the assembly, the debate could not have taken place before Hekatombaion 1. If we estimate Kleon's absence at twelve days (see note 12 above) as a minimum, then the earliest day on which he could have re-entered Athens was Hekatombaion 13, a date which I shall adopt, for the purpose of argument, as the earliest limit.²³ This can be equated with August 8 and P. II. 1.²⁴

At this juncture, Thucydides comes to our assistance with the information that before reinforcements under Kleon were voted, a very real alarm was prevalent in Athens, whose strategists feared that winter would overtake the besiegers and relieve the besieged at Sphakteria.²⁵ This fear, expressed forcibly and explained at some length by Thucydides, indicates that our limit, August 8, is certainly too early. A

22. Thuc. 4. 28. 2.

23. As a matter of fact, one can reasonably assume that between the debate and Kleon's sailing two or three days elapsed, during which Kleon mustered his troops.

24. I have assumed that the generals entered office on the first day of the civil year. The possibility of their having held office by the conciliar year does not affect my argument since any date previous to August 8 would be manifestly too early for Kleon's return.

25. Thuc. 4. 27. 1.

date nearer to September would conform better to the information vouchsafed by our chief source, for August 8 is based on the assumption that the debate in the assembly occurred at the end of July, at which time it would be difficult to believe that the Athenians were greatly disturbed by the imminence of winter.

An attempt to deduce the latest possible date for Kleon's return leads us back to the situation existing in mid-summer. The consternation caused at Sparta by the isolation of the Spartiates on Sphakteria was so great that the Spartans negotiated a truce, during which ambassadors to Athens sought to arrange a peace.²⁶ The truce lasted about twenty days²⁷ and came to an end after the ambassadors had returned to Pylos,²⁸ their mission, thanks to Kleon, a failure. Since the total length of the siege of Sphakteria was seventy-two days,²⁹ it follows that a state of war existed for fifty-two days, approximately forty-nine of which followed the truce.³⁰

26. Ibid. 15-16.

27. Ibid. 39. 2.

28. Ibid. 23. 1 ἀφικομένων δὲ αὐτῶν διελέλυτο εὐθὺς αἱ σπονδαί.

29. Ibid. 39. 1.

30. Immediately following the second sea fight, the Lakedaemonian disaster was reported to Sparta, whose magistrates journeyed to the scene of action. Thereupon, after perceiving

A chronological clue supplied by the scholiast to Lucian gives a terminus ante quem for the close of the Spartan negotiations in Athens.³¹ This commentator informs us that Kleon blocked the Spartan proposals for peace³² and that Euthynos was archon at the time. Thus the last possible day for the departure of the embassy from Athens was Skirophorion 29 (July 26), the final day of the civil year 426/5 B. C.

If we assume three days for the embassy to reach Pylos

the serious plight of their compatriots on Sphakteria, they arranged the truce (ibid. 15). For the report of the battle to reach Sparta and the officials to come to Pylos, before the armistice was drawn up, we can allow at least three days. So my timetable assumes three days of siege, twenty days of truce, and finally forty-nine days of war.

31. Schol. Lucian, Timon 30 (ed. H. Rabe) ἐπέστη δὲ καὶ τῇ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἰρήνῃ, ὡς Φιλόχορος (frag. 106, F. H. G., vol. 1, Müller) καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη (Equit. 794-796), προσθεὶς ἄρχοντα Εὐθύνου. Cf. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte III². 998, note 1; p. 1094, note 2. The passage from the Equites is as follows:

Αλ. (to Κλέων) Ἄρχεπτολέμου δὲ φέρουτος
τὴν εἰρήνην ἐξεσκέδασας, τὰς πρεσβείας τ' ἀπελαύνεις
ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ῥαθακυγίζων, αἱ τὰς σπονδὰς προκαλοῦνται.

32. This statement agrees fully with the narrative of Thucydides (4. 21).

and the truce to be declared at an end, and three days for Kleon's speedy return after the final victory of the Athenians, we have a total of fifty-five days in 425/4 B. C. down to the home-coming of Kleon from Sphakteria. Kleon's reentry into the city, therefore, fell not later than Meta-geitnion 25, which can be synchronised with P. III. 6 and September 19.

This tentative limit is made more precise by reckoning from the Spartan invasion of Attika at the beginning of the summer, before the grain was ripe. Various estimates, ranging from 100 to 110 days, have been made of the interval between the departure of Eurymedon for Sicily during the invasion and the return of Kleon to Athens after the Pylos affair.³³ If we use 115 days as the maximum and count back from September 19, our late limit as obtained above, we reach

33. De Sanctis allows twenty-five to thirty-five days from the sailing of Eurymedon (Thuc. 4. 2. 2) to the arrival of the relieving Spartan ships at Pylos (ibid. 8. 2). This figure, with the addition of the seventy-two days of siege and the time necessary for Kleon's trip home, gives 100-110 days. Busolt, op. cit. (see note 31 above), 1094, note 2, estimates the interval as 100 days, but it seems to me that in so doing he does not allow sufficient time for the battles which resulted in the isolation of the Spartiates on Sphakteria. For my timetable of events see Appendix A.

May 28 for the sailing of Eurymedon. This date, however, is roughly coincident with the Attic harvest, whereas a week or more after Eurymedon set out, the grain in Attika was still not sufficiently matured to provide the Peloponnesian troops with food. ³⁴ May 28, therefore, is clearly too late, and Eurymedon's sailing occurred with more probability about the ³⁵ middle of the month.

Eurymedon was driven into Pylos by a storm (Thuc. 4. 3. 1). This must have been the same storm which distressed the Peloponnesians in Attika and was a contributing factor to the subsequent early abandonment of the invasion (see note 34 above). The Spartans probably withdrew during the fortification of Pylos, that is, about ten days after the Athenian

34. Thuc. 4. 6. 1 ἄμα δὲ πρὸ ἐσβαλόντες καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἔτι χλωροῦ ὄντος ἐσπάνιζον τροφῆς τοῖς πολλοῖς, χειμῶν τε ἐπιγεγόμενος μείζων παρὰ τὴν καθεστηκυῖαν ὥραν ἐπίεσε τὸ στράτευμα.

35. Busolt (loc. cit.) gives May 3-10 for the sailing of the Sicilian squadron. Using this very reasonable conjecture, along with the maximum figure of 115 days as suggested above, we must date the return of Kleon from Pylos between August 25 and September 1 (P. II. 18-25). Since the approaching winter was a problem to the Athenians before the departure of Kleon, one can scarcely place his return earlier than the end of August, while it may well have been later. Cf. also op. cit. 1113, note 1.

fleet left the city. Since the invasion of Attika lasted in all fifteen days (Thuc. 4. 6. 2), we have another chronological check on Eurymedon's movements, and one which argues against placing his sailing later than May 15.

It is now clear that the limits which we have set, August 8 (P. II. 1) and September 19 (P. III. 6), are too early and too late respectively. In view of the governing factors supplied by the approaching winter on the one hand, and the sailing of Eurymedon on the other, I think that out of the maze of approximations inherent in our calculations, one fact emerges with considerable certainty --- that Kleon's part in the drama of Pylos was played in the second prytany of 425/4 B. C.

Now that we have a broad notion of the date of the return of Kleon, we must consider whether the general chronological relation between the probouleuma and the Pylos affair can be determined. If successful, we may find ourselves in a position to pronounce definite judgment on De Sanctis' identification of the anonymous expedition.

Although it is impossible to agree with De Sanctis that Kleon returned in the first prytany, still his hypothesis that the assessment decree was passed one prytany ahead of schedule is unaffected by the rejection of his chronological scheme. This hypothesis, furthermore, has the advantage of allowing us to take into consideration an important piece of evidence hitherto disregarded.

The body of the second decree, passed in Aigeis, begins as follows:³⁶ ἡποδοῦσαι πόλεις φόρος [ἐτάχθη ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἡῖ Πλειστίας] πρῶτος [ἐγραμμάτευε ἐπὶ Στρατοκλέος] ἄρχοντος βῶν καὶ πανήοιαν ἀπάγεν ἐς Παναθηναία τὰ μεγάλα ἡαπάσας. The restoration of the first clause, ἡποδοῦσαι... ἐτάχθη, when one considers what is actually to be read on the stone and the demands made by the formula immediately following, can be regarded as certain. The use of the aorist indicative ἐτάχθη seems to me to have a significance which has been overlooked. Meritt and West translate (p. 50): "All those cities assessed tribute...shall bring to the Great Panathenaia..." and assume that the aorist is written from the point of view of the future reader of the document. Consequently they have taken it for granted that the second decree antedates the completion of the assessment.³⁷ The translation ought then to be "such cities as may be assessed" (i. e. in the future). Normal Greek usage, however, expresses this future idea with ἄν and the subjunctive, a construction which is found with the same verb τάττω to express just such a future meaning, earlier in this very inscription.³⁸ Thus the aorist indicative must surely refer to the past,

36. I. G. 1². 63. 55-57.

37. As long as it was believed that passage of the bill was postponed from Oineis (Aigeis) to Aiantis (Leontis), no other interpretation was possible.

38. Line 23 ...τὸν φόρον] ἢὸς ἄν ταχθεῖ τῆ πόλει ἡεκάσται....

"whatever cities have been assessed tribute." In other words, at the time of the passage of the second decree the assessment was a completed fact.³⁹ Now the actual assessment, the details of which demanded much complicated preparation, did not reach its culmination until Posideion,⁴⁰ which, therefore, could not have postdated the prytany of Aigeis. From the logistai inscription, however, we have long known that Oineis or Aigeis held the fourth prytany.⁴¹ As a logical consequence, since Aigeis was one of the last six prytanies of the year, as pointed out above,⁴² Oineis must have been the fourth.⁴³ It will be remembered that the probouleuma,

39. The fact that the list of cities is inscribed directly after the second decree is some confirmation of the view adopted above. "Whatever cities have been assessed tribute... (They are as follows---)."

40. I. G. 1 . 63. 19. See p. 3 f. and note 4 above.

41. I. G. 1 . 324. 18 f. See p. 3 f. above.

42. In this year Posideion can be equated approximately with P. V. 26-VI. 18.

43. The significance of the form ἐτάχθε has more recently been perceived by Nesselhauf, Gnomon XII (1936), 296-301, in a review of Meritt and West. Nesselhauf's general conclusions, however, are quite untenable, as Meritt will show in a forthcoming paper.

according to De Sanctis, though providing for action in the next prytany (Oineis or Aigeis), was really ratified in the prytany of its drafting (Aiantis or Leontis). Aiantis or Leontis, therefore, the prytany immediately preceding Oineis,⁴⁴ was the third.

With the Pylos affair assigned to the second prytany and the assessment decree to the third, it now becomes evident that the expedition of the decree cannot be identified with the troops under Kleon which sailed home from Pylos. Thus De Sanctis' identification, so attractive dramatically but in fact untenable, must be discarded.

The only other expedition of this summer which can be connected with the assessment decree was that of Nikias, who, immediately after the Pylos episode, invaded the Korinthia with a large force.⁴⁵ The fact that Nikias returned to Athens after a very brief absence, having accomplished nothing of importance, accords well with the supposition that he terminated his campaign somewhat earlier than was planned.⁴⁶ It

44. For a table showing the order of events see Appendix B.

45. Thuc. 4. 42. 1 τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους μετὰ ταῦτα εὐθὺς Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς τὴν Κορινθίαν ἐστράτευσαν.

46. From the narrative of Thucydides (4. 42-45), it is difficult to estimate Nikias' absence at more than four or five days. When we contrast the brevity of the campaign and the ineffective skirmishing in which it indulged with the size of the armament, the conclusion is forced upon us that Nikias

seems extremely likely, therefore, that Cavaignac's identification of this expedition is right.⁴⁷

contemplated more than he accomplished. The troops levied by Nikias consisted of eighty ships, two thousand Athenian hoplites, two hundred cavalry, and allied contingents from Miletos, Andros, and Karystos (ibid. 42. 1). Nikias' progress can be followed day by day until the fortification of a post on the isthmus of Methana (ibid. 45). The length of time spent on this project is uncertain, but since the Athenians were undisturbed, two or three days would have been ample.

47. For a just consideration of so subjective a matter as Cavaignac's interpretation of the word $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ in the first assessment decree (see p. 6 f. above), the reader really needs a complete text of the document before him. Such a theory as Cavaignac advances cannot be logically or factually disproved. I can only say that to me his thesis appears extremely unlikely. Apart from the fact that lines 33-40, immediately following $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, deal with penalties to be inflicted on incompetent officials and that specification of the duties of the taktai, to which Cavaignac would refer $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, follows only after this interval in the text, such an interpretation is an unnatural and difficult rendering of the Greek and one that does not conform to the usual simplicity of fifth century epigraphic documents. It might be added that $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ is normally recapitulatory, although this is a point which one would hesitate to press in view of the elas-

Although Thucydides states that the expedition to the Korinthia sailed immediately after the Pylos incident, it should not be taken for granted that Nikias left the city directly after the return of Kleon to Athens. As a matter of fact, a whole chapter of narrative intervenes in Thucydides between the arrival of Kleon and the departure of Nikias.⁴⁸ When the initial flag-waving was over, the Athenians had to settle down to sober deliberation concerning the disposition of the prisoners and the means of retaining their held on Pylos. A garrison was established, consisting in part at least of a force of raiders despatched to Pylos by the Messenians in Naupaktos for the purpose of harrying the Spartans, their traditional foes. The latter, adopting a policy dictated by desperation, kept sending embassies to Athens in the vain hope of recovering Pylos and liberating the Spartiates now incarcerated in an Athenian prison.

The lack of a time indication in Thucydides for these negotiations is partly balanced by a reference in Aristophanes, who inveighs against the Athenians for three times

ticity displayed in the use of the demonstrative.

48. Thuc. 4. 41. In chapters 39 and 40 Thucydides sums up the Pylos story down to the return of Kleon with his prisoners, mentioning the duration of the siege and the effect of the Spartan capitulation on the Greek world. Chapter 41 resumes the narrative of events after Kleon's return, while 42 introduces the venture of Nikias into the Korinthia.

refusing in the assembly to accept peace proposals after the
 victory of Pylos. ⁴⁹ The inference to be drawn from a joint

49. Ar. Pax 665-667 (the reference is to Eirene),

ἔλθοῦσά φησιν αὐτομάτη μετὰ τᾶν Πύλω
 σπονδῶν φέρουσα τῇ πόλει κίστην πλεον
 ἀποχειροτουηθῆναι τρίς ἐν τῆμκλησίᾳ.

The use of the phrase μετὰ τᾶν Πύλω, coupled with the specific mention of three negative votes (cf. Thuc. 4. 41. 3 f. οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι...ἐπρεσβέοντο παρ' αὐτοῦς...καὶ πολλάκις φοιτῶντων αὐτοῦς...ἀπέπεμπον Ἄθηναῖοι), convinces me that the reference is to the frequent embassies sent from Sparta after the final surrender of the unfortunate Spartans, and not to the one embassy despatched from Pylos itself after the isolation of the Lakedaimonians on the island earlier in the summer (ibid. 16: see p. 11 above). τὰ ἐν Πύλω, to Aristophanes, meant not the blockading of the Spartans, but the sensational fulfillment of Kleon's mad boast. The Equites, which deals with τὰ ἐν Πύλω, emphasizes particularly the fact that Kleon was enjoying the glory that rightfully belonged to Demosthenes. Aristophanes' interest in Pylos was not the siege of the Spartans but the part played by Kleon, his special bête noire, in the final victory. The passage that I have quoted from the Equites (see note 31 above) could be assigned to either occasion of course. I prefer to refer it to the earlier embassy because in it Aristophanes berates Kleon specifically for blocking peace proposals and

perusal of Thucydides (see note 49) and Aristophanes is

because Thucydides also singles out the demagogue as the leader of the war party at that time (Thuc. 4. 21), when, perhaps, Kleon's imperialistic harangues and insidious methods were particularly obnoxious to more conservatively minded Athenians, who had not as yet had their spirits bolstered by the heartening success at Sphacteria. Later, although the influence of Kleon and his associates must have been strong, the Athenians, with Spartan prisoners in the city, needed less incitement to continue the war and press their advantage. So, when alluding to the unavailing attempts of the Spartan embassies to come to terms, neither Thucydides nor Aristophanes connects the Athenian attitude with Kleon primarily. Cf. Thuc. 4. 41. 4 οἱ δὲ μείζονων τε ὠρέγοντο καὶ πολλάκις φοιτῶντων αὐτοὺς ἀπράκτους ἀπέπεμπον. The passage from the Pax, on the other hand, leaves no room for ambiguity, if we are to take seriously the language of the poet, and place any reliance upon Thucydides' use of the imperfect ἐπρεσβεύοντο "they kept sending embassies," together with his explicit mention of more than one Spartan delegation. The scholiast to Aristophanes (ad Loc.) wrongly identifies the reference, quoting Philochoros (frag. 105, see note 31 above) on the previous Spartan overtures. He also seems to understand the passage as connected with discussion in the boule, a palpable error (see line 667). A second scholiast, however, gives an accurate note on the passage,

that the negotiations were lengthy.

Although the Spartans persisted in their pleas for an unspecified period, the Athenians, spurred on by Kleon's flamboyant success, were adamant, and eventually convinced the suppliants that their efforts were useless and dismissed them empty-handed. ταῦτα μὲν τὰ περὶ Πύλου γενόμενα writes Thucydides at this point,⁵⁰ dropping the curtain on the drama of Pylos.

In view of the immediate consequences of the Sphakterian victory as sketched above, it is hardly possible for Nicias to have sailed less than a month after Kleon's reappearance in the city.⁵¹ Thus, when Thucydides introduced a new topic,

also citing Philochoros, Busolt erroneously follows the first scholiast (op. cit. 1097, note 1).

50. 4. 41. 4.

51. Busolt (op. cit. 1113, note 1) thinks that at least three weeks were necessary to assemble a force as imposing as that under Nicias. He places the departure of Nicias about the middle of September, though he suggests the beginning of the month for the return of Kleon (but see note 35 above). To me it seems unlikely that Nicias' foray into the Korinthia was even contemplated before the overwhelming success of Kleon at Pylos had demonstrated the efficacy of a method of attack which established garrisoned posts in hostile territory. The expedition of Nicias can be consid-

μετὰ ταῦτα εὐθὺς, he had in mind not the return of Kleon, which had taken place four or five weeks previously, but the whole course of events concerning Pylos (τὰ περὶ Πύλου γυνόμενα), which were not concluded until the final dismissal of the Spartan envoys. If, for the sake of argument, we place the return of Kleon during the first week of September, then we must assume that Nikias sailed about the second week in October. It happens that the Eleusinian mysteries of 425/4 B. C. were celebrated during this week and Nikias may well have been disinclined to leave Athens with so large a body of men before the festival.⁵² Then, according to our theory, he returned within a few days, at the very end of the third prytany.⁵³

ered as an attempt to emulate Kleon while at the same time exploiting further this type of offense.

52. The Eleusinian mysteries began on Boedromion 16, which for 425/4 B. C. can be equated with October 9 and P. III. 26. Cf. L. Deubner, Attische Feste (H. Keller, Berlin, 1932), 72. The Julian date checks neatly with the estimate we have made of the interval between the return of Kleon and the departure of Nikias.

53. Nikias could not have left Athens until towards the end of a prytany, since the name of the tribe to hold the next prytany was not known until shortly before it entered office. Cf. W. S. Ferguson, The Athenian Secretaries (Cornell Studies

The campaign of Nikias can be linked chronologically with the operations of the Athenians in Korkyra. During the celebration of victory in Athens, the Sicilian squadron under the command of Eurymedon and Sophokles had apparently remained at Pylos, patrolling the vicinity and awaiting relief. Thucydides mentions the establishment of a garrison

in *Classical Philology*, no. VII, New York, 1898), pp. 20-26; M. Brilliant, *Les Secrétaires Athéniens* (Champion, Paris, 1911), p. 23 f. Ferguson has proved convincingly that the prytany order was not determined at the beginning of each year but that sortition for office took place toward the end of the prytany preceding that for which the lots were to be cast. Such evidence as we have at our disposal, chiefly epigraphic, fixes the thirtieth day of the prytany as the terminus post quem (*I. G.* II-III². 109; Ferguson, *op. cit.* 21). This is as far as our present knowledge allows us to go. It is rash to assume that the name of the succeeding prytany was not known three or four days in advance. There is no reason why the probouleuma should not have been drafted as late as the day before Nikias made his unexpected return, say P. III. 34, after the lot for the following prytany had fallen to Oineis. Then if Nikias appeared on P. III. 35, the demos ratified the bill on P. III. 37. This chronological scheme agrees well with the date suggested by the Eleusinian festival (see note 52 above).

on Pylos but does not tell us when the fleet continued its interrupted journey to Korkyra. ⁵⁴ After his description of the Korinthian campaign, however, Thucydides continues ⁵⁵ κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον, καθ' ὃν ταῦτα ἐγίγνετο, καὶ Εὐρυμέδων καὶ Σοφοκλῆς, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ τῆς Πύλου ἀπήραν ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν ναυοὺν Ἀθηναίων, ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Κέρκυραν ἐστράτευσαν.... The arrival of the fleet in Korkyra, then, occurred within a week or ten days, either way, of Nikias' invasion of the Korinthia.

On the third day of the fourth prytany (Oineis) of the year, a payment of money was made to Demosthenes for operations around the Peloponnese. ⁵⁶ Of this expedition nothing further is known, but Meritt, ⁵⁷ equating the date with October 23, ⁵⁸ suggests that Demosthenes led this force to relieve Eurymedon and Sophokles at Pylos and allow them to continue their journey to the destination which had been

54. In 4. 41. 2 the Athenians τῆς Πύλου φυλακὴν κατεστήσαντο, but this tells us nothing of the movements of the Sicilian squadron.

55. Ibid. 46. 1.

56. I. G. 1². 324. 18...στρατηγοῖς περὶ Παλοπόννησον Δεμ[ο]σθ[έν]ει....

57. Ath. Cal. (see note 8 above), p. 91.

58. I adjust the figures to accord with Meritt's revised tables. See note 21 above.

their goal since they left Athens in May. For the relieving troops to reach Sphakterian waters and the fleet to make Korkyra we must allow a week or ten days. This would place the beginning of military operations in Korkyra towards the end of October, about a fortnight after Nikias' scarcely jubilant return to Athens. We have no means of deciding whether Meritt is correct in thinking that Eurymedon and Sophokles stayed at Pylos until the arrival of Demosthenes, but, if his hypothesis is accepted, dating such as I have proposed does no violence to the chronological tags used by Thucydides for transitional purposes.⁵⁹

59. I think it more likely that Eurymedon and Sophokles left Pylos earlier and that they reached Korkyra before the expedition of Nikias left Athens. I find it difficult to suppose that the fleet, with winter looming and the long journey to Sicily in prospect, idled at Pylos longer than was absolutely necessary. The campaign undertaken on behalf of the Korkyraian democrats must have lasted a full fortnight and probably longer. If Eurymedon awaited Demosthenes at Pylos, we are forced to place the voyage to Sicily in November, a most unlikely season for such a journey. Yet the destination of Demosthenes could scarcely have been anywhere but Pylos, and the dating accords well with our analysis of the situation at Athens which led to the Korinthian undertaking. As the expedition to Sicily had been delayed for

Now that we have demonstrated that the assessment decree was passed in the third prytany, after Nikias' return to Athens, De Sanctis' analysis of the antecedent political situation falls to the ground. The decree was not passed on the wave of enthusiasm which followed Kleon's victory at Pylos. On the contrary, it was preceded by the failure of Nikias to accomplish in the Korinthia what Kleon had done on the west coast of the Peloponnese. Kleon's party had been in the ascendant since his triumph at Sphacteria, and his influence was undoubtedly enhanced by Nikias' futile attempt to counterbalance his rival's recently acquired prestige. Nikias' influence, then, might well have been insufficient to prevent the imposition of new burdens upon the allies. It should be noted, however, that the assessment decree itself

various reasons since May, it is perhaps not so difficult as it at first appears, to assume an additional hindrance and prolong its crossing to Sicily into the middle of November. Demosthenes, however, was perhaps sent to Pylos, not to free Eurymedon, but to take charge of a garrison which had previously been installed, and to bring food and supplies for the ensuing winter. Whatever be the solution of the problem, which does not primarily concern us, I think I have shown that the chronology which we have endeavoured to establish for the Kleon affair does not run contrary to the evidence of Thucydides.

contains nothing to which Nikias and the moderates could have objected. It decided neither the amount of tribute nor the rate of increase. These details were left to the taktai, assisted by the boule and special courts.⁶⁰ The fate of the empire, therefore, was determined in the period which followed the passage of the decree. The events leading up to its adoption are important only in so far as the bill may be considered indicative of its sponsors' intention to hoodwink public opinion into thinking that, by ratification of the decree, Athens was committed to no new policy. And after his own striking success and Nikias' dismal failure, Kleon had an easy path to tread.

60. I. G. 1². 63. 8-22.

Appendix A.

I give below my estimates of the elapsed time from the sailing of Eurymedon to the return of Kleon:

DAYS

To the arrival of Eurymedon at Pylos..... 4

Thuc. 4. 3. 1. There is no need to assume undue haste on the part of Eurymedon, and so his journey may well have taken longer than that of Kleon later in the summer.

The Athenians idle on Pylos..... 3

Ibid. 4. 1. Demosthenes, after his failure to convince the Athenian generals of the advisability of fortifying Pylos, ἡσύχαζεν ὑπὸ ἀπλοΐας, μέχρι αὐτοῖς τοῖς στρατιώταις σχολάζουσιν ὀρμὴ ἐνέπεσεν περιστάσιν ἐκτειλίσαι τὸ χωρίον.

Fortification of Pylos..... 6

Ibid. 5. 2. τειχίσαντες...ἐν ἡμέραις ἕξ.

To the assembling of the Peloponnesians at Pylos..... 20

When the Peloponnesians invading Attika heard of the seizure of Pylos, they hastened home. The Spartans set out for Pylos at once but the allies were slow in answering the call and the Spartan fleet had to be summoned from Korkyra (ibid. 8. 1 f.). From the completion of the fortifications to the muster of all the Peloponnesian forces at Pylos, three weeks is scarcely too large an estimate.

Preparations for battle.....	2
<u>Ibid.</u> 8. 4 ff.	
First battle.....	<u>2</u>
<u>Ibid.</u> 13. 1. ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τῆς ὑστεραίας μέρος τι προσβολὰς ποιησάμενοι ἐπέ- κυντο.	
Further manoeuvres.....	<u>1</u>
<u>Loc. cit.</u> καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ....	
Second battle.....	<u>1</u>
Siege.....	<u>72</u>
Thuc. 4. 39. 1.	
Kleon's voyage home.....	3
Total.....	<u>114</u>

I have placed in italics the figures which are either mentioned explicitly by Thucydides or which can be ascertained without doubt from his narrative. Of the estimated numbers, that which is most open to question is, of course, the twenty days assumed for the assembling of the Peloponnesian contingents at Pylos. There may be some significance in the fact that Diodoros records that Demosthenes fortified Pylos in twenty days (12. 61.

1) ἔχων δὲ τότε καὶ ναῦς πολλὰς καὶ στρατιώτας ἰκανοὺς, ἐν ἑἴκοσιν ἡμέραις ἐτείχισε τὴν Πύλον. Obviously, Diodoros' account cannot be accepted

against the testimony of Thucydides at face value. I can suggest two possible explanations. First, Diodoros (or rather, his source) may have counted his twenty days from the beginning of the fortification of Pylos to the mustering of the Peloponnesians ready for battle. In this case my estimate, which allows a total of twenty-six days for the same developments, is a few days too high. Secondly, Diodoros' story may quite reasonably reproduce a calculation reckoned from the sailing of the Athenian fleet to the completion of the fortifications, e. g. "Sailing with a large force, in twenty days he had fortified Pylos." This is the interpretation which I prefer. If it is correct, then the figures in my table above are rather low. If the words of Diodoros are to be considered at all, and if the truth lies in a choice between the two explanations which I have offered, then 115 days seems a fair mean.

Appendix B.

I give below a table of events which are closely connected chronologically with the exploit of Kleon and the assessment decree. It must be understood that the dates do not claim to be exact but are purely exempli gratia. I assume arbitrarily that Kleon returned on September 7, about

the time suggested by the evidence as presented in this paper, and obtain the other figures accordingly.

P. II,	1	Hek.	13	Aug.	8	
	17	Hekl	29	Aug.	24	Debate in the <u>ekklesia</u> . Kleon's boast.
	20	Met.	2	Aug.	27	Kleon leaves Athens.
	23	Met.	5	Aug.	30	Kleon arrives at Pylos.
	26	Met.	8	Sept.	2	Victory of the Athenians on Sphakteria.
	28	Met.	10	Sept.	4	Kleon leaves Pylos.
	31	Met.	13	Sept.	7	Return of Kleon to Athens.
P. III,	1	Met.	20	Sept.	14	
<u>Aiantis</u> or <u>Leontis</u>	18	Boed.	8	Oct.	1	(Arrival of Eurymedon in Korkyra?)
	26	Boed.	16	Oct.	9	Eleusinian mysteries begin.
	30	Boed.	20	Oct.	13	Sailing of Nikias.
	34	Boed.	24	Oct.	17	Drafting of <u>probouleuma</u> .
	35	Boed.	25	Oct.	18	Return of Nikias.
	37	Boed.	27	Oct.	20	Ratification of the <u>pro-</u> <u>bouleuma</u> by the <u>demos</u> .
P. IV.	1	Boed.	28	Oct.	21	
<u>Oineis</u>	3	Boed.	30	Oct.	23	Payment to Demosthenes.
	10	Pyan.	7	Oct.	30	(Arrival of Eurymedon in Korkyra?)

PART TWO

The Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C.
and the Last Campaign of Kleon

I. The First Cycle of Meton

Students of the Fifth century Athenian calendar will recall that Meton's first nineteen year cycle extended from 432/1 B. C.¹ to the end of 414/3 B. C. and, according to plan,² should have contained seven intercalations.³ Meritt,

1. Diodoros 12. 36.

2. Geminos 8. 53-6; Censorinus 18. 8.

3. All modern work on the Athenian calendar must start from Benjamin D. Meritt, The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1928), an exhaustive study of I. G. 1². 324. The most lucid analysis of Meton's cycle is that of William Bell Dinsmoor, The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1931), 309-343. Meritt's most recent revision is in Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1932), 128-179, including tables. Except where otherwise stated, it is these tables which I use throughout for the synchronisms cited in the text. The abbreviation P. represents Prytany.

after establishing a definite synchronism,⁴ P. I. 1 = Hek. 10, 422/1 B. C., demonstrated convincingly that the period from 432/1 to 422/1 B. C. included three intercalations.⁵ Thus we should expect four further intercalations between 422/1 and the end of the cycle in 414/3 B. C.

For 411 B. C. we are fortunate in possessing a certain synchronism, provided by Aristotle's Constitution of Athens:⁶ P. I. 1, 411/0 = Skir. 14, 412/1 B. C. Between the two equations mentioned, therefore, there are eleven intervening years:-

$$\begin{array}{l} 422/1 \text{ B. C.} \quad \text{P. I. 1} = \text{Hek. 10,} \quad 422/1 \\ 411/0 \quad \quad \quad \text{P. I. 1} = \text{Skir. 14,} \quad 412/1. \end{array}$$

It is obvious that during this eleven year period in the civil calendar from Hekatombaion 1, 422/1, to Hekatombaion 1, 411/0, there must have been four or five intercalations. Four intercalations would give a total of 4014 days⁷ whereas five intercalations yield a sum of 4044 days.⁸ It is now

4. Ath. Cal. (see note 3), 84 f.

5. Op. Cit. 86-88. Cf. Dinsmoor, Archons (see note 3), 327.

6. 'Αθ. Πολ. 32. 1 ἔδει δὲ τὴν εἰληχυῖαν τῷ κυάμῳ βουλήν εἰσιέναι τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα Σκιροφοριῶνος. Dinsmoor, Archons, 328 f., rejects this evidence; but see Meritt, A. F. D. (see note 3), 154-156.

7. $(7 \times 354) + (4 \times 384)$.

8. $(6 \times 354) + (5 \times 384)$.

possible to deduce the exact length of the conciliar calendar over the same length of time by subtracting the first nine days of Hekatombaion, 422/1, and the last sixteen of Skirephorion, 412/1, from the figures given above for the civil calendar. The result is 3989 or 4019 days, from which we can calculate an average senatorial year of $362 \frac{7}{11}$ or $365 \frac{4}{11}$ days. But Meritt has already shown⁹ that the term of the boule approached the solar year in length and averaged $365 \frac{1}{2}$ days. The unavoidable conclusion is that of the two averages given above, $365 \frac{4}{11}$ must be right and that, as a result, the eleven year span saw five intercalations.

The above calculations take us two years beyond the end of the first Metonic cycle, but epigraphic evidence gives us a point of departure in 414/3 and enables us to establish the character of 413/2 and 412/1 B. C. From I. G. 1². 328 we know¹⁰ that in 414/3 both the seventh and twenty-fifth of Gamelion fell in the seventh prytany. Now from P. VII.1, 414/3, to P. I. 1, 411/0, we can reckon twenty-four prytanies, which, with $36 \frac{1}{2}$ days as the average prytany length, totalled 876 days. Again, if both 413/2 and 412/1 were ordinary years, then Gam. 1, 414/3, to Skir. 14, 412/1 (P. I. 1, 411/0), covered sixteen days short of thirty months, that is,

9. Ath. Cal., 104.

10. Op. cit. 95; A. F. D., 156 f.; Meritt, "The Spartan Gynopaidia," C. P., XXVI (1931), 71; Dinsmoor, Arenens, 342.

869 days. In other words, P. VII. 1, 414/3 B. C., fell about Posideion 23 and the demands of I. G. 1². 328 are satisfied. On the other hand, if one of the intervening years was intercalary the length of the same period is increased to 899 days. But the latter supposition places Gam. 7, 414/3, in the sixth prytany and is therefore impossible, since it contradicts our data. It follows then that the period in question contained 869 days and that 413/2 and 412/1 must be restored as ordinary years.

The significance of this computation lies in the fact that, if there were five intercalations between 422/1 and 411/0, and 413/2 and 412/1 were ordinary, then there must of necessity have been five intercalations between Meritt's equation¹¹ of 422/1 and the end of the first cycle of Meton. In other words, the first Metonic cycle was irregular, in that it actually contained eight and not the theoretical seven intercalations planned by its constructor.¹²

11. See p. 35 above.

12. Meritt, Ath. Cal., 103. Dinsmoor, Archons, 328, disagrees but Meritt, A. F. D., 154-158, has convincingly demonstrated the fallacy of Dinsmoor's argument. It is, of course, obvious that my paper thus far is merely a summary of Meritt's work. Cf. Ath. Cal., 84 f., 93 f., 115 (table); A. F. D., 155-157, 176 and 178 (tables).

II. The Problem of 422/1 B. C.

The crucial problem of the first Metonic cycle in Athens lies in the correct placement of these five intercalations, but it is with one year only, 422/1 B. C., that I propose to deal here. Meritt, restoring 422/1 as intercalary, gives the following scheme for the period from 425/4 to 421/0 B. C.:¹³

<u>Year</u>	<u>Intercalation</u>	<u>P. I. 1</u>
425/4	0	<u>Skir.</u> 5
424/3	0	<u>Skir.</u> 19
423/2	0	<u>Skir.</u> 29
422/1	I	<u>Hek.</u> 10
421/0	0	<u>Skir.</u> 22

It seems to me, however, that the evidence at our disposal would be better satisfied if 422/1 were restored as ordinary. Such a thesis demands a re-examination of Meritt's reasons for making 422/1 intercalary and a consideration of the historical events pertinent to our enquiry.

Meritt rests his case upon the following foundations:

1. The three years previous to 422/1 were ordinary, as Meritt has proved beyond reasonable doubt. A further ordinary year in succession, it is implied, is highly incredible.¹⁴

13. A. F. D., 176, 178. Dinsmoor, Archons, 331, agrees.

14. Ath. Cal., 104.

2. Thucydides gives two synchronisms between the Athenian and Spartan calendars:-

Athenian Elaphebolion 14 = Spartan Gerastios 12, 424/3 B. C.¹⁵
Elaphebolion 25 = Artemisios 27, 422/1 B. C.¹⁶

These figures prove an irregularity, and therefore intercalation, at either Athens or Sparta in one of the two years 423/2 and 422/1. Meritt places the intercalation at Athens and thus, reverting to Hermann¹⁷ against Boeckh,¹⁸ makes Gerastios precede Artemisios at Sparta.¹⁹

3. Antiphon's sixth speech (περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ) gives an apparent synchronism between the conciliar and civil calendars in some unknown year.²⁰ Meritt, by an interpretation to be discussed at length below,²¹ draws the equation P. I. 36 = Met. 21, therefore P. I. 1 = Hek. 16. Meritt's reconstruction of the calendar, with 422/1 as intercalary, makes

15. Thuc. 4. 118. 12; 119. 1.

16. Thuc. 5. 19. 1.

17. Ueber Griechische Monatskunde (Göttingen, 1844), 124.

18. "Zur Geschichte der Mondcyclen der Hellenen," Besonderer Abdruck aus den Jahrbüchern für classische Philologie, N. F. Bd. I, Heft 1, 86-92 (Leipzig, 1855).

19. Ath. Cal., 111 f.; A. F. D., 146-149.

20. Antiphon 6. 44-45; cf. 11, 13; Meritt, Ath. Cal., 121 f.; A. F. D., 153 f.

21. See below pp. 43-50.

P. I. 1 = Hek. 16 in 419/8 B. C.,²² an exact correspondence with the figures taken from Antiphon; this dates the speech in 419/8 B. C. and corroborates Meritt's calendar scheme.

4. According to Meritt, Kleon set out for Thrace after the Pythian festival of 422/1,²³ a celebration which fell in the Delphic month Boukattios,²⁴ generally equated with the Athenian Metageitnion.²⁵ The scholiast to Aristophanes' Pax tells us that Kleon perished at Amphipolis eight months before the production of the Aristophanic play at the Great Dionysia of Elaphebolion, 422/1 B. C.²⁶ Thus, by inclusive reckoning, Kleon's death may be placed in Metageitnion or Boedromion, according as 422/1 was ordinary or intercalary. If Kleon left Athens after the Pythian games, however, that is, late in Metageitnion, then his death cannot have occurred before Boedromion because of the time necessary for his operations in Thrace.²⁷ Therefore the battle of Amphipolis,

22. See the tables in A. F. D., 176.

23. Thuc. 5. 1; 5. 2. 1; Meritt, Ath. Cal., 114.

24. Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie, "Delphoi," IV. 2532; A. Kirchhoff, Monatsb. der Berlin Ak. d. W., 1864, 229 ff.

25. Meritt, loc. cit.

26. The scholiast (edited Dindorf) to Pax 48 quotes Eratosthenes: 'Ερατοσθένης γὰρ ἐπὶ Θράκης τὸν θάνατον Βρασίδου καὶ Κλέωνος ὀκτὼ μῆσὶ προγεγονέναι φησὶ.

27. For Kleon's activity in the north cf. West and Meritt,

in which Kleon met his death,²⁸ was fought in Boedromion, a conclusion which, according to the above reasoning, once more implies intercalation in the year 422/1 B. C.

If we are to make 422/1 ordinary, then our first task is to assure ourselves that the consequences are not at variance with the historical evidence cited by Meritt. The important points in Meritt's argument are the synchronism drawn from Antiphon, and the evidence advanced from Thucydides' report of the end of the truce and the subsequent departure of Kleon from Athens. The first two links in Meritt's chain are in fact quite negligible if we can break the last two. For a sequence of four ordinary years is by no means incredible²⁹ when we bear in mind that even three successive ordinary years formed an irregularity in Meton's plan.³⁰ We know of one irregularity in the form of three

"Kleon's Amphipolitan Campaign and the Assessment List of 421," A. J. A. XXIX (1925), 59-69.

28. Thuc. 5. 10. 9.

29. See p. 38 above.

30. Meritt, Ath. Cal., 101 f.; A. F. D., 150 f., 177; Dinsmoor, Archons, 320 f. Both Meritt and Dinsmoor point out that intercalation was not decided scientifically but was entirely at the whim of the state.

consecutive years, 425/4, 424/3, and 423/2, without intercalation; we cannot, therefore, without convincing proof, ignore the possibility of further abnormality.³¹ Again, I cannot be convinced that the evidence from the Spartan calendar is at all conclusive as to the nature of 422/1 in Athens. Meritt is compelled to change the order of the Spartan months. If, however, the intercalation occurred at Sparta and 423/2 and 422/1 were ordinary at Athens, then Artemisios preceded Gerastios at Sparta and the Thucydidean equations can still be reasonably explained; for we have no independent testimony to decide the problem of the Spartan months. Considered alone, the Thucydidean equations are at least open to either interpretation.

To proceed constructively, I shall now assume that 422/1 B. C. was ordinary and I shall test that assumption by all the evidence bearing on the problem. I give below a table of correspondences resulting from the restoration of 422/1 as an ordinary year:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Intercalation</u>	<u>P. I., 1</u>
425/4	0	<u>Skir.</u> 5
424/3	0	<u>Skir.</u> 19
423/2	0	<u>Skir.</u> 29
422/1	0	<u>Hek.</u> 10
421/0	I	<u>Hek.</u> 22

31. Cf. the years 413/2 to 410/09 (Meritt, A. F. D., 176).

32

III. The Evidence from Antiphon

From this speech we gather that a member of the first prytany, Erechtheis, has been indicted for murder, after serving all but two days of his term, *πρυτανεύσας τὴν πρώτην πρυτανείαν ἅπασαν κλῆν δυοῖν ἡμέραιν.*³³ It is clear then that the indictment was made on the day before the last of the prytany, namely, P. I. 35, 36, or 37, according as we assign thirty-six, thirty-seven or thirty-eight days to the prytany. But the speech also gives civil dating for the indictment of the accused, the whole passage running as follows:³⁴ *ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὕτως ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσῆλθεν ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀρχαμένοις τοῦ ἑκατομβαιῶνος μηνὸς τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας συνεχῶς τούτων ἢ τινι ἐβούλοντο ἀπογράφεσθαι ἀπεγράφοντο οὐδεμίᾳ· καὶ αὖθις τοῦ μεταγειτνιῶνος μηνὸς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀρχαμένοις ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς ἀπογράφεσθαι ἢ τινι ἐβούλοντο, οὐδ' αὖ πω ἐνταῦθα ἀπεγράψαντο, ἀλλὰ παρεῖσαν καὶ τούτου τοῦ μηνὸς εἴκοσιν ἡμέρας· ὥστε αἱ σύμψασαι ἡμέραι ἐγένοντο αὐτοῖς πλέον ἢ πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐν αἷς ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς ἀπογράψασθαι οὐκ ἀπεγράψαντο.*

32. See p. 39 f. above.

33. Antiphon 6. 45.

34. Ibid. 44.

Meritt, arguing³⁵ that the phrase πλέον ἢ πεντήκοντα is a rhetorical exaggeration, draws from the passage the equation P. I. 36 = Met. 21. But let us pause a moment and consider. Thirty days of Hekatombaion and twenty of Metageitnion had passed, a sum total of fifty. Yet the Greek text gives this total as "more than fifty" (αἱ σύμματα ἡμέραι ἐγένοντο...πλέον ἢ πεντήκοντα). Can this be accepted, that is, can we equate "fifty" with "more than fifty?" To my mind, the whole tone of the passage is one of the utmost accuracy and this prevents us from falling back on "rhetorical exaggeration" as a means of fitting an impossible text into any calendar scheme. For an impossible text I believe it is, despite past efforts to accept and interpret the Greek as it stands.³⁶

35. Ath. Cal., 121.

36. There are six manuscripts of Antiphon: N, A, B, L, M, Z. It has been shown by Blass that only N and A are of any independent value since the other four are derived ultimately from A. N. and A probably go back to a common archetype. In the crucial sections of the passage under discussion there is no textual variation, that is, εἴκοσιν ἡμέρας (ἡμέραις N, corr. A) and πλέον ἢ πεντήκοντα are the readings of the mss. See Blass, Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta (Leipzig, Teubner, 1871), iii-xviii; Gernet, Antiphon (Paris, Budé, 1923), 16-25; Thalheim, Antiphontis

Meritt, however, was not the first to attempt to justify the equation in the text, for Wilamowitz³⁷ had already grappled with the same problem. He first changed πλέου to πλεῖν but his interpretation of the phrase πλεῖν ἦ is curious, for he affirms that πλεῖν ἦ πεντήκοντα means "just

Orationes et Fragmenta (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914), v-vii.

Certain critics have favoured emending πλέου to πλεῖν (Franke is cited in the 1914 Teubner edition). Liddell and Scott, s. v. πλείων, cite πλεῖν, nominative and accusative singular neuter for πλέου, as especially Attic but only with numerals. Instances of this usage are printed (Ar. Ach. 858, Equit. 444, Av. 6; Demosthenes 570. 16 etc.) but at the same time examples of πλέου with numerals are given (Xen. Cyr. 2. 1. 6; Isaios 82. 14; Demosthenes 744. 23. In the latter case Dindorf has unnecessarily emended to πλεῖν, though πλέου is found in S, a good ms.). Smyth, Greek Grammar for Colleges, 1074, seems to make no difference between the forms. We should then retain the πλέου of the mss.

37. "Die sechste Rede des Antiphon," Sitzungsb. d. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1900, 398-416. See especially 408 f. It is interesting to note that Wilamowitz, on stylistic and linguistic grounds, dates the speech at the end of the Archidamian war, perhaps a little later (p. 409).

exactly fifty" (πλεῖν ἢ... bedeutet nicht "mehr als" sondern "voll, accurat, effectiv"). Thus he manufactures for himself an exact chronological synchronism. For this usage Wilamowitz brings forward as parallels certain expressions which I here quote:

(a) Ar. Ach. 858 πλεῖν ἢ τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκδύτου. This Wilamowitz renders as "volle 30 Tage im Monat."

(b) Ar. Nub. 1065 πλεῖν ἢ τάλαντα πολλά. This expression is interpreted as "many complete talents," on the ground that the Greek makes no sense otherwise.

(c) Ar. Ran. 103 πλεῖν ἢ μαίνομαι. "I am quite mad" would be the translation here, if I understand Wilamowitz correctly. Otherwise, he asserts, the clause is nonsense.

(d) In the frequent πλεῖν ἢ μύριοι "absolutely uncounted" or "a whole million" is superior to "more than ten thousand," states Wilamowitz. In Demosthenes 19. 230 Wilamowitz admits³⁸ that the latter meaning is correct, but adds that in this passage πλεῖν is read by one manuscript only, the others giving πλέου.³⁹ Wilamowitz then draws the conclusion that when the true comparative was meant πλεῖον

38. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 409, n. 2 "In recht vielen Fällen ist eine sichere Entscheidung unmöglich."

39. As a matter of fact πλεῖν appears to be the reading of the good ms. S, while A gives πλέου and V, Y and P πλείους. See Fuhr's Teubner text of 1914 and his introduction.

was used, as in Ar. Ekkles. 1132.⁴⁰ My own feeling is that Wilamowitz bases his case essentially upon his refusal to grant to Aristophanes, and presumably to any other ancient writer, a sense of humour. For in every case cited the Greek not only can but must be recognized as pure exaggeration, a common form of exaggeration not confined to Athenian comic poets and orators, or to the ancient world at all.⁴¹ The English phenomenon, the man who works twenty-five hours a day, offers an exact parallel to Aristophanes' πλεῖν ἢ τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκάστου. Similarly, when Aristophanes wrote πλεῖν ἢ μαίνομαι he meant just what the Greek says and it was with deliberate intent that he avoided the simple mild expression. If he had wished to write "I am quite mad" he would have done so; the Greek language offered no barrier. It happens, however, that Aristophanes was a comic poet, writing to amuse his audience. We have no right whatever to remove that humour and exaggeration, part of the comedian's stock-in-trade, merely because certain expressions, when interpreted seriously and literally, are nonsense; of course they are nonsense***they are meant to be.

40. Wilamowitz admits that he can produce no linguistic or grammatical explanation of his interpretation of πλεῖν ἢ. He cites J. Wackernagel, Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde, 18, a work to which I have not had access.

41. The fact that most of Wilamowitz' parallels are drawn from Aristophanes is suggestive, to say the least.

πλεῖν ἢ, therefore, means "more than" and must not be distorted to explain away the chronological paradox presented by the text of Antiphon. In any case, as I have already demonstrated,⁴² the text reads κλέου. If emendation is necessary, and I think it is, a change in the spelling of κλέου is no improvement. The essential difficulty remains. If we are to use the evidence of Antiphon in our calendar scheme, our first task must be to mend the text.

Obviously the trouble lies either in κλέου ἢ πεντήκοντα or in εἴκοσιν ἡμέρας, or in both, for these phrases must read in such a way that, when we take into account the thirty days of Hekatombaion, they balance each other. I can advance no plausible correction of κλέου ἢ πεντήκοντα⁴³

42. See note 36, page 45 above.

43. West felt that the phrase κλέου ἢ πεντήκοντα was corrupt. In talking over the problem with me he suggested that the text once read ην' and was incorrectly resolved into the written numerals (ἢ πεντήκοντα); κλέου was then added as an attempted correction. He would then have adopted the emendation I have proposed (εἴκοσιν ἡ' ἡμέρας) and would thus have had an exact correspondence (thirty days of Hekatombaion plus εἴκοσιν ἡ' ἡμέρας = ην'). I hesitate to adopt this further change; it seems to me that it would be difficult to find a convincing parallel for the numerals ην' (=fifty-eight) written in reverse order.

but I do suggest that Antiphon really wrote εἴκοσιν ἡ' ἡμέρας and that the numeral ἡ' dropped out by haplography before the following ἡμέρας. This slight correction, palaeographically simple, transforms the Greek from utter impossibility into a reasonable and understandable text.

Now we have πλέον ἢ πεντήκοντα balanced by thirty days of Hekatombaion added to εἴκοσιν ἡ' ἡμέρας of Metageitnion, that is, fifty-eight days. Our equation from Antiphon, then, will be P. I. 37 (36 or 35) = Met. 29. It follows that P. I. 1 = Hek. 23 (24 or 25). According to my table,⁴⁴ in 421/0 P. I. 1 = Hek. 22, an almost exact correspondence with the equation from Antiphon. The difference of a day or so need not be considered a stumbling block but rather the opposite, since we know that there were at this time certain minor calendar irregularities at Athens. Hence synchronisms obtained from actual evidence are more to be trusted than those we reach from our tables for these years.⁴⁵ In other words, I believe that we have here identical dates. A slight adjustment can now be made in my table to make P. I. 1 for 421/0 B. C. equal Hekatombaion 23 (or 24), a change which either increases the conciliar year 422/1 to 367 (or 368) days, or signifies that one or two months which should have

44. See p. 42 above.

45. See Meritt, A. F. D., 148-151, 177 and tables, 176, 178. Cf. also pp. 73, 79 below, notes 92, 105.

been full had recently been left hollow (see p. 73 below). If we assume that in 421/0 B. C. P. I. 1 fell on Hekatombaion 23, then the following conclusions can be deduced from Antiphon's sixth speech:

1. The speech dates early in 421/0 B. C.⁴⁶
2. The true reading in chapter 44 is εἴκοσιν ἡ' ἡμέρας.
3. The Thargelia mentioned (ch. 11) were celebrated in 422/1 B. C.
4. The first prytany of 421/0 B. C. contained thirty-eight days.
5. The general tone of the speech suggests a chorus of some adequacy. This would fit very neatly into the year of the peace of Nikias, which had been signed some two months before the festival of the Thargelia of 422/1 B. C.

IV. Kleon's Last Campaign

The question of intercalation in 422/1 is linked with the departure of Kleon from Athens to take charge of military operations in Thrace. This is usually dated in Metageitnion, after the Pythian games of 422 B. C., a date which, in my opinion, is based on a misinterpretation of the opening words of the fifth book of Thucydides. Meritt,⁴⁷ accepting

46. See note 37, p. 45 above.

47. See 40 above.

this understanding of Thucydides and counting the Aristophanic scholiast's statement⁴⁸ inclusively, must place Kleon's death in Boedromion, 422/1 B. C., for quite obviously the Athenian general could not have perished in Metageitnion, the very month in which he left the city. But to place Kleon's death as late as Boedromion Meritt is forced to make 422/1 intercalary. The crux of the problem, therefore, clearly lies in the actual words of Thucydides, upon the meaning of which all else depends. I now propose to reconsider the evidence of Thucydides which has led critics to accept the Pythian games as the terminus post quem for Kleon's departure from Athens.

Thucydides states⁴⁹ that Kleon left Athens μετὰ τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν. This ἐκεχειρίαν takes us back to the opening sentence of the book,⁵⁰ which reads as follows: τοῦ δ' ἐπιγυνομένου θέρους, αἱ μὲν ἐνιαυτοὶ σπονδαὶ διελέλυτο μέχρι Πυθίων καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκεχειρίᾳ Ἄθηναῖοι Δηλίουσ ἀνέστησαν. This passage has often proved difficult to editors and translators. The Loeb editor renders:⁵¹ "The next summer the year's truce continued till, and ended with, the Pythian games." In a footnote, however, there is offered a

48. Scholiast to Pax 48. See note 26, p. 40 above.

49. 5. 2. 1.

50. 5. 1. 1.

51. C. Forster Smith, vol. 3, p. 3.

variant, of which the editor does not approve: "The next summer the one year's truce was ended and the war was renewed until the Pythian games." Jowett agrees with the first interpretation and Meritt⁵² follows him in extending the truce to the time of the Pythia. Thus the ἐκεχειρία becomes the holy truce of the Pythian games. This the Loeb editor calls the natural interpretation of the Greek, a statement open to serious doubt.

If, however, the phrases ἐν τῇ ἐκεχειρίᾳ and μετὰ τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν refer back to the ἐνιαύσιοι σπονδαί, then Kleon is represented as having left Athens after the official termination of the truce, sometime after Elaphebolion 14,⁵³ 423/2 B. C. This terminus post quem for the departure of Kleon is earlier by about five months than that already mentioned, the Pythian festival of 422 B. C.

To me it seems impossible that the word ἐκεχειρία, in its present context, could be used of the holy truce. There is certainly no such indication in the text of Thucydides, and it would be perfectly reasonable to expect one, in accordance with his regular custom.⁵⁴ If Kleon really

52. Ath. Cal., 114.

53. Thuc. 4. 118. 12.

54. Whenever Thucydides writes of a holy truce, in existence for the duration of one of the great festivals, he always designates it as such. He never uses σπονδαί or ἐκεχειρία

left the city after the Pythia, then one would expect that fact to be stated definitely, as it is elsewhere, when the historian uses such chronological indications.⁵⁵

absolutely to mean a holy truce. Cf. 5. 49. 1-3 where an account is given of the dispute between Sparta and Elis which arose as the direct result of an alleged violation of the Olympic truce of 420 B. C. Here, it is true, σπονδὰς and σπονδαῖς are found without qualification but not before the author has introduced the topic by ἐν ταῖς Ὀλυμπιακαῖς σπονδαῖς; and the holy truce is the very point at issue, hence the unqualified use of the word. Cf. also 8. 9. 1 τὰς Ἰσθμιάδας σπονδάς; 8. 10. 1 τὰ Ἰσθμια ἐγένετο καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (ἐπηγγέλθησαν γὰρ αἱ σπονδαί) ἐθεώρουν ἐς αὐτά.

B alone of the mss. gives αἱ σπονδαὶ in this passage and is supported by P. Oxy. 1247 (The Oxyrhynchus Papyrus X [London, Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1914], p. 127). If αἱ σπονδαὶ is accepted, the context is quite sufficient to qualify the noun. Thucydides uses both words, ἐκεχειρία and σπονδαί, interchangeably of military and holy truces; cf. 5. 49. 1-3 (holy) and 4. 123. 1 (military).

55. Thucydides appears to have employed the great Panhellenic festivals as chronological pegs. The following, all his references to the games, will illustrate his usage: 5. 47. 10 τριάκοντα ἡμέρας πρὸ Ὀλυμπίων, 5. 49. 1 Ὀλύμπια δ' ἐγένετο...ἐν ταῖς Ὀλυμπιακαῖς σπονδαῖς, 5. 50. 5 μετὰ

This, I hope, clarifies Thucydides' usage and the meaning of ἐκχειρία. We can now study the passage from another point of view, namely, can the Greek words διαλύω and μέχρι bear the strain put upon them by the interpretation which we are here challenging?

The word μέχρι means "until" and can quite properly be used of time. In passing let us observe that the translation disputed makes μέχρι mean "until after," and for this I can find no authority. Or perhaps the commentators take for granted a ἱερομηνία which is not mentioned by

τὰ Ὀλύμπια (all the foregoing refer to the Olympic festival of 420 B. C.); 3. 8. 1 ἦν δὲ Ὀλυμπιάς, 3. 8. 2 μετὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν (festival of 428); 8. 9. 1 πρὶν τὰ Ἴσθμια... τὰς Ἴσθμιάδας σπονδάς, 8. 10. 1 τὰ Ἴσθμια ἐγίγνετο, 8. 10. 2 μετὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν (Isthmian celebration of 412). Thucydides does not mention the Nemean games and the passage under discussion contains his only allusion to the Pythia. If he had meant "after the Pythia" here, he would surely have written μετὰ τὰ Πύθια or μετὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν, for this was his regular custom in dealing with the festivals; he anticipates the celebration, then records its actual occurrence, and finally writes down what took place after the festival. Cf. 5. 75. 2 and 5. 76. 1 for his similar treatment of the Karneia.

Thucydides; but this is far too difficult.

The verb διαλύω means "to put an end to," "to part asunder," "to break off," and is equivalent to the Latin dissolvere, dirimere. All derived senses of the verb can be traced back to this original meaning. So αἱ σπονδαὶ διελέλυντο must be rendered "the truce had come to an end." The whole clause αἱ μὲν...Πυθίων can mean only "the year's truce had been broken off and remained so until the time of the Pythian games" ---the natural and logical interpretation. It follows that from the end of the truce (Elaphebolion, 423/2) to the beginning of the Pythia (Metageitnion, 422/1) there existed a state of war, terminated by another cessation of hostilities, a holy truce, lasting for the duration of the festival. The festival over, the state of war resumed.

The chief difficulty, apparently, the reason for evolving from the passage a meaning exactly contrary to that intended by Thucydides, lies in the fact that a pluperfect (διελέλυντο) is immediately followed by an aorist (ἀνέστησαν).

Now the perfect stem of a Greek verb denotes action completed with permanent result. So the pluperfect, the past or secondary tense of the perfect system, presents action in the past, the effects of which continued. As an instance, ἤνθηκει means "had bloomed and was in flower," a past action continuing with more or less permanent re-

sult.⁵⁶ διελέλυντο μέχρι Πυθίων,⁵⁷ then, implies that the truce had come to an end and remained at an end until the time of the Pythian games.

Again, the pluperfect may be employed when an action occurred in the past so immediately or suddenly that it happened at almost the same time as another anterior action.⁵⁸ The aorist, on the other hand, merely denotes the occurrence of past action.⁵⁹ In view of these several considerations I suggest that the opening of the fifth book of Thucydides should be construed as follows: "In the following summer the year's truce was broken off and remained at an end until the Pythian festival; and (immediately preceding the end of the truce) during the truce the Athenians had expelled...." Thucydides opens by mentioning the end of the truce, the really important event of the spring, then retraces his steps momentarily to include in his account

56. Smyth, op. cit. (see note 36, p. 45 above), 1852 b, 1952.

57. Cf. Thuc. 4. 23. 1 for a similar use of the form: ἀφ-
κομένων δὲ αὐτῶν διελέλυντο (Cobet, for διελύοντο of the
ms.) εὐθὺς αἱ σπονδαὶ αἱ περὶ Πύθιον.

58. Smyth, op. cit. 1953; cf. Thuc. 4. 47. 1 ὡς δὲ ἐπέισ-
θησαν καὶ μηχανησαμένων τὸ πλοῖον ἐκπλέουτες ἐλήφθησαν,
ἐλέλυντό τε αἱ σπονδαὶ καὶ....

59. Smyth, op. cit. 1923.

the Athenian activity on Delos, which had slightly preceded the sundering of the truce.

I aver that the interpretation of this passage, quite apart from chronological and historical problems, but on purely linguistic grounds, must be as I have outlined it. We must now fit our chronology to Thucydides and not succumb to the allurements of forcing Thucydides to agree with our chronology.

I think it probable that in using the phrase μέχρι Πυθίων Thucydides had in mind the clause in the truce whereby the Delphic sanctuary was once more thrown open to the Athenians.⁶⁰ The implication is that so far during the war the Athenians had not enjoyed this privilege.⁶¹ After the termination of the truce, however, both sides leaned towards peace;⁶² it is for this reason unlikely

60. Thuc. 4. 118. 1 περί μὲν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ μαντείου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου δοκεῖ ἡμῖν χρῆσθαι τὸν βουλόμενον ἄδολως καὶ ἄδεως κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους.

61. Aristophanes' silence may be significant, in view of Vesp. 158 f., his only reference to Delphi:

ὁ γὰρ θεὸς
μαντενομένῳ μούχρησεν ἐν Δελφοῖς ποτέ.

It has already been remarked that 5. 1. 1 is Thucydides' sole mention of the Pythia (see note 55, p. 54 above).

62. Thuc. 5. 15-17.

that any Spartan influence at Delphi barred the Athenians from the festival of 422/1 B. C. Thucydides, therefore, pointedly refers to the Pythia, to accentuate Athenian participation.⁶³

The terminus post quem for Kleon's departure from the city is now established as Elaphebolion 14, 423/2, instead of the Pythia of 422/1. Kleon, therefore, may have been general in 423/2, an assumption for which we have no other evidence. This lack of corroboration, however, is inconsequential, since in any case we know definitely the names of only two generals for this year, Nikias and Nikostrates.⁶⁴ If Kleon was general in 423/2 then we may de-

63. Classen marks the text of Thuc. 5. 1. 1 corrupt and suggests that the Greek should read, e. g., ...αἱ μὲν ἐνι-
αὔσιοι σπονδαὶ διελέλυντο ἄλλαι δ' ἐπεγεγένηντο μέχρι
Πυθίων.... He believes apparently that the truce was pro-
longed by agreement until the Pythia, and refers the ἐκε-
χειρία to this further armistice. I find it difficult to
credit that such an extension would be dismissed so casual-
ly, to say nothing of my reluctance to obelize the passage,
except as a last resort. And, granting Classen his thesis,
what of the ἱερουμηνία (see p. 52 above)? Cf. J. Classen,
Thucydides, 3rd. ed., revised by J. Steup (Berlin, 1912),
note ad loc.

64. Thuc. 4. 129. 2.

duce that his command in Thrace was extended into the following year. On the other hand, it is just as possible that Kleon, after his election to the strategia for 422/1, persuaded the Athenians (Κλέων δὲ Ἀθηναίους πείσας... Thuc. 5. 2. 1) to allow him to depart for the Thraceward region before the official beginning of his term of office. Elaph. 14, 423/2, is to be equated with P. VII. 32,⁶⁵ a date which probably fell after the elections for the following year.⁶⁶ Kleon, therefore, at the time when the armistice ended, was in all likelihood general elect.

The activity of Kleon and his party in Athens at this time is to be closely connected with events in Thrace, where Skiene had revolted to Brasidas during the truce.⁶⁷ After the failure of Kleon's imperialistic policy, which finally came to grief at Delion,⁶⁸ the victor of Pyles was in ill repute at Athens.⁶⁹ The revolt of Skiene and the failure

65. Meritt, A. F. D., 176.

66. Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ. 44. 4.

67. Thuc. 4. 120. 1; 122. 3.

68. Winter, 424/3 B. C. (Thuc. 4. 89 ff.).

69. For a convincing analysis of Kleon's position in Athens during this period see West and Meritt, "Kleon's Amphipolitan Campaign and the Assessment List of 421," A. J. A. xxix (1925), 59-69; see particularly 59-62. Kleon's fall from favour and the odium which his policy was suffering

of Athens to recover the town immediately gave Kleon his great chance to recuperate his slipping fortunes. It was Kleon who urged the Athenians to destroy Skiene,⁷⁰ "posing henceforward as an ardent advocate of imperial defense against Brasidas."⁷¹

Waving the banner of Perikles, Kleon gradually regained his lost prestige and was elected strategos in the spring of 422. In the meantime the siege of Skiene had dragged on, the Athenian operations in Thrace against Brasidas having proved ineffectual.⁷² The stage was set perfectly for Kleon. He was general elect, the Athenians were worried about Skiene⁷³ and their Thraceward empire;

in 423 make it unlikely that he was strategos for that year. Therefore the second interpretation advocated in the body of this paper is probably the true one.

70. Thuc. 4. 122. 6 Κλέωνος γνώμη πεισθέντες. Note the use of πείθω and cf. 5. 2. 1.

71. West and Meritt, op. cit. (see note 69, p. 59 above), 61.

72. Operations against the rebellious Skiene began in the summer of 423, probably at the beginning of the Athenian year 423/2 (Thuc. 4. 129). The town was not finally taken until the summer of 421 B. C. (Thuc. 5. 32. 1).

73. At the Lensia of Gamelion, 423/2, Aristophanes' Wespae

here was the grand chance for the victor of Pylos to play in Thrace the part he had so successfully performed at Pylos, the scene of his greatest triumph.⁷⁴ The parallelism of the two situations is striking. All that remained was for Kleon to persuade the Athenians to send him Thracewards without waiting for the new strategie year--- and Pylos was his precedent. He could point to his highly satisfactory termination of the Pylos campaign, when he had actually fulfilled his mad promise;⁷⁵ from the point of view of the Athenians, Kleon's bravado had turned out advantageously once, why not again? Κλέων δὲ Ἀθηναίους πείσας ἐς τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης χωρία ἐξέπλευσε... (Thuc. 5. 2. 1).

If this is the truth, then the whole incident has the Kleon touch, familiar to us from the Pylos episode, where Thucydides treats events in some detail; and the

was produced. That the lengthy siege of Skione was a by-word in Athens this spring is suggested by lines 209 f.:

ὦ Δι' ἢ μοι κρεῖττον ἦν
τηρεῖν Σκιώνην ἀντὶ τοῦτου τοῦ πατρός.

74. For Kleon and Pylos see Thuc. 4. 27-39.

75. Thuc. 4. 39. 3 καὶ τοῦ Κλέωνος καίπερ μαυιώδης οὔσα ἡ ὑπόσχεσις ἀπέβη.

76

verb *πείσας* assumes a new significance.

It does not follow that Kleon left Athens immediately after his election. He was forced to win over the Athenians, to await the end of the truce and to obtain the necessary troops, money and supplies. Thucydides does not suggest haste---he merely writes *ἔξέπλευσε μετὰ τὴν ἐμεχειρίαν* (there is no *εὐθύς*). We know from the logistai inscription⁷⁷ that a payment of one hundred talents was made by the treasurers of Athens Polias this year on P. VIII. 25, a conciliar date which may be equated with Mounichion 15, one month after the armistice had come to an end. This sum is⁷⁸ suitable for an expedition such as that of Kleon and the season is opportune for the opening of military operations; should we assign this payment to Kleon for his campaign in Thrace?⁷⁹ In any case we may assume that Kleon left Athens

76. Cf. note 70, p. 60 above.

77. I. G. 1 . 324. 43 f.; Meritt, A. F. D., 139.

78. The payment of about eighteen talents (I. G. 1 . 324. 44-46; Meritt, loc. cit.) made on P. X. 3 (Skir. 6), although possible, is not equally suitable. It is rather small and it dates nearly three months after the end of the truce.

79. But see Wade-Gery and Meritt, "Pylos and the Assessment of Tribute," A. J. P., lvii (1936), 378 f. In writ-

some time before his legal term of office began, possibly late in Mounichion, 423/2 B. C.

It will be recalled that the Aristophanic scholiast places⁸⁰ Kleon's death in Metageitnion or Hekatombaion, according as we count inclusively or exclusively (reckoning 422/1 as ordinary). We know from Thucydides that the battle of Amphipolis was fought when summer was on the wane.⁸¹ Kleon's death, therefore, must be assigned to Metageitnion. This fits well enough with Thucydides' seasonal dating, for summer can draw to a close over a period of two or three weeks or more. When Thucydides writes τὸ θέρος ἐτελεύτα he means that the campaigning season was

ing of the payment of one hundred talents made in 426/5 Wade-Gery and Meritt remark "...the payment itself was merely part of the routine borrowing by the state from the treasure of Athena Polias. We know that similar loans of one hundred talents were made in the spring of 424, of 423, and of 422. There would doubtless have been the same loan of one hundred talents in 425 with or without Eurymedon's expedition...."

80. See note 26, p. 40 above. Meritt, of course, considering 422/1 intercalary, places Kleon's death in Boedromion (see pp. 40, 51 above).

81. Thuc. 5. 12.

almost over; he has no intention of indicating a fixed civil date, though the latter would tend to fall about the same time each year. Thus, if military operations concluded in any year somewhat earlier than usual, his chronological dismissal is still καὶ τὸ θέρος ἐτελεύτα.... the summer was drawing to a close.⁸²

Kleon then left Athens, let us say, late in Mounichion and died in the following Metageitnion, after an absence from Athens of about three months. Of Kleon's full activity in Thrace we cannot be sure for Thucydides probably neglects to tell the complete story.⁸³ It does not

82. It should be noted that in the clause τὸ θέρος ἐτελεύτα the verb is in the imperfect tense and must be translated "the summer was drawing to a close," to denote a gradual process over a period of time. The Loeb rendering ("and so the summer ended") is incorrect. Jewett's "and so the summer came to an end" is at least ambiguous, since it makes no distinction between aorist and imperfect. Thucydides never used the aorist ἐτελεύτησεν with τὸ θέρος. I hope eventually to make a special study of these chronological tags of Thucydides.

83. See Meritt and West, op. cit. (see note 69, p. 59 above), for a reconstruction based on the assessment of 421 B. C.

seem to me that three months is an overlong period to assign to the campaign in Thrace.⁸⁴

V. The Two First Secretaries

Indisputable epigraphic evidence can be cited to prove that in the archonship of Aristion, 421/0 B. C., there were two first secretaries to the boule at Athens. Difficulty arises when an attempt is made to fit their terms of office into the conciliar calendar.

I. G. 1². 311 is a record of receipts for the first fruits from Eleusis; its first preserved entry⁸⁵ is dated

84. There is always the possibility that the Delphic Boukaties did not correspond to the Athenian Metageitnien this year. Further, one must not overlook the admitted fact that the scholiast to Aristophanes is not an infallible source. These uncertainties, however, should not affect the analysis of Thucydides which I have developed here; and it is upon Thucydides, our best source, that we should build.

85. I reproduce the first half of the inscription as it is printed in the Corpus (editio minor). It is written sticheden, with thirty-two letters to the line:

in the civil year in which Aristion was archon and the conciliar year in which Prepis was first secretary (line 8 f.). I. G. 1². 370 unquestionably belongs to the fifth prytany, in the archenship of Aristion but during the boule for which Menekles was first secretary (line 5 f.).⁸⁶

Now the obvious conclusion to be drawn from the two inscriptions is that Prepis really held office in the first prytany of the conciliar year 422/1, which overlapped the civil year of Aristion, 421/0; and that Menekles entered office with the boule of 421/0, which functioned during

-
1. ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς, ἡῖι ...7... (πρῶτος) ἐγραμμάτευε, ἐπ' Ἀλκαῖο ἄρχοντος, ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσιν-
 ῶθεν, ἡοῖσι Φιλόστρατος Κυδαθηναιεύς,
 ἐγραμμάτευε, παρεδέχσαντο παρὰ ἡιερο-
 ποιῶν, Ἐλευσίῃνι19.....
 καὶ, χσυναρχόντων, ἀργύριον ἀπὸ τοῦ σίτου,
 τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τοῖν θεοῖν ...7... ἐπὶ τῆς,
 βολῆς, ἡῖι Πρέπιδος πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτευε, ἐ-
 π' Ἀριστίου ἀρχοντος, ἐπιστάται Ἐλευ-
 σινῶθεν, κτλ.

86. See also I. G. 1². 220 where Menekles is to be restored in the prescript, line 2 (cf. West καὶ Meritt, 'Ὁ Φορολογικὸς Κατάλογος τοῦ 421-0, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ. 1924, 48; Meritt, Ath. Cal., 113.

the major part of Aristion's archonship. A glance at my calendar (p. 42 above) will show that, with 422/1 restored as ordinary, the first day of the conciliar year 421/0 is equated with Hekatombaion 22; this was later adjusted to Hekatombaion 23 (p. 49 above). In other words, the last twenty-two days of the conciliar 422/1 fell during the civil year 421/0; that is, the demands of the epigraphic evidence are satisfied.

Meritt, however, restoring 422/1 as intercalary, equates P. I. 1, 421/0, with Skirepherion 22, 422/1 B. C.⁸⁷ It follows that, according to Meritt's scheme, Prepis and Menekles must both have been first secretaries for the same boule, 421/0. The epigraphic evidence, then, must be explained away. It is Meritt's view⁸⁸ that Prepis either died or was forced to resign, for some reason or other, early in the first prytany. The conciliar year now became that of Menekles, the successor to Prepis.

A further objection advanced by Meritt is that, if Prepis was first secretary for 422/1, then we have no receipts for the first fruits from Eleusis for 421/0, since in the inscription the year 420/19 follows immediately upon the year for which Prepis was eponymous secretary.

87. A. F. D., 176, 178.

88. Ath. Cal., 112-114.

Finally, Meritt believes that, even if Prepis did hold office for the conciliar 422/1, we should expect to find him dated (in line 8 f.) along with the archon for that year and not with Aristion, archon in the following year; this despite the overlapping of the conciliar 422/1 and the civil 421/0.

It may be said in reply to Meritt's first point that the first secretaries of the Athenian boule at this period were eponymous. It seems to me, therefore, that even if Prepis' term of office lasted for only a few days, if he died or resigned, the conciliar year would nevertheless have continued to bear his name, even after Menekles replaced him. Two eponymous secretaries for the same year would have added unnecessary confusion to an already complicated system of dating.

In the second place, it should be remembered that I. G. 1². 311, in the section which concerns us, is extremely fragmentary (see the text, note 85, p. 66 above). The entry or entries (for, so far as one can judge from the Corpus, there is no certainty that the account began in 422/1) above that for the archonship of Aristion are missing, except for a word or two, though a restoration is attempted in the Corpus. The previous entry, however, may well have been dated in the year of Prepis, but in the archonship of Alkaios, 422/1 B. C. If the payments recorded

in this inscription were made regularly, in Hekatombaion of each year, then they may be tabled as follows (I assume that the restoration in the Corpus is in general correct):

<u>Archon</u>	<u>Civil</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Concil.</u>	<u>First Secretary</u>
Alkaios	422/1	After <u>Hek.</u>	9 ⁸⁹	422/1	Prepis (line 1)
Aristion	421/0	<u>Hek.</u>	1-22	422/1	Prepis (8)
Astyphilos	420/19	After <u>Hek.</u>	3	420/19	Charinos (15)
Archias	419/8	After <u>Hek.</u>	15	419/89.... (22)

If this graphic representation is right, then it is clear that the annual payments were made quite regularly each year; there was no omission of a due instalment, despite the fact that two entries happened to fall in the one conciliar year 422/1 and none in the conciliar 421/0. If we are to accept the opening lines of the document, as supplemented in the Corpus, we must also restore the name Πρέπτις in line 1.⁹⁰ It is perhaps unsafe to deduce from the chart that the payments, if made on a definite day

89. The date of payment, of course, is governed by the day on which the opening of the new conciliar year fell. See my calendar, p. 42 above, for 422/1 and 421/0; and Meritt, A. F. D., 176 for 420/19 and 419/8.

90. It is obvious that, even if the Corpus restoration is nearly correct, there is some irregularity in the first line. The Corpus editor (Hiller von Gaertringen) assumes

each year, fell between Hek. 15 and Hek. 22, some ten days

that the word πρῶτος was omitted by error; this leaves seven letter spaces for the name of the first secretary. But Πρέπτις is one letter too short while the first secretary for the preceding year, Demetrios (I. G. 1². 324, line 37; Meritt, A. F. D., 139), is obviously out of the question. Some adjustment must therefore be made. Perhaps we can restore ἐ-πὶ in lines 1 and 2 in place of ἐπ' (line 2); thus we place an extra letter in the first line where Πρέπτις now fits the requirements of the stone. Yet in every other instance in this inscription ἐπὶ is elided before a following vowel (lines 9, 15, 22). Nevertheless, it is fair to cite the fact that the elision of παρὰ before ἱεροποιῶν in line 11 (where the restoration is certain) is contrary to the usage of the document (see lines 4, 18, 25). From this it would appear that the usage is not absolutely regular, and the hiatus ἐπὶ Ἀλκαῖο in lines 1 and 2 is not impossible. On the other hand it may be that there was some introductory formula to the inscription (cf. I. G. 1². 313); in that case there would be no objection at all to the presumption that a payment was made early in the year of Prepis, 422/1. It would be equally possible for that payment, if it fell before Hek. 10, 422/1, to have been made during the previous conciliar year, 423/2, which over-

before the Panathenaia and the beginning of the new financial year.

Finally, the very reason for the double dating of Attic inscriptions at this epoch is to be found in the fact that the civil and conciliar years were not coterminous. But Meritt, who in his Athenian Calendar convincingly and conclusively established the principle first advanced by Keil,⁹¹ appears to me to break it when he affirms that, if Prepis was secretary for 422/1, the archon for that year, Alkaios (not Aristion of 421/0), should have been cited in the prescript. If this were the case, there would have been no reason for the double dating, which existed for just such contingencies as this. Archon and first secretary did not hold office concurrently, and Prepis' conciliar year still had twenty-two days to run when Aristion assumed office for the civil year 421/0. The two dates were entirely separate and so we observe that by conciliar (or financial) dating, the second payment of I. G. 1². 311 occurred in the year of Prepis, while by civil dating (added for precision) the year was that of the archon Aristion. The clear cut distinction between the two forms of dating is all important. Each is correct according to its own system, even

lapped the civil 422/1 (see table, p. 42 above).

91. See bibliography in Meritt, Ath. Cal., 129.

though Prepsis' term of office expired in a few days.

Not to regard the epigraphic evidence as authentic is to disdain the gifts of providence. A calendar scheme which makes it necessary to ignore or explain away what amounts to a contemporary witness cannot be right; and the inscriptions form our most reliable guide. Only an ordinary 422/1 suits the evidence of the inscriptions.

VI. Aristophanes and the Calendar

If the year 422/1 is restored as ordinary the complaints of the gods, as represented by Aristophanes, can be viewed in a new light. I quote the Clouds, 615 ff.:

615. ἄλλα τ' εὖ δρᾶν φησιν. ὑμᾶς δ' οὐκ ἄγειν τὰς ἡμέρας
οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς, ἀλλ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω κυδοιδοπαῦν.
ὥστε ἀπειλεῖν φησιν αὐτῇ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐκάστοτε
ἡνίκ' ἂν ψευσθῶσι δείπνου, καὶ ἀπίωσιν οἴκαδε
τῆς ἐορτῆς μὴ τυχόντες κατὰ λόγον τῶν ἡμερῶν.
620. καὶ θ', ὅταν θύειν δέη, στρεβλοῦτε καὶ δικάζετε.
πολλάκις δ' ἡμῶν ἀγόντων τῶν θεῶν ἀπαστίαν,
ἡνίκ' ἂν πευθῶμεν ἢ τὸν Μέμνον' ἢ Σαρπηδόνα,
σπένδεθ' ὑμεῖς καὶ γελᾶτ', ἀνθ' ὧν λαχῶν Ἰκέρβολος
τῆτες ἱερομνημονεῖν καὶ ἔπειθ' ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν θεῶν
625. τὸν στέφανου ἀφηρέθη, μᾶλλον γὰρ ὅσῳ εἴσεται
κατὰ Σελήνην ὡς ἄγειν χρὴ τοῦ βίου τὰς ἡμέρας.

From 425/4 to 422/1 inclusive there had been no intercalation at Athens, a lapse which of itself would have been sufficient to throw the calendar out of norm by a month. I believe that Aristophanes, in the Clouds, was criticizing this error just as much as the discrepancy of a few days, which we know existed at this time, in relation to the true lunar month.⁹²

We know that the Clouds, although first produced at

92. Thucydides' dates for the signing of the armistice and the peace are sufficient evidence (see p. 39 above; Meritt, A. F. D., 148-150). There may also be some significance in the fact that Demosthenes miscalculated his assignation with Hippokrates in the winter of 424/3 by a few days (Thuc. 4. 89. 1 ...γενομένης διαμαρτίας τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐς ἃς ἔδει ἀμφοτέρους στρατεύειν...). Again, there was a dispute, which may be traced to calendar irregularities, over the revolt of Skione in the spring of 423 B. C.; the Athenians claimed that at the time of the revolt the truce had already been signed, whereas Brasidas' defense was that Skione came over to him before the signing of the armistice (Thuc. 4. 222. 3-6 Ἀριστῶνυμος...Σκιοναίους δὲ αἰσθόμενος ἐκ λογισμοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ὅτι ὕστερον ἀφεστηκοῖεν...Βρασίδης δὲ ἀντέλεγε πολλά, ὡς πρότερον...εἶχε δὲ ἡ ἀληθεία περὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐδικαίουν· δύο γὰρ ἡμέραις ὕστερον ἀπέστησαν οἱ Σκιοναῖοι).

the Great Dionysia in Elaphebolion, 424/3, was later revised and in its present form contains references dating at least as late as 421.⁹³ We are not, however, in a position to decide how much of the play, as it stands now, belongs to the original version.⁹⁴ Meritt⁹⁵ would assign the quoted passage to the first production and refer the complaints to calendar irregularities in 423 B. C., corroborated by Thucydides' dates for the armistice of 423 and the peace of 421. "I see no escape from the conclusion that in either Athens or Sparta, or in both, the actual civil year showed variations from the astronomical lunar year. The divergence is most pronounced in the spring of 423."⁹⁶ With Meritt's first sentence I fully agree, but I cannot convince myself that the divergence is any more pro-

93. In Clouds 553 there is a reference to the Marikas of Eupolis. The scholiast (ad loc.) tells us that Eupolis' comedy was produced in the same year as the Pax of Aristophanes, namely, 421 B. C.

94. See Roger's Clouds (second edition, 1915), introduction, 10-18. The sixth Greek argument to the play (Oxford text numbering) is also helpful.

95. A. F. D., 149 f.

96. Op. cit. 149.

nounced in the spring of 423 than in the spring of 421.⁹⁷ As a matter of fact, there is far more point to the passage from Aristophanes if we assume it to have been written for the revised and later edition of the Clouds.⁹⁸ I

97. "This portion of the Clouds belongs to the original version of the play... and so falls exactly at that time when we have evidence from Thucydides that there were irregularities of some sort in the calendar..." (op. cit. 149 f.). But the same argument applies equally well to the revised version, in or after 421 B. C.

98. Meritt's note (loc. cit.) is purely negative. I maintain that we cannot definitely determine the dates of individual passages unless we have credible information (from the Greek argument, for instance; see note 94, p. 74 above), or sure datable references, as, for example, the mention in line 584 f. of an eclipse. Meritt states that the naming of Hyperboles (623) is no evidence for a late date. The scholiast to 624 observes that there was no record of Hyperboles as hieromnemon in 424/3. Meritt deduces from this that Hyperboles was chosen but did not serve; as corroboration of his belief he cites lines 624-5. But I think that these two lines are much more amusing and characteristic if, with Rogers, we interpret them literally. We must understand that in some way Hyperboles' garland

then understand the complaints of the gods as falling under two heads:

(1) The festivals come at the wrong time of year.

(2) Mortals have failed to realize κατὰ Σελήνην ὡς ἄγειν χρὴ τοῦ βίου τὰς ἡμέρας.

Now a discrepancy of a month would throw the calendar out

was publicly dislodged, in such a manner as to make him cut a ridiculous figure. The incident would have been chuckled over wherever Athenians gathered to gossip and hence was well suited to Aristophanes' type of humour. Meritt attaches little importance to the additional comment of the scholiast, οὐδέπω γὰρ διέπρεπε Κλέωνος ἔτι ζῶντος· μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἤξιώθη. This note suggests 421 rather than 423 as the year in which Hyperboles was sufficiently well known to obtain the post of hieromnemon. There is a further point worth mentioning. If the passage dates in 423 then Hyperboles must have been chosen hieromnemon to the meeting of the Amphictyonic council in the autumn of 424. But we have already learned (p. 57 f. above) that in all probability the Athenians had no access to Delphi at this time; would they have elected a representative to the Amphictyonic council under these conditions? Such a proceeding is much more understandable two years later, in the autumn of 422, when peace was in the air.

of harmony not with the moon but with the seasons. A seasonal inaccuracy of one month is a large irregularity, something more than the petty disagreement between lunar and civil years which certainly existed. With Meritt's conclusion on the latter score (complaint 2 above) there is no arguing: "... the actual civil calendar of Athens from 423 to 421 cannot be equated with the true astronomical lunar calendar."⁹⁹ I do insist, however, that such a minor divergence would not have given rise to the complaints in the Clouds, lines 618-623. An inaccuracy of two or three days would not have found the gods feasting when men sacrificed, the gods expectant while the Athenians ramped in the courts; on the other hand, such a condition of affairs would have been caused by the error of a month, and the hungry gods of Aristophanes, who were constantly missing their sacrifices, would have had good reason to be wrathful.

The allusions to the calendar in Aristophanes' comedy, therefore, must take their place with the rest of the evidence against intercalation at Athens in the civil year 422/1 B. C.

99. A. F. D., 150.

VII. The Julian Dates for Armistice and Peace

The armistice of 424/3 was signed Elaphebolion 14, ἄμα ἦρι τοῦ ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους εὐθύς.¹⁰⁰ Elaphebolion
101
14 unquestionably represents the Julian March 23.

The peace of Nikias was ratified Elaphebolion 25, 422/1, τελευτῶντος τοῦ χειμῶνος ἄμα ἦρι ἐκ Διονυσίων εὐ-
θὺς τῶν ἀστικῶν.¹⁰² Meritt equates the signing of the peace
with April 11,¹⁰³ whereas my revised calendar gives March
104
12.

Since Thucydides' seasonal dating is fairly stereo-
typed it seems to me unlikely that the two Greek expres-
sions that I have quoted refer to exactly the same time of
year. That is, "at the very beginning of summer" must in-
dicate a time slightly later in the year than "at the very
end of winter," and one phrase is not used as a synonym for
the other. The distinction is a slight one, but one which,
in my opinion, does exist. We know that March 23, a date
which cannot be disputed, fell ἄμα ἦρι τοῦ ἐπιγιγνομένου

100. Thuc. 4. 117. 1.

101. Meritt, A. F. D., 176, 178; see also note 21, p. 9 above.

102. Thuc. 5. 20. 1.

103. Meritt, A. F. D., 176, 178.

104. See tables, p. 82 below.

θέρους εὐθύς. I now propose, therefore, that March 12 is more suited to τελευτῶντος τοῦ χειμῶνος ἅμα ἤρι than is April 11.

And the date March 12 for the peace of Nicias demands that 422/1 be considered ordinary. Thucydides once more, therefore, opposes intercalation in 422/1 B. C.

VIII. Chronological Tables

I give below a calendar showing the chronology of the period from 424/3 to 421/0, presented according to the views urged in this paper, and based upon the belief that 422/1 B. C. was an ordinary year at Athens.¹⁰⁵

CIVIL YEAR

Year	Archon	Days	Date of <u>Hek.</u> 1	Intercalation
424/3	Isarchos	354	July 17	0
423/2	Ameinias	355	July 6	0
422/1	Alkaios	354	June 26	0
421/0	Aristion	384	June 14	I

105. These tables are based on Meritt, A. F. D., 176, 178. Since we cannot tell the exact nature of the irregularity which existed at this time, I have restored the months as if no such variation occurred (see Meritt, op. cit. 177).

CONCILIAR YEAR

Date of P. I. 1	Days	First secretary	
<u>Skir.</u> 19 - July 5	365	Epilykos ¹⁰⁶	424/3
<u>Skir.</u> 29 * July 5	365	Demetrios	423/2
<u>Hek.</u> 10 - July 5	367 ¹⁰⁷	Prepis	422/1
<u>Hek.</u> 23 - July 6	366 ¹⁰⁷	Menekles	421/0

ORDER OF MONTHS WITH PERTINENT EVENTS¹⁰⁸

- 423 Jan. 10 + Gam.
 Feb. 9 - Anth.
 March 10 + Elaph. 14th. (March 23, P. VIII. 6, Spartan Gerastios 12): armistice with Sparta.
Great Dionysia: Aristophanes' Nu-

106. I. G. 1². 324. 26; Meritt, op. cit. 138.

107. See p. 49 f. above.

108. This chart, reading across, gives the year B. C., the Julian equivalent for the first of the Attic month, a plus sign denoting a full month (thirty days) or a minus sign indicating a hollow month (twenty-nine days), the Attic month, and the events discussed in this paper, listed, as far as possible, in chronological order.

bes, first version.

423 April 9 - Moun. }
 May 8 + Thar. } Armistice.
 June 7 - Skir. }

July 6 + Hek. }
 Aug. 5 - Met. }
 Sept. 3 + Boed. } Armistice.
 Oct. 3 - Pyan. }
 Nov. 1 + Main. }
 Dec. 1 - Pos. }

Dec. 30 + Gam. Lenaia: Aristophanes' Vespae.
 Armistice.

422 Jan. 29 - Anth. Armistice.
 Feb. 27 + Elaph. Kleon elected general.
 14th. (P. VIII. 32): armistice
 expires.
 State of war.
 March 29 - Moun. 15th. (P. VIII. 25): payment of
 one hundred talents made to Kleon?
 At the end of the month Kleon
 leaves Athens.
 State of war.
 April 27 + Thar. State of war.

422	May 27 + <u>Skir.</u>	State of war.
	June 26 - <u>Hek.</u>	State of war.
	July 25 + <u>Met.</u>	Delphic month <u>Boukaties</u> . Kleen dies before Amphipolis. Pythian festival: holy truce. After the <u>Pythia</u> war is resumed.
	Aug. 24 - <u>Boed.</u>	} State of war.
	Sept. 22 + <u>Pyan.</u>	
	Oct. 22 - <u>Maim.</u>	
	Nov. 20 + <u>Pos.</u>	
	Dec. 20 - <u>Gan.</u>	
421 ¹⁰⁹	Jan. 18 + <u>Anth.</u>	State of war.
	Feb. 17 - <u>Elaph.</u>	Great <u>Dionysia</u> : Aristophanes' <u>Pax</u> . 25tn. (March 12, P. VI. 37, Spartan <u>Artemisios</u> 27): peace of Nikias signed.
	March 17 + <u>Moun.</u>	
	April 16 - <u>Thar.</u>	<u>Thargelia</u> . Chorus dancer dies (Antiphon 6).
	May 15 + <u>Skir.</u>	

109. We must allow for Julian intercalation in this year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This is not a complete bibliography but includes, apart from the works cited specifically in the text, certain material which I have found useful in dealing with the special problems discussed at length in the body of this thesis)

I. Ancient Authors and Texts Cited

ANTIPHON, Περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ.

ARISTOPHANES, Comedies; also scholia (ed. G. Dindorf, Oxford, 1888).

ARISTOTLE, Ἄθ. Πολ.

CENSORINUS, De Die Natali.

DEMOSTHENES.

DIODOROS.

GEMINOS, Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὰ φαινόμενα.

INSCRIPTIONES GRAECAE, Vol. 1, editio minor, ed. F. Hiller von Gaerträngen, Berlin, 1924, nos. 63, 64, 311, 315, 324, 370.

INSCRIPTIONES GRAECAE, Vol. II and III, editio minor, ed. Johannes Kirchner, Berlin, 1913-1927, no. 109.

ISAIOS.

LUCIAN, Timon; also scholia (ed. H. Kabe, Leipzig, 1906).

PHILOCHOROS, in C. and T. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum

Graecorum, Vol. I, Paris, 1885.

PLUTARCH, Aristides.

THUCYDIDES.

II. Modern Authors

BELOCH, K. J. G. Griechische Geschichte, II. 2², Strassburg, 1916.

BUSOLT, G. Griechische Geschichte, III. 2, Gotha, 1904.

BLASS, F. W. Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta, Leipzig, 1871.

BOECKH, Aug. Zur Geschichte der Mondcyclen der Hellenen, Besondere Abdruck aus den Jahrbüchern für classische Philologie, N. F. Bd. I, Heft 1, 86-92, Leipzig, 1855.

BRILLANT, M. Les Secrétaires Athéniens, Paris, 1911.

CAVAIGNAC, E. Études sur l'Histoire Financière d'Athènes au Ve siècle,

L' Augmentation du Tribut des Alliés d' Athènes en 425, Rev. Ét. Gr. XLVIII (1955), 245-249.

CLASSEN, J. Thukydides, 3rd ed., revised by J. Steup, Berlin, 1912.

DE SANCTIS, G. La τάξις φόρου del 425 a. C., Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione classica XIII (1935), 52-60.

ibid. 508-510.

DEUBNER, L. Attische Feste, Berlin, 1932.

- DINDORF, G. See under ARISTOPHANES.
- DINSMOOR, W. B. The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1932.
- FERGUSON, W. S. The Athenian Secretaries, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, no. VII, New York, 1898.
- GERNET, L. Antiphon, Paris, Budé, 1923.
- GRENFELL, B. P. and HUNT, A. S. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Vol. X, London, 1914.
- HERMANN, K. F. Ueber griechische Monatskunde, Göttingen, 1844.
- INSCRIPTIONES GRAECAE, Vol. 1, editio minor, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin, 1924, nos. 63, 64, 311, 313, 324, 328, 370.
- INSCRIPTIONES GRAECAE, Vol. II and III, editio minor, ed. Johannes Kirchner, Berlin, 1913-1927, no. 109.
- JOWETT, B. Thucydides, Oxford, 1881.
- KIRCHHOFF, A. Ueber die Zeit der pythischen Festfeier, Monatsberichte der Berlin Ak. d. W., 1864, 129-135.
- KOLBE, W. Revue of MERITT and WEST, Ath. Ass., Historische Zeitschrift, CLIII (published 1936), 568-569.
- MERITT, B. D. The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1928.
- The Spartan Gymnopaedia, G. P., XXVI (1931), 70-84.

Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century, Ann Arbor, 1932.

MERITT, B. D. and WEST, A. B. The Athenian Assessment of 425 B. C., Ann Arbor, 1934.

MÜLLER, C. and T. See under PHILOCHOROS.

NESSSELHAUF, H. Review of MERITT and WEST, Ath. Ass., Gnomon, XII (1936), 296-301.

PAULY-WISSOWA, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Vol. IV, s. v. Delphoi. (H. Pomtov).

RABE, H. See under LUCIAN.

ROGERS, B. B. The Comedies of Aristophanes, 6 vols., London, 1907-1919.

SCHMIDT, A. Handbuch der griechischen Chronologie, Jena, 1888.

SMITH, C. F. Thucydides (Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1919-1923.

SMYTH, H. W. Greek Grammar for Colleges, New York, 1920.

STEUP, J. See under CLASSEN.

THALHEIM, T. Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta, Leipzig, 1914.

VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. Die sechste Rede des Antiphon, Sitzungsberichte d. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, XXI (1900), 398-416.

WADE-GERY, H. T. Review of MERITT and WEST, Ath. Ass., C. R., XLIX (1935), 185-186.

WADE-GERY, H. T. and MERITT, B. D. Pylos and the Assessment of Tribute, A. J. P., LVII (1936), 377-394.

WEST, A. B. and MERITT, B. D. Cleon's Amphipolitan Campaign and the Assessment List of 421, A. J. A., XXIX (1925), 59-69.

Ὁ Φορολογικὸς Κατάλογος

τοῦ 421-0, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1924, 41-49.