When Did the Athenian *Ecclesia* Meet?

Mogens Herman Hansen

ARISTOTLE STATES BRIEFLY that the *prytaneis* summon the *ecclesia* four times in a prytany (*Ath.Pol.* 43.3), and he goes on to describe in some detail the obligatory items on the agenda of all four meetings.[1] Neither Aristotle nor any other source speaks explicitly about the distribution of the four meetings within the prytany. It is apparent from the law on *epicheirotonia ton nomon* that the first *ecclesia* in a year was regularly held on Hekatombaion 11 = prytany I 11.[2] Another law prescribes a meeting of the *ecclesia* to be held in the precinct of Dionysus after the Greater Dionysia and the Pandia.[3] In the 320's one *ecclesia* in Boedromion was held in the theatre and devoted to a review of the *epheboi* (*Ath.Pol.* 42.4). Apart from these three sessions we have no evidence of any fixed meeting days. The electional assembly was held in prytany VII–X when the omens were favourable (*Ath.Pol.* 44.4). In every prytany one of the four meetings was an *ecclesia kyria* (*Ath.Pol.* 43.4–5). Aristotle describes the agenda of the *ecclesia kyria* before the agenda of the other three meetings, probably because the *ecclesia kyria* was the most important meeting. He implies nothing about the sequence of the four sessions.

So to answer the question, when did the Athenian *ecclesia* meet, we must turn from the literary sources to the epigraphical evidence. From *ca* 370 the Athenians began to record in the preambles of their

---

[1] The following will be cited by author's name: M. H. HANSEN, "How Often Did the *Ecclesia* Meet?" *GRBS* 18 (1977) 43–70, and "Ἐκκλησία Σύγκλητος in Hellenistic Athens," *GRBS* 20 (1979) 149–56; W. A. MCDONALD, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks* (Baltimore 1943); B. D. MERITT, *The Athenian Year* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1961); J. D. MIKALSON, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975); M. J. OSBORNE, *Naturalization in Athens* (Brussels 1981); W. K. PRITCHETT, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1963); W. K. PRITCHETT and O. NEUGEBAUER, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1947). It is of no consequence for my argument whether or not the *Ath.Pol.* is by Aristotle and I take no position on the question.

[2] The ἐπιχειροτονία τῶν νόμων took place at the *ecclesia* held on pryt. I 11 (Dem. 24.20, 26, 27). If some laws were voted down, *nomothesia* had to be discussed again at the last of the three *ecclesiai* (of the prytany): τὴν τελευταίαν τῶν τριῶν ἐκκλησιῶν (24.21), τὴν τρίτην ἀπέδειξαν ἐκκλησίαν (24.25). So the Athenians, in 353/2, held only 3 *ecclesiai* in a prytany: *cf.* Addendum, *infra* 349.

[3] Dem. 21.8–9. *Cf.* McDonald 47–51 and Hansen (1977) 57–58.

decrees the day of the prytany on which an *ecclesia* was held (the first attested example is *IG* II² 105 of 368/7). From the 340's the day of the month was recorded as well (first seen in *IG* II² 229 of 341/0).[4] After *ca* 340 most decrees are dated in accordance with both the conciliar and the festival calendar. If we focus on the period of ten *phylai* (368/7–308/7), we have no less than 104 dated decrees inscribed on stone.

This evidence has been thoroughly studied by epigraphists in order to reconstruct the Athenian calendars, especially the festival calendar, and the relationship between the calendars. The main purpose is often to find a plausible restoration of a mutilated decree. The epigraphists have paid little attention to the constitutional implications, apart from J. D. Mikalson who has a short but illuminating section (182–93) on meeting days of the *ecclesia*. Mikalson, however, concentrates on the festival calendar and investigates only the relationship between meeting days of the *ecclesia* and the days of the month.[5] Accordingly, he omits all decrees that record only the day of the prytany. This method is probably valid for the period of twelve *phylai*, when months were more or less concurrent with prytanies, at least in ordinary years. In the period of ten *phylai*, however, it is not satisfactory to tabulate meetings of the *ecclesia* according to the festival calendar. The people were convened by the *prytaneis* and the *boule* in accordance with the conciliar calendar, four times every prytany. So what matters is the day of the prytany, and not the day of the month.

---

[4] The earliest preserved calendar equation is from an inscription of the Athenian cleruchy on Samos dated 346/5 (Meritt 72–73); it is a fair assumption, but only an assumption, that the clerouchs imitated Athenian practice. *IG* II² 404, usually dated *ca* 350 (see *infra ad* no. 65), is probably the earliest extant text recording both the day of the month and the day of the prytany.

[5] Mikalson (185) refers to 26 attested meeting days of the *ecclesia* during the period of the ten tribes. But he includes Dem. 24.26 recording a meeting of the *nomothetai* (and not of the *ecclesia*) on Hek. 12, and a reference in *IG* II² 1673.9–10 to a decree of the people allegedly passed on Thar. 23: [κατὰ ψήφι]σμα τοῦ δήμου ὅ Χαρικλείδης εἶπεν, Θαργηλιῶνος μηνὸς ὀγδόηι φθίν[οντος]. But it is unparalleled to record the date in a reference to a decree, and there may well be a stop after εἶπεν (" ... according to the decree of the people proposed and carried by Chariclides. On the 23rd of Thargelion ... "). So we are left with 24 attested meeting days, *viz.* Hek. 11 (Dem. 24.26, *IG* II² 365), Met. 9 (*IG* II² 338), Met. 24 (Dem. 50.4), Boed. 11 (*IG* II² 380), Pyan. 16 (*IG* VII 4254), Maim. 11 (*Hesperia* 9 [1940] 345–48), Maim. 30 (*Hesperia* 30 [1961] 289–92), Gam. 11 (*IG* II² 450), Gam. 30 (*Hesperia* 4 [1935] 35–37), Elaph. 8 (Aeschin. 3.66–67), Elaph. 12 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 476–79), Elaph. 14 (Thuc. 4.118), Elaph. 18 (Aeschin. 2.61), Elaph. 19 (Aeschin. 2.61, *IG* II² 345), Elaph. 25 (Aeschin. 2.90, 3.73), Elaph. 30 (*IG* II² 336b, 354), Thar. 11 (*IG* II² 351, VII 4252–53), Thar. 14 (*IG* II² 352), Thar. 29 (Aeschin. 3.27), Skir. 10 (*IG* II² 349), Skir. 16 (Dem. 19.58), Skir. 18 (*SEG* XXI 272), Skir. 27 (Dem. 19.60), Skir. 30 (*IG* II² 415).

Admittedly, the people did not meet on festival days, and Mikalson has admirably demonstrated that the *ecclesia* was convened neither on annual nor on monthly festival days except in an emergency.[6] Now in all twelve months, days 1–4 and 6–8 were festival days. Consequently it is very common to find an *ecclesia* on the 29th or 30th of the preceding month or shortly after the long period of festival days, preferably on the 11th day of the month, as pointed out by Mikalson (185). This is, in my opinion, the reason that the first *ecclesia* in the year was held on Hekatombaion 11 and not earlier.

Apart from this effect of the festival calendar on the sessions of the *ecclesia*, there is probably no connection between the festival calendar and the meeting days of the *ecclesia*. We must turn to the conciliar year and ask whether the information we have about meetings held on certain days of the prytany can shed some light on the problem of when the Athenian *ecclesia* met.

From the period 368/7–308/7 we have 104 decrees of the people recording the day of the prytany on which the decree was passed. Occasionally two or more decrees derive from the same session,[7] and so we have evidence of only 95 dated meetings of the *ecclesia*. During this span of 61 years the Athenians must have held some 2250 *ecclesiai*. Thus, our sources cover only about 4% of the meetings. This is sufficient for our purpose, however, if we have reason to assume that the preserved decrees are evenly distributed among the four *ecclesiai* held in a prytany. Aristotle's description of the agenda of the meetings reveals that certain issues were reserved for certain meetings: at the *ecclesia kyria* the Athenians voted on impeachments of officials, defence, and domestic policy. Two other meetings were

---

[6] For the period of ten *phylai* Mikalson accepts only four *ecclesiai* held on festival days, *viz.* Hek. 12 (Dem. 24.26), Elaph. 8 (Aeschin. 3.66–67), Elaph. 12 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 476–79), and Elaph. 14 (Thuc. 4.118). Of these the first can be dismissed as a meeting of the *nomothetai* (see *supra* n.5). On the other hand, Mikalson rejects *IG* II² 359, a decree of 326/5 restored by Meritt to give the equation [Elaphebolion] 8 = prytany [VII] 30. Mikalson correctly notes that [Ἐλαφηβολι]ῶνος is restored, and I admit that epigraphically there are other possibilities (Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, Ἀνθεστηρι-ῶνος, Σκιροφοριῶνος). But ὀγδόηι ἱ[σταμένου] is an inescapable restoration, and the 8th of a month was a festival day in all twelve months. Thus *IG* II² 359 must have been passed on a festival day, no matter how the month is restored, and Meritt's restoration gives a perfect equation. Hence, still, four known *ecclesiai* held on festival days.

[7] In the following cases we have two or more decrees passed at the same session: 343/2 pryt. X 4 (*IG* II² 224, 225), 337/6 pryt. VI 5 (*IG* II² 239, *Hesperia* 9 [1940] 325–27), 337/6 pryt. X 35 (*IG* II² 242, 276, and 243 with no date explicitly recorded), 332/1 pryt. II 32 (*IG* II² 344, 368.5–6), 332/1 pryt. VIII 7 (*IG* II² 345, 346, 347, *Hesperia* 8 [1939] 26–27), 332/1 pryt. IX 23 (*IG* VII 4252, 4253), 323/2 pryt. V 21/2 (*IG* II² 343?, 448.3–4), 320/19 pryt. V 36 (*IG* II² 381, 382).

set off for decrees concerning cult, foreign policy, and domestic policy, while supplications were brought at the fourth meeting. In this light we may examine the contents of our 104 decrees: 63 are honorary decrees, 10 concern foreign policy, and only 2 domestic policy. In 29 cases the content is unknown since only the preamble survives. Thus there is an overwhelming preponderance of honorary decrees. But it can be shown that honorary decrees were passed indiscriminately at all four sessions in a prytany. First, we have numerous examples of honorary decrees passed at the *ecclesia kyria*.[8] Second, we know that honorary decrees might be passed during one of the sessions set off for cult, foreign policy, and domestic policy.[9] Finally, supplications might of course result in honours bestowed on the supplicant.[10] Hence the excess of honorary decrees probably has no effect on the distribution of our dated decrees over the prytany.

The more serious problem is that many decrees are mutilated and the prytany date is either partially or entirely lost. As a guide for my investigation I adopt the principle stated by Mikalson (10): "I have accepted only those restorations which are demonstrably correct." Because my scope is different from Mikalson's, however, I can use many of the fragmentary decrees he rejects. The month and day according to the festival calendar is of no importance here except when an equation with the prytany date has to be calculated. The *number* of the prytany, moreover, is of secondary importance if only the *day* of the prytany is preserved. Finally, if *e.g.* only [---] καὶ δεκά[τ]ει τῆ[ς---] can be seen on the stone (*IG* II² 546.4), the exact day cannot be restored, but we know at least that this session of the *ecclesia* must have taken place not earlier than the 13th and not later than the 19th of the prytany. Accordingly, some decrees can be dated exactly, others within the periods 1–9, 10–19, 20–29, or 30–39; and only 25 decrees must be ignored either because the date is too fragmentary to be confidently restored or because a comparison with the date according to the festival calendar shows that the scribe made an error.[11]

---

[8] *IG* II² 336a, 356, 367, 448a, VII 4252, 4253, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 345–48.

[9] *IG* II² 224 is an honorary decree passed at the same *ecclesia* as an alliance (225). Furthermore, an honorary decree for the Bosporan princes was passed at the *ecclesia* held on Elaph. 18 347/6 (*IG* II² 212.53–57), which was the first of the two meetings for the conclusion of peace with Philip of Macedon, *cf.* Hansen (1977) 51.

[10] In some honorary decrees we find the formula περὶ ὧν ὁ δεῖνα ἔδοξεν ἔννομα ἱκετεύειν ἐν τῆι βουλῆι (*IG* II² 218.7–9), which indicates that the decree in question was passed at the *ecclesia* set off for supplications.

[11] An inexplicable error of the scribe has to be assumed in *IG* II² 351, 373, and 388.

On this understanding, Table 1 presents decrees of the period 368/7–308/7 dated by the day (marked on the right) or by the quarter (left) of the prytany.

	1			20	
	2			21	××
	3	×		22	×
	4	×		23	××
××××	5	××	××	24	×
	6	×		25	
	7	×		26	××××
	8	××		27	
	9			28	
				29	×××
	10	××		30	××
	11	××××		31	×
	12	××		32	×××
	13			33	×
×××××××	14		××××××	34	×××
	15			35	×××
	16	××		36	×××
	17	×		37	××
	18			38	
	19			39	×

Table 1

Table 1 confirms the accepted opinion that the *ecclesia* had no fixed meeting days. The people could be summoned by the *prytaneis* on almost any day of a prytany, provided that it was not a festival day. There is, however, one important reservation to be made: according to the lexicographers, an ordinary meeting of the *ecclesia* had to be summoned at four days' notice. Obviously, the people might be convened at shorter notice, in an emergency even overnight; but such meetings would be ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι.[12] Furthermore, there is reason to think that the *prytaneis* had to preside over the meetings they had summoned and could not leave the presidency to the subsequent board of *prytaneis*; combining the four days' notice with the

[12] See Hansen (1977) 46–47; (1979) 151ff (to the four examples there quoted of the formula ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος in the preambles of Hellenistic decrees, let me add *I. Délos* 1507.39, ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἐ[ν τ]ῶι θεάτρωι).

rule that the presidency could not be passed on to one's successors, the inference is that an *ecclesia* held on one of the first four days of the prytany must have been an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος.[13] No meetings are attested on the first and the second day of a prytany, but we have one decree passed on the third[14] and two passed on the fourth (*IG* II² 224.4, 225.2). Accepting the two rules stated above we must infer that these two meetings were ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι.

In addition to meetings held on one of the first four days of a prytany, those held on festival days must also have been ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι. Mikalson has convincingly demonstrated that *ecclesiai* were ordinarily held neither on annual nor on monthly festival days. As a corollary to his observation I suggest that the very few attested meetings falling on festival days were all ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι. In the fourth century down to 307, we have only three examples (*cf. supra* n.6): (a) a meeting held on Elaph. 8 (Kronia and Proagon) 347/6 (Aeschin. 3.66–67), (b) one on Elaph. 12 (Greater Dionysia) 319/8 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 476–79), (c) another on [Elaph.] 8 of 326/5 (*IG* II² 359).

(a) The *ecclesia* held on Elaph. 8 347/6 was the notorious meeting when the first embassy sent to Philip of Macedon reported back to the people. It was not summoned by the *prytaneis* on their own initiative, but, in the *boule*, Demosthenes had proposed and carried a decree ordering the *prytaneis* to summon an *ecclesia* on Elaph. 8. The meeting was undoubtedly an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος, summoned in an extraordinary way and at shorter notice than prescribed by law for ordinary meetings (*cf.* Hansen [1977] 56–57).

(b) Similarly, in the preamble of the decree passed on Elaph. 12 319/8 we find the unusual formula ἐκκλησία κατὰ ψήφισμα βουλῆς. It indicates a special summons and corroborates the view that an *ecclesia* held on a festival day was an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος.

(c) The third example (*IG* II² 359) has been doubted by Mikalson, but for no good reason. No matter how the month is restored, there can be no doubt that this decree was passed on the 8th of the month, a festival day in every month. So even if we reject the perfect equation [Elaph.] 8 = pryt. [VII] 30, we must still admit that this *ecclesia* was held on a festival day and thus was probably an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος. From this an interesting consequence follows: later in the preamble the *ecclesia* is expressly described as an ἐκκλησία κυ[ρία], and so we have now fourth-century evidence for an ἐκκλησία κυρία

13 *Cf.* Hansen (1979) 153–54.
14 *IG* II² 130.5; *cf.* also *IG* II² 172, on which see *infra ad* no. 9.

σύγκλητος. In an earlier article I believe to have demonstrated the existence of such meetings for the Hellenistic period.[15] I would therefore extend my observation to the fourth century and adduce *IG* II² 359 in support of my view that an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος was not an extra meeting but one of the four required meetings summoned in a special way, either at short notice or warranted by a decree of the council or people rather than by the *prytaneis* on their own initiative.

Table 1 not only demonstrates that there were no fixed meeting days; it shows as well that most *ecclesiai* were held late in the prytany. Half the decrees were passed in the last third of the prytany, and no less than 36% in the 30th to 39th days, although this period constitutes only 20% of the total days of a year.[16] How is this uneven distribution of *ecclesiai* over the prytany to be explained? In an earlier article I argued that from the 350's on the *prytaneis* had to summon four *ecclesiai* in a prytany, no more and no less. One consequence of this rigid system would be that the *prytaneis* had to save one or two *ecclesiai* until the last days of the prytany so that, in an emergency, they could always summon the people at short notice or hold two meetings on consecutive days without exceeding the number of *ecclesiai* at their disposal.[17] On the other hand, since they had to summon four *ecclesiai*, meetings could only be postponed and not omitted. And the result must have been several *ecclesiai* regularly held in the last part of the prytany. Accordingly, the high number of *ecclesiai* attested from the 29th on to some degree supports my theory of exactly four *ecclesiai* in a prytany. But there may of course be other explanations: it is for example very human to postpone obligations, and the concentration of *ecclesiai* towards the end of the prytany may be due simply to a habitual laziness on the part of the *prytaneis*.

The general rule that *ecclesiai* tend to be held late in the prytany applies especially to the ἐκκλησία κυρία. From *ca* 335 onwards it was often (but not always) stated in the preamble that the meeting was either an ἐκκλησία or an ἐκκλησία κυρία. The latter occurs in seven decrees; it has been confidently restored in seven more.[18] Other re-

---

[15] *Cf.* Hansen (1979) 151, 155.

[16] In an ordinary year of 354 days, days 30–36 of a prytany constitute 18% (4×7 + 6×6 = 64) of the year; in an intercalary year (384 days) the fraction is 24% (4×10 + 6×9 = 94). By and large, every third year was intercalary, and so on average prytanies I–X 30–36/9 constituted 20% of all days.

[17] Hansen (1977) 45, 51–52, 69–70.

[18] Attested in *IG* II² 336a.4–5, 356.7–8, 359.7, 378.5, 381.8, VII 4252.6–7=4253. 6–7. Convincingly restored in *IG* II² 340.6–7, 352.9–10, 362.6, 363.5, 367.6–7, 448.4, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 345.7–8.

stored instances are tentative and therefore to be omitted.[19] Distributing the known ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι over the four periods defined above, we find in 1–9 none, in 10–19 one, in 20–29 seven, in 30–39 four. In one case the day of the prytany cannot be convincingly restored.[20] So *ca* 60% of the dated ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι fell in prytanies I–X 20–29, constituting *ca* 28% of all the days of the year. As far as the evidence goes, the ἐκκλησία κυρία was never the first assembly in a prytany. Occasionally it was held as the last, and regularly it was convened in the third quarter of the prytany as the second or third session.

DECREES RECORDING THE DAY OF THE PRYTANY

I list here the epigraphical evidence on which Table 1 is based, together with discussion of restorations where this seems necessary. For convenience the inventory is organized according to publications; for new fragments or new restorations I refer principally to *SEG* and only occasionally to other publications; starred entries are discussed in the comments *infra*.

	Day of Prytany	References
IG II²		
1. 105.3–4*	32, 34, 35, or 37	+*IG* II² 523, *SEG* XIV 46
2. 109.5	30	
3. 116.7–8	12	
4. 117.4–5*	?	
5. 118.1–2*	?	
6. 123.4–5	8	
7. 127.5	11	
8. 130.5	3	*SEG* XXII 88, XXIV 85
9. 172.1*	3, 4, or 5	
10. 205.5–6	26	*SEG* XIV 51
11. 219.5–6*	16 or 21	*Hesperia* 8 (1939) 172–73
12. 220.1–2*	16 or 21	
13. 220.26–27*	10	

[19] In *IG* II² 368.23 ἐκκλησία κυρία is totally restored. Alternative restorations: Meritt 107–08, [τῆ]ς π[ρυτανείας· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν.]ω[---] (name of *proedros*); I suggest [τῆ]ς π[ρυτανείας ν ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι· τ]ῶ[ν προέδρων] (for a *vacat* before and not after ἐκκλησία cf. e.g. *IG* II² 778, 799). In *IG* II² 452 ἐκκλη[σία κυρία] was restored by Koehler (also Meritt 96). In *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 35 the unparalleled formula ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν Διονύσου was restored by Oliver. In *Hesperia* 13 (1944) 234–35 Meritt restored ἐκκλησί[α κυρία], whereas in 1963 both he and Dow restored only ἐκκλησία (cf. *infra ad* no. 96). In *IG* II² 727.2–3 the length of line was in fact determined by the phrase ἐκκλησία κυρία, to which there are several alternatives: ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου, ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι, ἐκκλησία ἐμ Πειραιεῖ.

[20] On *IG* II² 363.5 see *infra ad* no. 50.

14. 224.4	4	
15. 225.2*	4	
16. 228.3–4	29	Osborne D 15
17. 229.4–5	37	+Addenda, Pritchett and Neugebauer 43, Meritt 73
18. 231.4	11	
19. 233.2	8	
20. 237.3–4*	6	*SEG* XVII 24, XXI 266, XXIV 95, Osborne D 16
21. 239.7–8*	5	*SEG* XXI 267
22. 242.4–5*	35	Pritchett and Neugebauer 43, Meritt 77
23. 276.1*	35	*Hesperia* 9 (1940) 342
24. 328.5–6*	17 or 28	*SEG* XXI 268
25. 330.3	17	Pritchett and Neugebauer 44, Meritt 79
26. 330.48–49	37	Pritchett and Neugebauer 43, Meritt 79
27. 331.4*	34, 35, or 36	*SEG* XXI 270
28. 332.5	?	Pritchett and Neugebauer 44–45
29. 336.2–3	21	*SEG* XXI 273, Osborne D 23
30. 336b.5–6	26	*SEG* XXI 278, Osborne D 23
31. 338.4–5	39	*SEG* XXV 484
32. 339.6–8	15–19	*SEG* XVI 54, XXI 277, XXVI 75
33. 340.6	12	Pritchett and Neugebauer 46, Meritt 84
34. 344.7–8*	32	*SEG* XXI 279
35. 345.6	7	
36. 346.9–10	7	Pritchett and Neugebauer 49, Meritt 86–87
37. 347.6*	7	
38. 348.2*	3–7	*SEG* XXI 282, XXIII 54
39. 349.6–7	16	Pritchett and Neugebauer 49, Meritt 91
40. 350.4–5*	13 or 16	*SEG* XXI 320, XXII 98, XXVI 85, Osborne D 39
41. 351.6–7*	? (19?)	+*IG* II² 624, *SEG* XXI 283, XXIV 99
42. 352.7–8	32	Pritchett and Neugebauer 50, Meritt 92–93
43. 353.6–7*	11	Pritchett and Neugebauer 50, Meritt 94–95

44. 354.6	?	*SEG* XVIII 14, XXI 285, XXIII 56
45. 356.6–7	26	*SEG* XXI 286, XXIII 57
46. 357.5*	1–10	*SEG* XXI 287
47. 359.6–7*	30	Pritchett and Neugebauer 54, Meritt 6–8
48. 360.3–4	34	*SEG* XIII 40, Meritt 102
49. 362.5–6	29	*SEG* XXI 291
50. 363.4–5*	?	*SEG* XII 89, XXI 281, XXIII 53, XXV 66
51. 365.4	11	*SEG* XXI 294
52. 366.4–5	16	
53. 367.5–6	36	*SEG* XXI 295, XXVI 81
54. 368.5–6*	32	*SEG* XII 88, XXI 280
55. 368.22–23*	?	*SEG* XXI 296
56. 372.5*	6, 8, or 9	*SEG* XXI 300
57. 373.19*	23?	*SEG* XXI 301
58. 375.5–6*	35 or 37	*SEG* XXI 302
59. 378.4–5	24	*SEG* XXI 353, Osborne D 70
60. 380.5–6	31	Pritchett and Neugebauer 61, Meritt 113
61. 381.6–8	36	Pritchett and Neugebauer 61, Meritt 118
62. 382.7–8*	36	
63. 383b.7	10	*SEG* XXI 305
64. 388.5–6*	?	*SEG* XXI 313
65. 404.1–2*	30+	*SEG* XIX 50, XXI 254
66. 408.2–3	13–19	
67. 415.7–8	34	
68. 420.3*	?	*SEG* XXI 322, XXII 93
69. 421.1–2	?	
70. 422.1	?	
71. 448.3–4*	21 or 22	*SEG* XXI 297, XXIII 59, XXVI 82, Osborne D 38
72. 448.37–38*	35	*SEG* XXI 317, XXII 95, XXIII 61
73. 449.2–3*	6 or 38	*SEG* XVI 56, XXI 325
74. 450a.4–5	26	Pritchett and Neugebauer 66, Meritt 128–29
75. 451.2–3*	?	
76. 452.4–5*	?	*SEG* XIV 56, XXI 284, XXIII 55, XXIV 100, XXV 68
77. 453.4–5*	19 or 29	Pritchett and Neugebauer 66, Meritt 129
78. 535	15 or 16	*SEG* XXI 318, XXII 96

79. 545.2*	?	
80. 546.4	13–19	*SEG* XXI 304
81. 547.2–3*	?	*SEG* XXI 292
82. 727.1–2*	?	*SEG* XXI 324

Hesperia

83. 3 (1934) 3–4*	?	*SEG* XXI 288, XXIII 58, XXV 69
84. 4 (1935) 35–37*	?	*SEG* XXI 319, XXII 97
85. 5 (1936) 413–14*	13–19	Pritchett and Neugebauer 49, Meritt 86
86. 7 (1938) 291–92	32	*SEG* XVI 52
87. 7 (1938) 292–94	22	Pritchett and Neugebauer 42, Meritt 77
88. 7 (1938) 476–79	34	*SEG* XXI 312
89. 8 (1939) 12–17	29	
90. 8 (1939) 26–27*	7	Pritchett and Neugebauer 49, Meritt 87
91. 8 (1939) 31–32	13 or 16	Pritchett and Neugebauer 65, Meritt 126
92. 9 (1940) 325–27*	5	Pritchett and Neugebauer 42, Meritt 76
93. 9 (1940) 345–48	21	*SEG* XXI 310, Osborne D 29
94. 10 (1941) 49–50	30+	Pritchett and Neugebauer 57, Meritt 105
95. 10 (1941) 268–70	35	*SEG* XXI 316
96. 13 (1944) 234–35*	?	*SEG* XXI 306
97. 26 (1957) 207–08	20–29	*SEG* XVII 27
98. 26 (1957) 231–33	36	*SEG* XVII 19
99. 30 (1961) 289–92	5	*SEG* XXI 303
100. 40 (1971) 183–86	30+	

IG VII

101. 4252.5–6	23	
102. 4253.5–6*	23	
103. 4254.6–7	33	

SEG XXI

104. 272.7–8	23	Meritt 80

COMMENTS

1: Kirchner printed [ἐγραμ]μάτευε, [δευτέραι καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς πρυ]-τανεία[ς]. Koehler's alternative was [τετάρτηι κτλ.]; but if we adopt the much more common form ἐγραμμάτευεν, we must restore πέμπτηι or ἑβδόμηι. Hence four possible dates.

4: [τετάρτηι καὶ] δε[κάτηι] is due to Wilhelm. But only two letters are visible and the surrounding formulae almost entirely restored, and the restoration presupposes 29 letters to the line although the text is otherwise 28.

5: ἔ[κτ]ει [τῆς πρυτανείας· τῶν πρ]οέ[δρω]ν is arbitrary. As an alternative I suggest e.g. [ὁ δεῖνα] Ἑ[ρμ]ει[ος ἐγραμμάτευε· τῶν πρ]οέ[δρω]ν; cf. IG II² 128, 209, 218, etc.

9: The stone, apparently now lost (cf. M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* [Toronto/Sarasota 1978] no. 81, 411), was published by Koehler from Lolling's copy. The crucial letter for determining the day of the prytany is the first of line 1: ιT, [τρί]τ[ηι] Koehler, [τρ]ίτηι Kirchner. Given the broken letter we cannot preclude P (τετάρτηι) or Π (πέμπτηι). There can be no doubt that this decree was passed on one of the first days of the prytany, but any of these three seems possible.

11: In place of Kirchner's faulty ἐξ Οἴο[υ ἐγραμμάτευεν· ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι·] τ[ῶν] πρ[οέδρων κτλ.], Schweigert (*Hesperia*) suggested ἐξ Οἴο[υ ἐγραμμάτευε· ἕκτηι καὶ δεκάτηι] τ[ῆς] πρ[υτανείας· τῶν προέδρων]. As an equal possibility I suggest μίαι καὶ εἰκοστῆι.

12: Only 16 and 21 are possible restorations, each filling 15 spaces: [ἐγραμμάτ]εν[ε---15---τῆς πρ]υτανεί[ας]. The usual form ἐγραμμάτευεν would give 14 spaces (so Kirchner), but none of the 39 days of the prytany fills 14 spaces.

13: [ἐγραμμάτ]ευεν· δ[εκάτηι τῆς πρυτανείας· τῶ]ν προέδ[ρων] is Koehler's plausible restoration. Before ca 340, the day of the prytany is the only formula that can be inserted between ἐγραμμάτευεν and τῶν προέδρων.

15: Passed at the same meeting as *IG* II² 224.

20: In light of Osborne's examination of the stone, the restoration to be preferred is Θαργηλ[ι]ῶνος δευτέρ]α[ι φθίνοντος, ἕκτη]ι [τῆ]ς [π]ρυτανείας.

21: Accepting Schweigert's assumption that *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 325-27 and *IG* II² 239 were passed at the same meeting, we have pryt. VI and the day is 5. The year must have been ordinary, for the following year was certainly intercalary (*IG* II² 330.48) and the two other decrees of 337/6 (*IG* II² 242 and *Hesperia* 7 [1938] 292-94) can be plausibly restored only if we adopt an ordinary year. Thus, the month must be (the first part of) Gamelion; πέμπτηι, ἑβδόμηι, or δεκάτηι ἱσταμένου are the three possible restorations to fill the 16 spaces. The perfect equation Gam. 7 = pryt. VI 5 was suggested by Schweigert, but doubted by Mikalson 190, the seventh of a month being always a festival day. As an alternative I suggest πέμπτηι ἱσταμένου. The equation Gam. 5 = pryt. VI 5 can be obtained if we assume either that two of the 36-day prytanies were moved from pryt. I–IV to pryt. V–X; or that one prytany was moved and that the first six months were distributed e.g. 30, 30, 29, 30, 29, 30; or that one or two days were inserted in the civil calendar.

22: Boeckh's [ἔ]νει [κ]αὶ νέ[αι, πέμπτηι καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς] πρυτανεί[ας] is a plausible restoration. Epigraphically, ἑβδόμηι καὶ τριακοστῆι fits the lacuna; but, first, the calendar equation is inexplicable, and second, we would

have two intercalary years in succession (cf. *IG* II² 330.48), which is most unlikely and in this case almost impossible (cf. *ad* no. 21).

23: According to Schweigert's restoration (*Hesperia*), this decree was passed at the same meeting as *IG* II² 242.

24: Passed in 336/5, which was undoubtedly an intercalary year (*IG* II² 330. 48). Assuming an irregular distribution of the 39-day prytanies, Koehler restored [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς Ἀ[καμαντίδος τετάρτης πρυτ]ανείας ἧ[ι――19――ἐ]γραμμάτ[ευεν· Μαιμακτηριῶνος τετ]ράδι φθί[νοντος, μίαι καὶ τριακοστ]εῖ τῆς πρ[υτανείας· τῶν προέδρων ἐπ]εψήφιζε[ν], and suggested the equation Maim. 27 = pryt. IV 31. Pritchett and Neugebauer (43) suggested the much better equation Maim. 27 = pryt. IV 28. Assuming that the omitted day in a hollow month was the 21st or 22nd, Meritt (78) suggested Maim. 26 = pryt. IV 28. Again, however, the equation presupposes irregularities in the distribution of the 39-day prytanies, and a preferable view is that the omitted day in a hollow month was invariably the 29th. On the assumptions that Hekatombaion was a hollow month and that the prytanies were distributed regularly, I suggest the equation Met. 27 = pryt. II 17: [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς Ἀ[καμαντίδος δευτέρας πρυτ]ανείας ἧ[ι――19――ἐ]γραμμάτ[ευεν· Μεταγειτνιῶνος τετ]ράδι φθί[νοντος, ἑβδόμηι καὶ δεκάτ]ει τῆς πρ[υτανείας· τῶν προέδρων ἐπ]εψήφιζε[ν]. Thus at least two restorations are possible (pryt. IV 28 and II 17), and this inscription must be disregarded as a source for the calendar.

27: Kirchner restored pryt. III 17, but Meritt's publication (80) of EM 13067 established the correct restoration as [Ἀντιο]χίδος [δεκάτης πρυτανείας]. Since [ἕνηι] καὶ νέα[ι] in line 3 is a certain restoration, the decree must have been passed on the very last day of the year. Meritt plausibly restores [πέμπτηι καὶ τριακοστῆι τῆς πρυταν]είας in 4, but because the text is not *stoichedon* we cannot rule out τετάρτηι or ἕκτηι καὶ τριακοστῆι· hence a choice of three days.

34: In *ZPE* 48 (1982) M. B. Walbank argues that *IG* II² 344 and 368 are not copies of the same decree, but are two separate decrees, passed, probably, on the same day and at the same assembly.

37: In this case we have preserved no less than four decrees passed on the same day, *IG* II² 345, 346, 347, and *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 26–27.

38: Since this decree is concerned with honours bestowed on an actor, ἐκκλησί[α ἐν Διονύσου] is a plausible restoration, and accordingly it was passed at the *ecclesia* held in Elaphebolion after the Dionysia. [ἐνάτηι] ἐπὶ δέ[κα, ἕκτηι τῆς πρυτανείας], suggested by Kirchner, is a fair guess, but there are other possibilities. The day of the month may have been the 16th, 17th, 18th, or 19th, cf. Hansen (1977) 58. And the day of the prytany may have varied from the 3rd to the 7th. Since the heading of the inscription is non-*stoichedon* with lines of increasing length, we cannot arrive at an exact equation, and the only inference to be made is that the *ecclesia* was held early in the prytany.

40: Pritchett and Neugebauer 65 restore [Ἀνθεστ]ηριῶνος ἐ[νάτει φθίνοντος, τρίτ]ει καὶ δεκάτ[ει τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐ]κκλησία ἐν Δι[ονύσου], and

suggest the equation Anth. 22 = pryt. VII 13, which, however, is 1–2 days wrong if the year had regular prytanies (4×36 + 6×35) and alternating months of 29 and 30 days. Meritt 127 restores ['Ανθεστ]ηριῶνος ἑ[βδόμει φθίνοντος, ἕκτ]ει καὶ δεκάτ[ει τῆς πρυτανείας], and suggests the equation Anth. 23 = pryt. VII 16, assuming the omission of the 22nd in a hollow month and, consequently, an irregular distribution of months. If again we assume that the day omitted in a hollow month was invariably the 29th and that the months were regularly distributed, beginning with a hollow Heka-tombaion, Meritt's restoration of the text gives the perfect equation Anth. 24 = pryt. VII 16. Osborne suggests ['Ανθεστ]ηριῶνος ἑ[νάτει ἱσταμένου, ὀγ-δό]ει καὶ δεκάτ[ει τῆς πρυτανείας], which gives an impossible equation.

41: ἑ[νδ]εκά[τ]ηι Θαργηλιῶνος, ἐνάτη[ι κ]αὶ δ[ε]κάτηι τῆς πρυτανείας. But the year is intercalary (*IG* II² 352) and the calendar equation Thar. 11 = pryt. IX 19 is wrong by ten days. The scribe probably made an error either (a) in the day of the month (Thar. 1 = pryt. IX 19) or (b) in the day of the prytany (Thar. 11 = pryt. IX 29). Meritt (92–93) prefers (a), but the first of a month is invariably a festival day (Mikalson 151) and so the error is rather (as suggested by Pritchett and Neugebauer 50) in the prytany date. In any case, the inscription must be rejected as a reliable source.

43: The restoration Πυανοψ[ιῶνος ἕνηι καὶ νέα]ι, ἑνδεκά[τηι τῆς πρυταν-ει]α[ς] has been doubted by Mikalson (191) because Pyanopsion 30 was a festival day. But the prytany date cannot be questioned.

46: The number of the prytany has to be restored and the name of the month is omitted; various restorations and equations have been proposed. What concerns us here is the day of the prytany, ἕνηι κ[αὶ νέαι......τῆς πρυταν]είας. Six spaces give us a choice between πρώτηι, τρίτηι, ὀγδόηι, and ἐνάτηι. If we assume a slight violation of the *stoichedon* order, we can extend the possibilities to cover πέμπτηι, ἑβδόμηι, and δεκάτηι. The only inference to be made is that the meeting was held early in the prytany.

47: *Cf. supra* 336–37.

50: In *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 48 Meritt proposed to restore only the month and the day of the prytany, but not the day of the month: ['A]νθε[στηριῶνος· ἕκτηι καὶ δεκάτηι τῆ]ς πρυ[τανείας]. Pritchett and Neugebauer (55) changed the reading to [Πυα]νο[ψιῶνος]. For the recording, however, of the month alone without indication of the day, we have (in the 10-*phylai* period) only two (restored) parallels: *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 3–4 and 7 (1938) 291–92. (*IG* II² 365.4 is a case apart, if we omit a superfluous repetition of ἑνδεκάτει.) Later Meritt (*Year* 88–89) suggested ['A]νθε[στηριῶνος ἑνδεκάτηι, τρίτηι τῆ]ς πρυ[τανείας], giving the equation Anth. 11 = pryt. VII 3. If we accept Meritt's restoration of the month, the day was rather the 12th, since the 11th was a festival day (Mikalson 190). In 'A]νθε[στηριῶνος, however, all the three letters reported by Meritt have been questioned by Pritchett, Mitsos, and Stroud: *cf.* Pritchett 284–85 and *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 168–69. In conclusion, this preamble cannot be confidently restored.

54: *IG* II² 368 was probably passed at the same meeting as 344, *cf.* M. B. Walbank in *ZPE* 48 (1982) 266.

55: This preamble has been restored by Koehler to give Pos. 12 = pryt. V 18 (ord.), by Pritchett and Neugebauer (57) to give Pos. 29 = pryt. V 21 (interc.), and by Meritt (107–08) to give Pos. 2+1 = pryt. V 8 (ord.). All three restorations present difficulties. Koehler must restore an unprecedented form of the day of the month (δευτέραι ἐπὶ δέκα for δωδεκάτηι). Pritchett and Neugebauer must assume two ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι on consecutive days (cf. IG II² 448.1–4); and according to Meritt's restoration, the ecclesia was held on an intercalated day, Pos. 2 being a festival day (cf. Mikalson 90–91). The preamble must be discarded as too fragmentary to be confidently restored. For the ἐκκλησία κυρία restored in line 23 cf. supra n.19.

56: In Hesperia 8 (1939) 174 Schweigert restored ['Ελαφηβολιῶνος ἐνάτηι ἐπὶ] δέκα, [ἕκτηι τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλ]ησία, giving the equation Elaph. 19 = pryt. VIII 6 (ord.). This was accepted by Pritchett and Neugebauer (59–60), but Meritt (110–11) preferred an intercalary year and restored ['Ελαφηβολιῶνος τρίτει ἐπὶ] δέκα, [ὀγδόηι τῆς πρυτανέας]. If we accept an intercalary year, ἐνάτηι (Kirchner) is a possible alternative to ὀγδόηι. But a restoration based on an ordinary year is preferable for three reasons. First, according to Meritt's restoration, we must admit an ecclesia held on a festival day, which was exceptional (Mikalson 129). Second, in line 6 [ἐκκλ]ησία [ἐν Διονύσου] is plausibly restored. This formula almost invariably describes the ecclesia held in the precinct of Dionysos after the Dionysia (McDonald 48–49). So Elaph. 19 (or 18) is to be preferred to 13. Third, Meritt's restoration depends on the less common form πρυτανέας (for which see Pritchett and Neugebauer 38 n.11). No matter whether the year was ordinary or intercalary, the ecclesia must have been early in the prytany, since the day occupied only 5–6 spaces.

57: The recorded date is Θαργηλιῶνος δευτέραι ἱστα[μέ]νου, τρίτει καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανείας. On any combination of the festival and conciliar calendars there is no convincing equation, and all scholars assume a mason's error, which cannot however be confidently corrected.

58: The equation given by the stone is Thar. 30 = pryt. X 30+. All scholars plausibly assume that the mason erroneously inscribed Θαργηλιῶνος instead of Σκιροφοριῶνος: the number of the prytany, the day of the month, and half that of the prytany ([κ]αὶ τριακοστῆι) are preserved, and the obvious way to correct the error is to change the name of the month. Pritchett and Neugebauer (60) restore the day of the prytany to give 35 and assume an ordinary year; Meritt (111) restores 37 and takes the year to be intercalary.

59: Pace Osborne D 70, I still prefer, following Wilhelm and Dow (cf. SEG XXI 353) to assign this decree to the year of Archippos instead of Olympiodoros (294/3). In line 3 Λεωντίδος πέμπτης fill the ca 16 spaces, cf. SEG XXI 303. In 4, in the ca 17 spaces left for the day of the month I restore δεκάτηι προτεραίαι (cf. IG II² 1673.77), giving the equation Pos. 20 = pryt. V 24. In SEG XXI 303 (unquestionably dated 321/0) we have the equation Maim. 29/30 = pryt. V 5. We should accordingly expect Pos. 19 = pryt. V 34; but the equation Maim. 29/30 = pryt. V 5 is two days removed

from the perfect equation Maim. 29/30 = pryt. V 3, and I have little diffi-
culty in assuming a further irregularity of one day in the following month,
making up for the former irregularities and thus approaching the perfect
equation Pos. 20 = pryt. V 23.

62: *IG* II² 382 was passed at the same meeting as 381.

64: Passed in 319/8, which was beyond doubt an ordinary year. Ἐλαφη-
βολιῶνο[ς---15---] καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆ[ς πρυτανείας]: no satisfactory equation
can be restored. Pritchett and Neugebauer (a) and Meritt (b) restore [δω-
δεκάτει, ὀγδόηι (a) or ἐνάτει (b)] καὶ εἰκοστεῖ, and assume an error in the
inscribing of the month, so that the true equation is (Moun.) 12 = pryt. VIII
28 (a) or 29 (b). They may be right, but we may also assume an error in the
prytany date (εἰκοστεῖ for δεκάτηι) and restore Ἐλαφηβολιῶνο[ς ἕνηι καὶ
νέαι, ἕκτει] καὶ (δεκάτηι) τῆ[ς πρυτανείας], to yield the equation Elaph. 29
= pryt. VIII 16. For a similar violation of the *stoichedon* order *cf. IG* II²
149.11, 20. So the decree is not a reliable source for the date of the *ecclesia*.

65: stoich. 51, [---14---]ῶνος ἐ[ν]άτ[ηι---30---τῆς πρυτα]νείας
(Kirchner). After ἐνάτηι we might restore either ἐπὶ δέκα, ἱσταμένου,
φθίνοντος, or μετ᾽ εἰκάδας, leaving 23, 21, 21, or 20 spaces for the day of
the prytany. ἐπὶ δέκα can be excluded since no day of the prytany has more
than 21 letters. ἱσταμένου and φθίνοντος are compatible with the restora-
tions δευτέραι/τετάρτηι καὶ τριακοστῆι. μετ᾽ εἰκάδας goes with the restora-
tions πέμπτηι/ἑβδόμηι καὶ τριακοστῆι. The inscription is assigned by letter
forms to *ca* 350, and so μετ᾽ εἰκάδας is possible but not the best choice, for
this dating formula is first attested in 334/3 (*Hesperia* 9 [1940] 339-40).
Consequently we have at least four possible equations: Boed. 9 = pryt. II 32
(ord.), Maim. 22 = pryt. IV 32 (ord.), Moun. 9 = pryt. VIII 34 (interc.),
Gam. 22 = pryt. VI 35 (interc.). In any case, the day of the prytany must fall
in the period 30-39.

68: *stoichedon*, with only the right side preserved. Meritt assumed 47 let-
ters to the line, restoring [Ἑκατομβαιῶνος ἕκτει ἐπὶ δέκα, ἕκτει καὶ δεκάτ]ει
τῆς πρυτ[ανείας] (2-4). This is unconvincing. To fill out line 4 he had to
restore the formula ἐκκλησία στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων, which is not
attested before the second century B.C. (*cf.* Hansen [1977] 151 n.14); the
inscription probably had fewer than 47 letters to the line. Moreover, we
cannot be sure that the name of the month was recorded; this may be yet
another example of a preamble recording only the day of the month (*cf. e.g.*
IG II² 354, 356, 360, 383b, 449, etc.). If that is so, the day of the prytany
may have filled more than the 15 spaces proposed by Meritt, falling in the
20's or 30's of the prytany.

71: Ποσιδεῶνο[ς] ἐ[---17---]αι καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανεία[ς]. Meritt
108, taking the year to be ordinary, claimed to see a *kappa* after the *epsilon*
and restored ἐκ[τηι ἐπὶ δέκα, δευτέρ]αι καὶ εἰκοστεῖ. But this restoration
gives no satisfactory equation. Inspecting the stone, Pritchett doubted the
kappa; and according to Osborne it cannot be seen on the stone. Pritchett
and Neugebauer 57-58 suggested an intercalary year and restored Ποσιδε-
ῶνο[ς] ἕ[νηι καὶ νέαι v δευτέρ]αι καὶ εἰκοστεῖ τῆς πρυτανεία[ς]. But the

vacat is suspicious, and the perfect equation would be μίαι instead of δευτέραι καὶ εἰκοστêι. A preferable restoration would be ἐ[νάτει ἐπὶ δέκα, δευτέρ]αι καὶ εἰκοστêι, which in an ordinary year gives the perfect equation Pos. 19 = pryt. V 22. It presupposes *stoich.* 42 instead of 41, but the same violation of the *stoichedon* order recurs in lines 59 and 67. Schweigert, *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 343, suggests that *IG* II² 343 must have been passed at the same meeting and restores ἕκτει μετ' εἰκάδας, μίαι καὶ εἰκοστêι (Pos. 25 = pryt. V 21). His equation, however, is wrong by 5 days in an intercalary year and 7 in an ordinary. In any case, in *IG* II² 448.3–4, the day of the prytany was either 21 or 22.

72: According to Osborne (D 38) the date is Μαιμακτηριῶνος ἕνη[ι καὶ νέαι, πέν]πτει καὶ τριακοστêι τῆς πρυτανεία[ς]. The equation Maim. 30 = pryt. IV 35 is difficult to explain. In an ordinary year the last day of Maimakterion comes 4–5 days after prytany IV 35, in an intercalary 4–5 days before.

73: Restored by Wilhelm and Meritt (130) as [ἐ]πὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδ[ος ἕκτης πρυτα]νείας ὀγδόηι [ἐπὶ δέκα, ἕκτηι] τῆς πρυτανείας. But in an ordinary year pryt. VI 6 = Gam. 8, in an intercalary Pos. II 23. Even by moving all the 39-day prytanies to the end of the year, we cannot push Poseideon 18 later than pryt. VI 5. So a satisfactory equation can be obtained only by tampering with the *stoichedon* count. Pritchett and Neugebauer (67) suggested [ὀγδόης or ἐνάτης πρυτα]νείας (six letters in five spaces), which gives the acceptable equations Elaph. 18 = pryt. VIII 6 (ord.) or Moun. 18 = pryt. IX 6 (interc.). (In both cases the perfect equation would be pryt. VIII and IX 5.) Meritt suggested as an alternative ὀγδόηι [καὶ τριακοστῆι] τῆς πρυτανείας, *cf. IG* II² 545.2 where the day of the month is certainly omitted in an inscription of the same period. So the day of the prytany may be the 6th or the 38th, and the preamble must be rejected as too fragmentary to be convincingly restored.

75: [ἐπὶ Θεοφ]ράστου ἄρχοντ[ος ἐπὶ τῆς......ίδος πρώ]της πρυτανεί-[ας· Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, ἐνδεκάτη]ι τῆς πρυτα[νείας· ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπ]εψήφι[ζεν (so Reusch). This restoration is plausible, especially when compared with *IG* II² 365.3–4, but there are other possibilities. This prescript may for example record only the number of the prytany, the day of the prytany, the type of meeting, and the *proedroi, cf. e.g. Hesperia* 40 (1971) 183–86 (and *supra ad* no. 73). If we assume 32 letters to the line we may restore [ἐπὶ Θεοφ]ράστου ἄρχοντ[ος ἐπὶ τῆς Λεωντίδος τρί]της πρυτανείας, τετάρτηι καὶ τριακοστῆ]ι τῆς πρυτα[νέας· ἐκκλησία κτλ.]. The tribe, the number of the prytany, the day of the prytany are only restored *exempli gratia*. The only anomaly is πρυτανέας in line 3, for which *cf.* Pritchett and Neugebauer 38 n.11. The fragment cannot be confidently restored.

76: For more than a century the question has been whether or not μίαι κ[αὶ τριακοστêι] can be seen on the stone (line 4). The answer seems to be a *non liquet*, and the decree must be dismissed as an inconclusive source.

77: Passed in pryt. VI, so the month must be Gam./Anth. if an ordinary year, Pos. II/Gam. if intercalary.]δέκα in line 4 shows that the day of the month was 13–19. Now Anth. 13–19 fall in pryt. VII, and Pos. II 13–19 in

pryt. V–VI 2. Therefore Gamelion remains as the only possible restoration. The day of the prytany is ἐν[---]: *prima facie* the 9th, 11th, 19th, 29th, or 39th. There are now two possible equations: in an ordinary year Gam. 13 = pryt. VI 11, in an intercalary Gam. 16–17 = pryt. VI 29. The restoration ἐν-[δεκάτηι τῆς πρυτανεία]ς in 4 gives an impossibly short line of 27 letters. On the other hand, the perfect equation Gam. 17 = pryt. VI 29 (interc.) can be restored if we assume that the inscription is *stoich.* 35. In line 3 the prytany will be either Ἐρεχθηίδος, Κεκροπίδος, or Ἀντιοχίδος. The day of the month can be restored [ἐβδόμηι ἐπὶ] δέκα. In line 4 the restoration is ἐν[ά-τηι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανεία]ς. The one difficulty is that the name of the *proedros* (in 5–6) cannot be convincingly restored—or [Τελ]έσιππος can be retained only by assuming a *vacat* after ἐκκλησία, for which however we have only restored parallels (*IG* II² 455, 662, 679, 684, 697, *Hesperia* 40 [1971] 183–86). Assuming 34 letters to the line, Koehler, followed by Meritt 129, restored the equation Gam. 19 = pryt. VI 19 (ord.), whereas Pritchett and Neugebauer (66) suggested Gam. 18 = pryt. VI 29 (interc.). The inscription is too fragmentary to be convincingly restored.

79: Restoring in 1–2 the usual form ἐγραμμάτευεν, we have 15 spaces before [τῆ]ς πρυτανεία[ς], in which we can fit the 16th or the 21st. But ἐγραμ-μάτευε is possible, thus extending the choices to the 13th, 18th, 19th, and 26th.

81: This preamble is too fragmentary to provide reliable information. It has been restored by Pritchett and Meritt to give Thar. 29 = pryt. X 5, which is perfectly possible, but not the only possible restoration. Let me suggest an alternative:

[ἐφ' Ἡγησίου ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμα]-
[ντίδος ἐνάτης πρυτανεία]ς, ἧ[ι Εὐφά]-
[νης Φρύνωνος Ῥαμνούσι]ος ἐγ[ραμμά]-
[τευεν, Μουνιχιῶνος] δευτέρα[ι μετ' ε-]
[ἰκάδας, δεκάτηι τῆς] πρυτανε[ίας· ἐκ]-
[κλησία κτλ.]

Another possiblity is to restore the equation Pyan. 2 = pryt. III 20, which however is unlikely, as Pyan. 2 was a festival day (Mikalson 66).

82: Accepting *stoich.* 28, we have 18 spaces in which to restore the day of the prytany. The choice then is between the 14th, 27th, and 36th day; *cf. supra* n.19.

83: Meritt first restored Μουνιχιῶνος· [ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι·] ἐνάτει μετ' εἰκά[δας]. In *Year* 100 he proposed [πέμπτει τῆς πρυτανεία]ς. The phrase is totally restored and the position between the month and the day of the month is unparalleled. Pritchett and Neugebauer (53) suggested [δευ-τέραι, ἡμερολεγδὸν] δ' ἐνάτει μετ' εἰκά[δας], in which case the strange prytany disappears. But we have no parallel in any decree of this period, *cf.* Pritchett 274.

84: Passed in 318/7 on the last day of Gamelion. The day of the prytany has been variously restored: VII 8 (Oliver in *Hesperia*), VI 26 (Pritchett and

Neugebauer 65), VI 28 (Meritt 127), VII 16 (Dušanić in *BCH* 89 [1965] 132–33). The decree is restored to be *stoich.* 89 or 90 or 91. Only the first 19 spaces are preserved. Not a single letter of the prytany date survives, and I prefer to suspend judgement.

85: In line 2 there are probably seven spaces for the number of the prytany, thus πέμπτης, ἑβδόμης, or δεκάτης. In 5–6 the obvious restoration is]τει καὶ [δεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας], and accordingly the day must be 13–19. The year is ordinary and we can thus delimit three groups of days: (a) pryt. V 13–19 = Pos. 9–16, (b) pryt. VII 13–19 = Anth. 20–27, (c) pryt. X 13–19 = Skir. 7–14. Meritt preferred (a) and suggested Pos. 11 = pryt. V 15, but did not mention two other possible equations, (b) Anth. 20 = pryt. VII 13 and (c) Skir. 11 = pryt. X 16. The restorations are (a) [ἐγρ]αμ-μάτε[νεν Ποσιδεῶνος ἑνδεκάτει, πέμπ]τει καὶ [δεκάτει τῆς πρυτανείας]; (b) [ἐγρ]αμμάτε[νε Ἀνθεστηριῶνος εἰκοστεῖ, τρί]τει κτλ.; (c) [ἐγρ]αμμάτε[νε Σκιροφοριῶνος ἑνδεκάτει, ἕκ]τει κτλ. We have evidence of three other dated meetings of the *ecclesia* in this year (332/1): on Boed. 9 = pryt. II 32 (*IG* II² 368), on Elaph. 19 = pryt. VIII 7 (*IG* II² 345–47, *Hesperia* 8 [1939] 26–27), and on Thar. 11 = pryt. IX 23 (*IG* VII 4252–53). By adopting (a) or (b), we have perfect equations, if we assume that the prytanies were regularly distributed (4×36 + 6×35) and that one day was inserted in the civil calendar after Boed. 9 (*cf.* Pritchett 340–42).

90: Passed at the same meeting of the *ecclesia* as *IG* II² 345–47.

92: Passed at the same meeting as *IG* II² 239.

96: First restored by Meritt at *stoich.* 37 to yield Gam. 10 = pryt. VI 24. This was accepted by Pritchett and Neugebauer 62, but it presupposes a suspicious *vacat* at the end of line 4 in the middle of the prytany date, and the perfect equation is Gam. 10 = pryt. VI 22 or 23. Later (*Year* 119–20) Meritt preferred *stoich.* 38 and assumed a *vacat* in lines 1–3 and 5–7, 4 being restored to give the equation Moun. 8 = pryt. VIII 34. This restoration, however, is also open to criticism. In an intercalary year the perfect equation is Moun. 9 = pryt. VIII 34. More important, the use of *vacat* is to say the least unconvincing (*cf.* Pritchett 376–77), and Moun. 8 was a festival day (Mikalson 140–41, 191). These objections can be met if we restore ἐνάτηι instead of ὀγδόηι and assume *stoich.* 37, but with two letters inscribed in one space at the end of 4. The problem is now to explain *IG* II² 336b as restored by Meritt (119). In *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 431 Meritt reverted to his original equation Gam. 10 = pryt. VI 24, now adopting *stoich.* 36 and assuming two letters in one space at the end of 4. S. Dow, *HSCP* 67 (1963) 67–75, restored 35 letters per line and the equation Gam. 6 = pryt. VI 24, which however is a festival day and so not likely to be correct. I suspend judgement.

102: Passed at the same meeting as *IG* VII 4252.

ADDENDUM: Since this article went to press, the question of the number of *ecclesiai* in a prytany has been reopened. In a forthcoming article Fordyce Mitchel and I argue, on the basis of Dem. 24.21 and 25, that the Athenians in the 350's held three *ecclesiai* in a prytany and that the 'Aristotelian' sys-

tem of four was introduced between 353/2 and 347/6. A consequence is that, in describing the period of four in a prytany, I must exclude from my inventory the decrees of the period 368–347 (nos. 1–10, 89, 98). Accordingly, there are 60 dated decrees of the period 347–307, and the distribution over the four periods is: days 1–9: 9; 10–19: 16; 20–29: 13; 30–39: 22. The percentages are: 15.0, 26.66, 21.66, and 36.66. The inferences to be made are the same. I gather, finally, that Cynthia Schwenk, in a paper read at the Vancouver APA meeting in 1979, proposed an interpretation of *IG* II² 359 very similar to my own (*supra* 336).[21]

THE UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN AND
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
July, 1982