

THE WRONG SALAMIS?

Plut. *Camillus* 19, 6: οἱ <δ'> Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τὴν περὶ Νάξου ἐνίκων ναυμαχίαν ... τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος περὶ τὴν πανσέληνον, ἐν δὲ Σαλαμῖνι περὶ τὰς εἰκάδας, ὡς ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡμερῶν ἀποδέδεικται.

Plut. *Lysander* 15, 1: ἕκτη ἐπὶ δεκάτῃ Μουνυχιῶνος μηνός, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐνίκων τὸν βάρβαρον.

Plut. *Moralia* 349 F: τὴν δ' ἕκτην ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Μουνυχιῶνος Ἀρτέμυδι καθιέρωσαν, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς Ἑλλησι περὶ Σαλαμῖνα νικῶσιν ἐπέλαμψεν ἡ θεὸς πανσέληνος.

It has long been known that Plutarch gives two widely divergent dates for the battle of Salamis, one in spring and one in autumn. Explanations are more difficult to find, especially as one of the dates (which, in the light of Herodotus' account, is generally regarded as the correct one)¹) is cited with a reference to a special monograph by Plutarch entitled *On Days*, which – whether or not it was based on a work by that name attested for Philochorus (*F gr Hist* 328 FF 85 ff.) – at least shows special interest and special study on Plutarch's part. Explanation, of course, has been attempted, but not with any outstanding success. Yet, although admittedly the matter is of no great importance in the study of the war against Xerxes, since the spring date cannot be correct, it is surely important at least in the study of Plutarch and of the reliability of his chronological evidence. A new investigation, based on a slightly different method, needs no apology.

First: since the two statements are incompatible, what is the nature of the error? The simplest answer, of course, is that it is a mere slip by Plutarch. It may be that he wrote 'Mounychion' when he meant 'Boedromion'. That was the preferred solution of N.G.L. Hammond in his discussion of Salamis²). Of course, the fact that he should have done so twice, in different works, produces a feeling of uneasiness. Hammond argued

1) This hardly needs substantiation, and will indeed appear from the discussion to follow. We are not aware of any attempt to defend the Mounychion date as the correct date of the battle of Salamis in 480.

2) *JHS* LXXVI (1956) 43, n. 41.

that in the *Lysander* not only the date of Salamis, but Lysander's intervention in the constitution-making in Athens, is thus treated, for the latter also took place in the autumn³). Unfortunately inspection reveals that in the *Lysander* the reference is not to the constitution-making in Athens, but to the capture of the city, which in another context Hammond himself puts in April of 404⁴). The supposition of an unthinking substitution of one name for another – implausible on other grounds, since the date as such, the 16th, would conflict with the date of the 20th given in the *Camillus* – is completely destroyed by attention to the supposed parallel.

Next, can it be maintained that both are somehow correct? Strange as such an attempt might seem, it will in fact be found in the principal standard work in English, the *Cambridge Ancient History*. It is there suggested, by J.A.R. Munro⁵), that the error was due to the Athenian calendar: the date that was in fact Boedromion 20 was in 480 B.C. Mounychion 16, since the calendar was out of gear; and it was only Meton's famous calculations that discovered the error and set the calendar (and history) straight, in 432 B.C. One does not know what is more to be admired in that flight of historical fancy: the idea that a calendar, however primitive, had actually got to a stage of substituting spring festivals for those of autumn; or the picture of the Athenian Historical Academy, aided by a team of mathematical chronologers, striving to set the record straight after Meton's epoch-making discovery – which, as far as we can tell, did not have any really pronounced effect on the day-to-day handling of the current Athenian calendar⁶).

If we discard these two possibilities – that the two dates can somehow be proved identical, and that the substitution of one for the other is a mere casual slip – what is left? Can the wrong date be (as was Hammond's alternative suggestion) a mere error? I.e., did Plutarch get two different dates from different sources without realising it, or had he made a mistake

3) This with a reference to A. Fuks, *The Ancestral Constitution* 70, where, on inspection, it will be found that Plutarch is not cited and no such error is posited.

4) *History of Greece*² 418.

5) *CAH IV* 313.

6) On this there seems to be agreement in principle among the different schools of eniautologists. See, e.g., B.D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* (1961) 4f.

in his notes, from a single source? The latter suggestion may at once be discarded: it would not explain his giving both the dates. As to the former: it cannot be denied that Plutarch makes errors of fact, e.g. in personal relationships or in names⁷), whatever the reason. The only way to test the likelihood of his presenting contradictory versions of the same date, however, is to check his record in this particular field. The Appendix aims at presenting a conspectus of Plutarch's references to precisely dated events according to the Athenian calendar. It will be seen that the case of Salamis is the only one that shows this kind of serious contradiction. For Plataea there are two versions, differing by one day. The difference is trivial, and explanations can readily be found, though we cannot be sure which is in fact the true one⁸). Since the number of instances is sufficient to justify a conclusion, the conclusion must surely be that Plutarch is very unlikely to have contradicted himself on an Athenian date without noticing, where the contradiction is a matter of several months.

Once we accept this, the only remaining explanation seems to be that the Athenians themselves had two different celebrations: one on the date of the battle, one merely a 'commemorative festival': Plutarch's error would then be the relatively minor one of having confused the latter with the actual date of the battle⁹).

7) For random instances, see *Alex.* 2, 2; 67, 7, with J. R. Hamilton's *Commentary* (1969) *ad locc.*

8) E. g., the celebration by the Hellenes may mark the anniversary of the original distribution of the spoils on the day after the battle rather than the day of the battle itself; or there may be a genuine (and slight) lapse of memory on Plutarch's part at *Arist.* 19, since he there starts from a Boeotian date, and merely adds the Athenian equivalent as an afterthought, almost certainly without checking; or the date may really have been the 4th, but when the story of the exact coincidence of the battles of Plataea and Mycale arose (Herodotus IX 100 in fact still implies slight priority for the former), the Athenians may have decided to celebrate both on the same day, that of Mycale. One could no doubt think of other hypotheses. Certainly, there is no good reason to follow Beloch in rejecting both dates. (On this, see n. 11 and text, below.)

9) This was Busolt's solution (*Gr. Gesch.* II² 703, n. 3: 'indem er den Schlachttag fälschlich mit dem Datum der Erinnerungsfeier für den Sieg identifiziert'). It was taken over by Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.* II² 2, 48, without acknowledgment) with – for that scholar – surprising docility: 'das Fest der Artemis, an dem die Gedenkfeier des Sieges gehalten wurde, ist mit dem Schlachttag verwechselt.' It is odd that these distinguished scholars did not investigate the assumptions implicit in such a view.

Yet this is by no means as straightforward as it may have looked (e.g.) to Busolt. For one thing, it leaves untouched the problem of why here and here only Plutarch should have been guilty of flagrant self-contradiction regarding an Athenian calendar date – a problem that scholars who did not assemble the relevant passages in Plutarch perhaps failed to notice. Moreover, it adds a further difficulty: the suggestion of a ‘commemorative festival’ seven months after the date of the event in the calendar surely itself requires justification – far from availing to support another hypothesis. Deubner¹⁰) accepted Busolt’s view without hesitation, and indeed found further support for it: a rowing contest and a *naumachia* celebrated in connection with that festival under the Empire provide evidence that a naval victory was being commemorated; thus the reference to Salamis seems secure.

The corroborative evidence is interesting, but hardly essential to the case. For Plutarch explicitly tells us what was in fact being commemorated and why: the naval battle of Salamis was the object of commemoration, and the particular occasion for gratitude was the fact that the light of the goddess, as the full moon, had helped to make the victory possible. Thus this is in any case attested as the general belief under the early Empire, and the nature of the contemporary celebration with its stress on prowess in the water merely adds concrete illustration, not any kind of proof. But for Deubner proof was not needed: Busolt’s word was sufficient, and, as we have seen, the fact that Plutarch’s statement posed a problem led only to the suppression of Plutarch’s statement. Indeed, the theory could be generalised: in Deubner’s list of ‘historische Gedenktage’¹¹) all commemorative festivals are treated on a level with that of Salamis on Mounychion 16 – i.e. the possibility that they may be actual anniversaries of the events commemorated is not even considered. Yet a look at the list of such festivals given by Plutarch makes Deubner’s view (implausible in itself) appear wholly arbitrary. A large number of festivals can be seen to have had no other object than the commemoration of a historic occasion and were thought (surely with full justification) to have been

10) *Att. Feste* 204: ‘Auf den gleichen Tag hatte man die Feier der Schlacht bei Salamis verlegt’ (with a reference to Plutarch, but no mention of his statement that it was the anniversary of the battle itself or of his reference to the role played by Artemis). *Ib.* 205: the rowing and *naumachia*.

11) *Ib.* 235.

established precisely for that purpose, on the anniversary of the occasion. In not one single case can we prove, or do we even have legitimate reason to suspect, a parallel to what is suggested in the case of Salamis and then extended by implication into a supposed general practice: the celebration of historic events on dates of already existing festivals without actual relation to the date of the event commemorated. On the contrary: when Plutarch tells us that the victory of Mantinea on that date made the date of the *Scira* more sacred, or that the battle of Naxos was won at the time of the Mysteries¹²), we have no reason to doubt that he is recording tradition based on plain fact.

Moreover, the Busolt-Deubner view fails to provide any valid reason why that particular date should have been chosen for the supposed 'commemoration' of a battle fought on a totally different date. Plutarch, as we saw, provides the answer: the goddess had helped the Greeks by shining brightly as the full moon. If we are to accept the 'commemorative' theory, surely we must accept as the basic fact, which can alone be held responsible for the 'commemoration', the undeniable coincidence of the battle with a night of full moon. Busolt failed to appreciate this. Indeed, he went so far as to advance arguments – both good and bad – for his own view, which puts the real battle almost as far as possible from any full moon¹³). According to his view, the stress on darkness in Aeschylus' description of the battle in the *Persae* excludes moonlight either during the night before or during the night after the battle. He combined this with the statement in Herodotus IX 10 about an eclipse of the sun 'not long after' the battle and argued that the battle must have taken place when the moon was in its last quarter. This would seem to make the story of the light shed by Artemis a fabrication, and would thus withdraw any foundation that might have existed for a 'commemorative festival' at the date when we are supposed to find it. Though Deubner had no questions about Busolt's treatment of this matter, we are justified in regarding it as far from enlightening.

The difficulty was noted in what remains one of the best discussions of the problems connected with the battle of Salamis,

12) *Mor.* 350 A; *Phoc.* 6, 6f. The whole of this subject is fully discussed by J.B. in his unpublished Harvard thesis, *The Theban Hegemony* (1973), 383 ff., on which the brief statement needed for the present purpose is based.

13) *Gr. Gesch.* II² 702, n. 2.

that of W. W. Goodwin¹⁴). Goodwin easily refuted Busolt's excessively rigid interpretation of Herodotus' vague phrase about the eclipse as coming 'not long after' the battle: indeed, Busolt's self-contradiction over this (not that he noticed it) was totally unnecessary, and the phrase will easily stretch to any reasonable number of days. Goodwin succeeds in providing some much-needed moonlight by moving the battle to about three days after the full moon. Moreover, he duly notes that darkness as well as light is required for the battle – the light to explain the festival, the darkness to explain the battle itself, with its unnoticed manoeuvring after nightfall, both in prospect (which is perhaps more important) and in actual fact. He points out that the time he proposes would allow over three hours of darkness (from about 6 to nearly 10 p.m.) between sunset and moonrise¹⁵). As for Aeschylus' words at *Pers.* 357 and 365, he maintains that they do not imply actual darkness: they merely mean 'night', in poetic parlance, and do not exclude moonlight. Similarly, for the night following the battle, line 426 would not be out of place provided the moon merely did not rise straight after sunset. This makes it possible to have a moon that was *almost* full (if not quite) at about the right time, and the 'commemorative festival' can be saved.

But though Goodwin's construction overcomes the naive self-contradiction implicit in Busolt's view, one wonders whether it provides light and shade in the right proportions after all. For the interpretation of Aeschylus is very forced. It can hardly be denied by anyone who reads line 357 in its context that the point here is real darkness, not technical night¹⁶), whatever we may think of the precise implications of lines 364–5¹⁷). Nor is a dark interval between sunset and moonrise really sufficient. For there is a very graphic description of the Persian fleet's watch in lines 377–87: as soon as the sun had set and night was coming on, they started cruising, and they cruised 'all night'; when night began to fade, there was still no sign of the expected attempt by the Greeks to escape – and then came bright day-

14) *HSCPb* XVII (1906), 75 ff. (pp. 88 ff. on this problem).

15) For the dates of the full and the new moon in September 480 see Busolt and Goodwin, ll. cc. For our purpose there is no need to go into the much-discussed details of the manoeuvres during the night preceding the battle.

16) ὡς εἰ μελαινης νυκτός ἴξεται κνέφας

17) εἴτ' ἂν φλέγων ἀκτίσω ἥλιος χθόνα
λήξῃ, κνέφας δὲ τέμενος αἰθέρος λάβῃ

break¹⁸). This picture, painted by an eye-witness for eyewitnesses a few years after the event, and totally uninfluenced by the need to account for 'commemorative festivals' in honour of the moon, surely leaves no room for Artemis to make her appearance. It is a consistent one of darkness succeeding the light of day – which ought to have led to the attempt to escape – and being finally succeeded by the light of day (clearly the first and only light there had been since nightfall) without its having taken place. The Greeks were not baulked by the rising of an almost full moon about three hours after nightfall, as they ought to have appeared to be since they were expected (as we are told at the beginning of the speech) to flee under cover of darkness; nor could the unfortunate Persians relax their fatiguing vigilance, until dawn revealed their total disappointment. Not only is Artemis ignored in this first and most reliable account (at least as far as the picture of physical conditions is concerned) – it leaves no possible role for her. No unprejudiced reader could regard the scene painted by Aeschylus' messenger as reconcilable with a night on which a nearly full moon rose – and, of course, would be *expected* to rise – a few hours after the fading of daylight, to be continuously visible with its bright illumination until the moonlight turned into daylight. As to the question of how, in the circumstances described by Aeschylus, Artemis came to be the object of such special gratitude that the victory was later commemorated on her festival with an imaginary reference to her service in the battle – that is a question to baffle any student of mythology, ancient or modern.

The outlines of the problem can now be briefly summarised, in the light of our discussion. Plutarch reports a festival commemorating the victory over the barbarian at Salamis, celebrated in special gratitude to Artemis who had shone *panselēnos* on that victory, at a time of year almost at the opposite end of the

18) ἐπει δὲ φέγγος ἡλίου κατέφθιτο 377
καὶ νύξ ἐπέηι, πᾶς ἀνὴρ κώπης ἀναξ
ἔς ναῦν ἐχώρει πᾶς θ' ὄπλων ἐπιστάτης·
τάξις δὲ τάξιν παρεκάλει νεὸς μακρᾶς,
πλέονσι δ' ὡς ἕκαστος ἦν τεταγμένως.
καὶ πάννηχοι δὴ διάπλοον καθίστασαν
ναῶν ἀνακτες πάντα ναυτικὸν λεῶν.
καὶ νύξ ἐχώρει, κοῦ μάλ' Ἑλλήνων στρατὸς
κρυφαῖον ἔκπλοον οὐδομῇ καθίστατο·
ἐπεὶ γε μέντοι λευκόπυλος ἡμέρα
πᾶσαν κατέσχε γαίαν εὐφεγγῆς ἰδεῖν, 387

calendar from the date of the real battle of Salamis, which Plutarch also records under that correct date. Such self-contradiction is unique in Plutarch, who had made a special study of these matters and had written a book *On Days*. Moreover, when we come to read Aeschylus' account of the battle of Salamis, what is clearly required is darkness and not moonlight – darkness and, even more, the calculable prospect of darkness: no weak hypothesis of an accidentally overcast sky will do, for the darkness is an integral part of both the wily scheme and the ensuing action. Artemis is not only ignored – there is no place for her.

It should by now be clear that a new kind of explanation is needed to escape from these paradoxes. And why not the most obvious one: perhaps we have two different battles? Since the real battle of Salamis in 480 cannot, on two major counts, be the one commemorated on Mounychion 16, it is surely better to look for another real battle of Salamis that could be (for the name of Salamis is given) than to propose that a totally imaginary one in fact was. Once this is stated, we have not far to look. For we all know of the 'other' Salamis, the naval battle off the city in Cyprus that is connected with the events around Cimon's death. That too was a great victory of Greeks over barbarians; and there is at least no positive evidence to gainsay the possibility that Artemis might have played her part in it. We merely have to assume that Plutarch, the specialist full of the antiquarian lore of his study *On Days*, failed to realise that he was seriously misleading the reader, who might perhaps think of the Salamis of 480 – just as a modern scholar might speak of the death of Pericles after the battle of Arginusae without being either wrong or deliberately misleading.

Little is in fact known about that other battle of Salamis, except that it was a great victory. The date is a problem of many facets, for it concerns the question of the year of Cimon's expedition¹⁹) as well as the resolution of a total conflict in our

19) The beginning of Cimon's campaign has been put in 451 (Meiggs, *HSCP* LXVII (1963), 11 f.), 450 (Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* II² 1, 176; cf. 2, 211 f. – this may be said to be the *communis opinio*) and 449 (Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* III 1, 342 f.). Diodorus' chronology is notoriously unreliable, and the date chosen depends largely on the way in which a particular historian fits the events round the 'Peace of Callias' – or whatever fixed point he can find to take its place – together. On the whole problem see E. Meyer, *Forsch.* II 14 ff. On Eurymedon and Cyprus see now M. Sordi, *Rivista Storica dell' Antichità* I (1971), 33–48, which it will be clear we do not accept.

sources over the development of that campaign. The former is not relevant here, since it must be decided on other grounds, and our passage, however interpreted, can do nothing to help. As to the latter, we have the clear statement of Thucydides I 112, 4 that Cimon died before Citium and that the battle of Salamis was fought after his death, when the Athenians and allies had apparently left the island. The historian is not at his best here, as so often in the account of the Fifty Years. He does not tell us where the fleet was going, when it fell in with the enemy off Salamis – he later tells us that after the battle they sailed home, together with the ships that Cimon had detached to Egypt, but that can hardly be taken to have been their intention before the battle, since Salamis is by no means on the way home for a fleet sailing from Citium to Athens. He also mentions a land battle in addition to the naval battle and gives no indication as to how they were connected. One might guess, especially since he mentions the naval battle first, that the defeated enemy tried to salvage his fleet by pulling the ships on to the beach, but was defeated there so that the fleet was destroyed. But this is by no means an inevitable conclusion. The whole matter is further complicated by the fact that Diodorus XII 3–4 (presumably from Ephorus²⁰) gives a long and circumstantial account of the Cyprian campaign, which is so different that it is hard to believe it concerns the same events. He relates the actual capture of Citium and Marium, followed by a naval victory (location unspecified) and a land victory in Cilicia (an Athenian general who fell there is actually named), both under Cimon's leadership; and, in the next campaign, the capture of other cities on Cyprus and the beginning of a siege of Salamis (still under Cimon), which was finally stopped by the Peace of Callias. Cimon's death during this operation is mentioned in a postscript. Plutarch, *Cimon* 18 f. adds to the confusion: following Phanodemus, he also assigns the naval victory to Cimon (but has no word of a land victory in Cilicia); and after a piece of oracle-mongering he recounts Cimon's death before Citium,

20) The strange document best inspected in *Fgr Hist* 70 F 191 can hardly be Ephorus, whether or not it should be regarded as based on his account. See Jacoby's commentary *ad loc.* (vol. 2 *CC* 90 f.) and Gomme, *Hist. Comm. on Thuc.* I 286, n. 2. We cannot accept Sordi's reconstruction (see last note) of Ephorus' supposed chronology, which does not seem to agree with the indications of those authors chiefly based on him.

whereupon the fleet slipped away home before the enemy became aware of the general's death.

Full discussion of this tangle of evidence would take us too far, and there appears to be no way of arriving at a certain answer. Thucydides is generally (and no doubt rightly) considered to have the least objectionable account, later 'improved' for the greater glory of Cimon, in various degrees²¹). Though the strange route of the Athenian fleet on its journey from Citium must remain a puzzle, and a siege of Salamis (perhaps pursued contemporaneously with that of Citium and having to be wound up after it) cannot be entirely excluded²²). However, on the whole the romance in Diodorus is no doubt rightly ignored²³).

It is here that Artemis may perhaps be able to shed some light, even though the illumination must necessarily remain fitful. It has never been clear whether the campaign on Cyprus should all be fitted into one campaigning season or whether it includes a winter. Thucydides, even if he knew it, does not tell us, and Diodorus, who does, clearly did not know. If the reconstruction suggested in this paper is right, it may be assumed (no matter what the state of the Athenian calendar may reasonably be thought to have been in the middle of the fifth century) that the battle of the other Salamis took place some time in spring, at a time when the moon was full: this presumably allowed the Athenians and allies to complete the victory. In other words, the winter had indeed been spent on the island, and this no doubt helps to account for the shortage of provisions from which the army besieging Citium is said by Thucydides to

21) See Gomme, *op. cit.* I 330; Beloch, *op. cit.* II² 1 176f.

22) Gomme, l.c., accepts 'some fighting in Cilicia', though he would assign the death of the Athenian general to Eurymedon. Beloch, l.c., agrees that details in Diodorus may be correct, including the capture of Marium and the attempt to besiege Salamis. N.G.L. Hammond (*Hist. of Greece*² 302) suggests that the fighting in Cilicia may be accepted and put when the fleet was on its way home after the battle of Salamis. In view of Diodorus' confusion with the Eurymedon campaign and his acceptance of the Cimon legend (see Meyer, l.c.), there is little hope of securely disentangling the story.

23) It might be noted that many of those who did not hesitate to condemn Diodorus' blatant fiction as based on fourth-century invention (and they include Beloch and, in part, Meyer) have shown little hesitation in substantially accepting his account of the Peace of Callias, integrally embedded in the Cyprus story and equally unsubstantiated by fifth-century evidence.

have suffered²⁴). What is more, recognition of this fact helps in finally disposing of the version that attributes the victory to Cimon in what would be late summer of his campaign: the commemorative celebration was presumably established straight after the return of the victorious force, long before the legend developed (probably only in the fourth century), and those who propagated the legend clearly did not have enough of the true historian's mind to attend to the familiar evidence that stamped their efforts as pure fiction.

The establishment of the celebration – a rare distinction, compared with the large number of Athenian victories at the height of Athens' power, as indeed Plutarch's lists make clear – also aids us in a proper appreciation of the importance of the other Salamis: a victory that tends, to us, to appear obscure and remote by comparison with its more celebrated namesake. Not only did it in fact save a large expeditionary force of Athenians and allies, in Cyprus and Egypt, but it once more (and this time for a generation to come) swept the barbarian off the Greek seas and finally put an end to the challenge to Athenian power that had had to be reckoned with ever since the failure in Egypt. It is not surprising that those who established the celebration also commissioned the great epigram quoted by Diodorus and connected by him (absurdly, as has always been recognised) with the battle of the Eurymedon, despite its reference to Cyprus²⁵. In the light of the commemorative celebration, the language of the epigram, which some have thought extravagant, becomes intelligible from the point of view of contemporaries – indeed, perhaps defensible even for the historian. The first Salamis and

24) Beloch's emendation (on flimsy linguistic grounds) of *λιμοῦ* to *λοιμοῦ* has not found general acceptance. On the question of whether one campaigning season or two should be assumed, opinion is divided, and indeed no conclusion is possible (rightly E. M. Walker, *CAH* V 87) unless the evidence of the festival is admitted as relevant.

25) For the epigram see Diodorus XI 62, 3, first sorted out by Meyer, *op. cit.* (n. 19) 1–25. Cf. Gomme, *op. cit.* 288f., with reference to (and arguments against) Wade-Gery's reconstruction *JHS* LIII (1933) 71ff. Gomme is certainly right in arguing that the Eion epigram must be dissociated from the one in Diodorus. Meyer already suggested that the latter should be taken as wholly referring to the Cyprus campaign and also defended its literary quality. It is our contention that in this he was essentially right and that nothing justifies any dissection of the poem. Where Meyer seems to us to have been wrong was in doing much less than justice to the victory of the other Salamis. What Sordi calls 'il problema posto dall'epigramma' (*op. cit.* (n. 19) 35) therefore does not worry us.

even Eurymedon, though great victories, had failed to dispose of the King's fleet for more than a few years, while the men on Cyprus had won what for historical purposes one may call the final victory in that long war. It is no wonder that the (to us) anonymous commander who won the victory had, in due course, to yield pride of place to the memory of the great Cimon²⁶).

Harvard University
University of Illinois

E. Badian
J. Buckler

²⁶) This paper represents the present opinions of both authors. The actual writing was done by E.B., the table of Attic dates in Plutarch is entirely the work of J.B., who disapproves of Latinising Greek names.

APPENDIX: ATTIC DATES IN PLUTARCH

HERATOMBAION July/August	METAGITNION Aug./Sept.	BOEDROMION Sept./Oct.	MAIMAKTERION Nov./Dec.	MOUNIKHION April/May	THARGELION May/June	SKIROPHORION June/July
3		PLATAI MYKALE (<i>Cam.</i> 19. 5; <i>Mor.</i> 349F)				
4		PLATAI [Zeus eleutherios]* (<i>Arist.</i> 19. 8)				
5	KERROSSOS LEUKTRA (<i>Ages.</i> 28. 7; <i>Cam.</i> 19. 4) [Zeus basileus]* 1)					
6	BIRTH OF ALEXANDER (<i>Alex.</i> 3. 5)	MARATHON (<i>Cam.</i> 19. 5; <i>Mor.</i> 349E; 861F) Artemis Agrottera* (<i>Mor.</i> 862B)			BIRTH OF SOKRATES (<i>Mor.</i> 717B)	
7	KRANNON KHAIRONHEIA ARKHIDAMOS IN ITALY (<i>Cam.</i> 19. 8-9)				BIRTH OF PLATON Thargelia (<i>Mor.</i> 717B-D)	
12		RETURN FROM PHYLE Thank-Offering to Athena* (<i>Mor.</i> 349F)				MANTINEIA Skira (<i>Mor.</i> 350A)
14						PEACE OF SPARTA (<i>Ages.</i> 28. 7) Dipoliceia 4)
16		NAXOS (<i>Cam.</i> 19. 6; <i>Phok.</i> 6. 7; <i>Mor.</i> 349E) <i>alade mistai</i> 5)	[Eleutheria]* (<i>Arist.</i> 21. 3)	SALAMIS Mounikhia (<i>Mor.</i> 349F; <i>Lys.</i> 15. 1)		

19

DEATH OF PHOKION
Olympicla
(*Phok.* 37. 1)

20

SALAMIS
DESTRUCTION OF THEBES (?)
MAKEDONIAN GARRISON
IN ATHENS
Mysteries of Eleusis
(*Cam.* 19. 6, 10)

24

FALL OF TROY
VICTORY OF IMMOLEON
(*Cam.* 19. 7)
Kallynteria 2)

25

RETURN OF
ALKIBIADES
Plynteria
(*Altk.* 34. 1)

NIKIAS'
SURRENDER
[Asinaria] *
(*Nik.* 28. 2)

ARBELA
(*Cam.* 19. 5)

DEMETRIOS OFF
PEIRAEUS
(*Demet.* 8. 5)

EXPLANATION:

Festivals marked by * indicate those which were established to commemorate the battles that were fought on that day.
Festivals in brackets are non-Athenian.

Footnotes indicate the source for the festival, if not in Plutarch.

1) Diiod. 15. 53-4

2) Ephoros, *F. gr. Hist.* 70 F 80.

3) L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* 17.

4) *ibid.* 158.