

acknowledge the sentence of the High Commission. On giving security to banish himself from the kingdom before the ensuing Michaelmas, and not to return without the royal licence, he was released from prison. He accompanied Lord Cranstoun to Carlisle, where that nobleman presented a petition in his favour to the king; but it was followed by no beneficial result. The subsequent application of Lord Cranstoun to the privy-council, and to the bishops, was attended with no better success. He lingered in Scotland, publishing a few tracts, till the 27th of August 1619, when he sailed for Holland. Where he chiefly resided in that country we are not informed, but Bishop Guthrie states, that "in the time of his exile he had seen the wild follies of the English Brownists in Arnheim and Amsterdam." During his residence in Holland he published various works, and, among the rest, his *Altare Damascenum*. At one period his enemies supposed him to be dead; and he has recorded a very extraordinary attempt to impose upon the world a recantation fabricated in his name. Calderwood appears to have returned to Scotland in 1624, and he was soon afterwards appointed minister of Pencaitland, in the county of Haddington. During the remainder of his life he continued to take an active part in the affairs of the church, and he introduced in 1649 the practice, now confirmed by long usage, of dissenting from the decision of the Assembly, and requiring the protest to be entered in the record. His last years were devoted to the preparation of a *History of the Church of Scotland*. In 1648 the General Assembly urged him to complete the work he had designed, and voted him a yearly pension of £800. He left behind him an historical work of great extent and of great value, not indeed as a masterly composition, but as a storehouse of authentic materials for history. An abridgment, which appears to have been prepared by himself, was published after his death. An excellent edition of the complete work was published by the Wodrow Society, 8 vols. 1842-49. The manuscript, which belonged to General Calderwood Durham, was presented to the British Museum. A copy, transcribed under the inspection of Wodrow, is among the archives of the church; another belongs to the library of the university of Glasgow; and, as Dr M'Crie has stated, "in the Advocates' Library, besides a complete copy of that work, there is a folio volume of it, reaching to the end of the year 1572. It was written in 1634, and has a number of interlineations and marginal alterations, differing from the other copies, which, if not made by the author's own hand, were most probably done under his eye." Calderwood died at Jedburgh on the 29th of October 1650, aged seventy-five. He appears to have been a man of unbending integrity, fearless in maintaining his opinions, and uniformly consistent in his professions; but as human virtues are never perfect, his decision of character had some tendency to deviate into that obstinacy from which good men are not always exempted.

CALEDONIA, used in general somewhat loosely to denote the northern portion of Britain during the period of the Roman occupation of the island, had originally a more restricted application. It is proposed in this article to give, from a geographical as well as an historical point of view, a brief account of what seems to have been known regarding it in ancient times.

The word *Caledonia* is first met with in the fourth book of Pliny's *Historia Naturalis* (circa 77 A.D.), where, in the very meagre notice of Britain, the Caledonian forest (*Caledonia sylva*) is given as the northern boundary of the Roman part of the island. Its next appearance is in the *Agricola* of Tacitus (96 A.D.). Here, both in the brief geographical description of Britain, chaps. x. and xi., and in the account of Agricola's campaigns, chaps. xxv.-

xxxviii., Caledonia is unquestionably Britain north of the Firth of Forth. On turning to the geographer Ptolemy (circa 120 A.D.), we fail to meet with the term except as the name of one of the many tribes among which he has parcelled out the "Britannic Island, Albion." To explain this it is not necessary to assume that Ptolemy was ignorant of the wider acceptance in which Caledonia had recently come to be employed among the Romans. It is more reasonable to suppose that, as he avowedly drew the materials for his tables from earlier, chiefly from Tyrian sources, he judged it prudent to follow in the main long-recognized authorities. Yet even in Ptolemy we have an indication either of the importance of the Caledonians among their neighbours or of the occasional use of the word as a general name for all the northern tribes. Twice he gives the Deucaledonian Ocean as bounding Britain in the north, that is, after the necessary correction for his mistake in making the whole of the northern part of the island trend to the east instead of to the north, as washing the shores of modern Scotland on the west. Confused and inaccurate in some respects as the Alexandrian geographer's tables are, they, notwithstanding, contain a surprising amount of information regarding the leading features of the coast-line of Britain, the correctness of much of which can be verified by existing names. His account of the tribes and their towns, especially towards the north, is, as might have been expected, much less definite and trustworthy. In order to be able to give here some notice of the Ptolemaic geography of North Britain, Caledonia may for the moment be regarded as a synonymous term.

Ptolemy's error in turning the northern part of the island to the east has already been noticed. How he was led into it there are no means of determining. One effect of it is to exaggerate greatly the length of the Solway Firth and displace the Hebrides from their true position, as may be seen by referring to certain maps appended to several MSS. of the Geography and given with some editions of it. The error can easily be rectified; and when this is done the outline of the coast will be found to be wonderfully correct.<sup>1</sup> Commencing with the promontory of the Noouantai (Mull of Galloway) in the south-west and proceeding northwards along the shores of the Deucaledonian Ocean, we have in succession the Bay of Rerigonios (Loch Ryan), the Bay of Ouindogara (Ayr), the estuary of the Klota (Clyde), the Bay of Lelaamnonios (Loch Fyne), Cape Epidion (Mull of Kintyre), the outlets of the River Longus (Loch Linne?), outlets of the River Ituos, Bay of Ouolsas (Lochalsh), outlets of the River Nabaos, and Cape Tarouedoum or Orkas (Dunnet Head). Coming down the east coast, said to be washed by the German Ocean, we find Cape Ouirouedroum (Duncansbay Head), Cape Oueroubium (Noss Head?), the outlets of the River Ila, the High Bank, outlets of the River Loxa, estuary of the Ouinar (Moray Firth), estuary of the Touaisis (Spey?), outlets of the River Kelnios (Deveron?), the promontory of the Taizalai (Kinnaird's Head), outlets of the River Deoua (Dee), estuary of the Taoua, outlets of the River Tina (Tay), estuary of the Boderia (Firth of Forth), outlets of the River Alaunos, outlets of the River Ouedra (Tyne?). On the south, bounded by the Hibernian Ocean, we have the peninsula of the Noouantai (the Rhinns of Galloway), outlets of the River Abrouannos (Luce?), estuary of the Iena (Cree?), estuary of the Deoua (Dee), outlets of the River Noouios (Nith), outlets of the Itouna (Eden).

The country is represented as inhabited by the following

<sup>1</sup> The orthography of the names that follow is that of the text of Ptolemy (Wilberg's), and not of the Latin translation. With a few exceptions they are evidently intended to express native terms by means of Greek (perhaps originally Tyrian) characters, and it seems undesirable to obscure them further by presenting them in those of another language.

tribes, sixteen in number:—the Noouantai, dwelling under (i.e., east) of the peninsula of the same name (Wigtownshire), their towns Loukopibia and Retigonion; east of them the Selgouuai (along the Solway Firth, and inland), their towns Karbantorigon, Ouxellon (Dumfries?), Korda, Trimontion; still further east, the Otadinoi, probably along the south-east coast, their towns Kouria and Bremerion; and the Damnonioi, occupying apparently the basins of the Clyde, Forth, and Tay (in part), their towns Kolania, Ouandouara (Ayr?), Korra, Alauca (Stirling?), Lindon, Ouiktoria (near Perth); the Kaledonioi, in the district from Loch Fyne to the Moray Firth, with the Caledonian forest to the west of them; eastward the Ouakomagoi (Banff and parts of Moray and Aberdeenshire), their towns Banatia, Tameia, the Winged Camp, Touaisis; east of these the Taizaloi (part of Aberdeenshire), their town Deouana (Aberdeen), and the Ouenicones (Forfarshire), their town Orrea (Forfar?); while occupying the west of Argyll and Inverness, part of Ross-shire, and the whole of Sutherland and Caithness, were in succession the Epidioi (in Kintyre), Kerones, Kreones, Karnonakai, Karinoi, Kornauioi (Caithness), Decantai, Lougoi, and Smertai. Near the promontory of Orkas were the islands of Okitis and Doumna; north of which lay the Orkades (Orkneys), about thirty in number, and still farther north Thoule (Shetland?).

Ptolemy's description is the only detailed one we have till we come down to the 16th century. It is matter for regret that the *Antonine Itinerary*, so useful an aid to the identification of the Ptolemaic towns in the southern part of the island, does not extend to the north, and that the lists of the anonymous geographer of Ravenna are so corrupt as to be almost useless. About the middle of the last century a new element of confusion was introduced into what was tangled enough previously, by the publication of Bertraw's well-known forgery *De Situ Britannia*, falsely ascribed to Richard of Cirencester, which being accepted as genuine by Roy, Chalmers, Stuart, and others, has been the means of giving currency to many unfounded notions regarding the nature and extent of the Roman conquests in North Britain.

The written history of Caledonia as well as of the rest of what is now Scotland commences with the warlike operations in Britain of Agricola, the lieutenant of the Emperor Domitian. (See BRITANNIA, p. 353.) In the third year of his command this famous general, who was fortunate enough to have his son-in-law Tacitus as his biographer, determined to attempt the annexation of the northern portion of the island. Accordingly, in 80 A.D., he advanced as far as the estuary of the Taus, or as Wex reads, the Tanans. Whatever the true reading may be, the supposition that on this occasion Agricola reached the Tay is untenable; though, whether the river referred to be the English Tyne, the Tweed, or the Scotch Tyne, it is impossible to say. The succeeding summer found him as far north as the isthmus formed by the firths of Clota and Bodotria (Clyde and Forth). On it he erected a line of forts, with the intention apparently of making it the northern boundary of the empire in those parts. In the following year he crossed the Clota, and overran additional territory "in that part of Britain which looks towards Ireland." Information having now reached him that the remoter and still unconquered tribes were forming a combination against the Romans, he resolved to anticipate them, and (83 A.D.) carried the war beyond the Bodotria into the country of the Caledonians. That summer an engagement was fought, which, though it resulted in favour of the invaders, taught the Romans that they had no ordinary foe to cope with. On the approach of winter both sides retired to their quarters to make preparations for renewing the struggle. Next season (84) Agricola, on resuming the offensive, found himself con-

fronted by a grand union of all the tribes of Caledonia, under a leader whom Tacitus names Galgacus. The Roman general had previously despatched a fleet to ravage the coast, and on continuing his march northwards, encountered the enemy, upwards of 30,000 strong, near Mount Graupius; for there can be little doubt that this, the reading of Wex and Kritz, ought to be adopted instead of the Grampius of the common editions. The exact locality of the conflict that ensued has been the theme of much profitless controversy; but we shall probably not greatly err in placing it somewhere on the borders of Kincardineshire. General Roy, whose conjecture is usually followed, fixed on Ardoch in Perthshire. A careful study, however, of the whole narrative leads one to look for the field of battle farther north, and nearer the coast. Tacitus, writing on the model of Thucydides and Livy, has put into the mouth of each leader, on the eve of the engagement, a speech of his own composition, in which he describes the feelings that may be supposed to have actuated the hostile armies. That ascribed to Galgacus is a splendid specimen of polished sarcasm, mixed with impassioned appeals to the patriotism of his hearers. Might, however, prevailed over right, and the Caledonians were defeated with a loss of 10,000 men. Agricola, now thinking he had pushed his conquests far enough, made no attempt to pursue his beaten foe, but at once led his army back to the territory of the Boresti (or Horesti), whose name is probably preserved in the modern Forfar. Here he gave orders to the commander of his fleet to sail round the island, a feat which the latter accomplished. Soon after he himself was recalled to Rome by his jealous master.

Notwithstanding Agricola's success, the Romans seem to have been quickly obliged to abandon part of their conquests, for in less than forty years (129 A.D.) Hadrian's wall, which ran from the Tyne to the Solway, became the northern limits of their empire in Britain. About twenty years later a second Agricola appeared in the person of Lollius Urbicus, the lieutenant of Antoninus Pius. Almost nothing is known of his actions, but he seems to have once more carried the arms of Rome to the Clyde and Forth, if not beyond them, and to have erected on the line of Agricola's forts the more substantial work now known by the name of the emperor he served (see ANTONINUS, WALL OF). The natives must soon have recovered the lost ground; but scarcely anything is known henceforth of the state of affairs in the north till 208, when, if we may trust the historian Dion Cassius, as abridged by Xiphiline, the Emperor Severus determined to attempt the subjugation of the whole island. At that time the two most powerful tribes of North Britain were the Mæatae, close to Hadrian's Wall, and the Caledonians beyond them. Protected by their native fastnesses, the latter offered him such a resistance that, without being able to bring them to a decisive engagement, he lost through disease, fatigue, and the sword, no fewer, it is said, than 50,000 men. Having reached what is termed the northern extremity of the island, but which was in all likelihood merely the northern coast of Aberdeenshire, Severus retreated southwards in a very feeble state of health, partly induced by the fatigues he had undergone. A league formed the next year between the Caledonians and the Mæatae, both of whom had already cast off his authority, led him to make preparations for a new campaign, with the avowed determination of extirpating the whole race. In the midst of these, however, he died at York in 210.

For a whole century afterwards the ancient writers are almost silent regarding Caledonia. In the year 310 we hear for the first time of the Picts; and in 367 Theodosius, an able Roman general, was sent into Britain by Valentinian I. to defend the Britons of the south against the

attacks of the men of the north, represented by Ammianus Marcellinus as being the Picts divided into two tribes (the Dicaledones and the Vecturiones), the Saxons, the Attacotti, and the Scots. He was so far successful that the countries between the walls of Hadrian and Antoninus became yet again a subjected province, named Valentian by Theodosius, in honour of the emperor,—a conquest, however, which can have lasted but a brief period. Henceforth, if we except the effusions of the poet Claudian, the scanty notices of Britain to be met with during several succeeding centuries present the same sad tale of sufferings inflicted on the now effeminate Britons of the south by their warlike neighbours, till at length the settlement of large bodies of Saxons in England changed the aspect of affairs.

The etymology of the word Caledonia has been variously given. *Celydd* (in Welsh, a woody shelter) is the popular derivation; but Isaac Taylor (*Words and Places*, p. 44) thinks the word may possibly contain the root *gael*, and if so, the Caledonians would be the Gaels of the duns or hills. Equally obscure are the ethnological relations of the people, the most probable opinion being that which regards them,

as belonging to the British branch of the great Celtic family. A casual inference, hazarded by Tacitus (*Agricola*, chap. xi.), that the red hair and large limbs of the inhabitants of Caledonia point clearly to a German origin, must not be pressed too far. There were probably even in his day Teutonic settlements along our eastern and northern shores, but it seems too much to assume that that race was the dominant one north of the Forth. It is a still more doubtful question to what race the Picts belonged. But the discussion of these and other points belongs to the history of SCOTLAND (*q.v.*) (See *Claudii Ptolemæi Geographia*, ed. Wilberg, Essendæ, 1838; Roy's *Military Antiquities of the Romans in North Britain*, London, 1793; Burton's *History of Scotland*, vol. i., Edin. 1867.) (J. M'D.)

CALENBERG, or KALENBERG, a former principality of Hanover, which was traversed by the Weser and the Leine, and had an area of about 1050 square miles. It derived its name from an ancient castle, now in ruins. In the Middle Ages it belonged to Lüneburg, and after passing from one branch to another of the house of Brunswick, it came, in 1705, to Ernst August, electoral prince of Hanover.

## CALENDAR

A CALENDAR is a method of distributing time into certain periods adapted to the purposes of civil life, as hours, days, weeks, months, years, &c.

Of all the periods marked out by the motions of the celestial bodies, the most conspicuous, and the most intimately connected with the affairs of mankind, are the *solar day*, which is distinguished by the diurnal revolution of the earth and the alternation of light and darkness, and the *solar year*, which completes the circle of the seasons. But in the early ages of the world, when mankind were chiefly engaged in rural occupations, the phases of the moon must have been objects of great attention and interest,—hence the *month*, and the practice adopted by many nations of reckoning time by the motions of the moon, as well as the still more general practice of combining lunar with solar periods. The solar day, the solar year, and the lunar month, or lunation, may therefore be called the *natural* divisions of time. All others, as the hour, the week, and the civil month, though of the most ancient and general use, are only arbitrary and conventional.

DAY.—The true solar day is the interval of time which elapses between two consecutive returns of the same terrestrial meridian to the sun. By reason of the inclined position of the ecliptic, and the unequal progressive motion of the earth in its orbit, it is not always of the same absolute length. But as it would be hardly possible, in the artificial measurement of time, to have regard to this small inequality which is besides constantly varying, the *mean solar day* is employed for all civil purposes. This is the time in which the earth would make one revolution on its axis, as compared with the sun, if the earth moved at an equable rate in the plane of the equator. The mean solar day is therefore a result of computation, and is not marked precisely by any astronomical phenomenon; but its difference from the true solar or apparent day is so small as to escape ordinary observation.

The subdivision of the day into twenty-four parts, or hours, has prevailed since the remotest ages, though different nations have not agreed either with respect to the epoch of its commencement or the manner of distributing the hours. Europeans in general, like the ancient Egyptians, place the commencement of the civil day at midnight, and reckon twelve morning hours from midnight to mid-day, and twelve evening hours from mid-day to

midnight. Astronomers, after the example of Ptolemy, regard the day as commencing with the sun's culmination, or noon, and find it most convenient for the purposes of computation to reckon through the whole twenty-four hours. Hipparchus reckoned the twenty-four hours from midnight to midnight. Some nations, as the ancient Chaldeans and the modern Greeks, have chosen sunrise for the commencement of the day; others, again, as the Italians and Bohemians, suppose it to commence at sunset. In all these cases the beginning of the day varies with the seasons at all places not under the equator. In the early ages of Rome, and even down to the middle of the 5th century after the foundation of the city, no other divisions of the day were known than sunrise, sunset, and mid-day, which was marked by the arrival of the sun between the Rostra and a place called Græcostasæ, where ambassadors from Greece and other countries used to stand. The Greeks divided the natural day and night into twelve equal parts each, and the hours thus formed were denominated *temporary hours*, from their varying in length according to the seasons of the year. The hours of the day and night were of course only equal at the time of the equinoxes. The whole period of day and night they called *νυχθημερον*.

WEEK.—The week is a period of seven days, having no reference whatever to the celestial motions,—a circumstance to which it owes its unalterable uniformity. Although it did not enter into the calendar of the Greeks, and was not introduced at Rome till after the reign of Theodosius, it has been employed from time immemorial in almost all eastern countries; and as it forms neither an aliquot part of the year nor of the lunar month, those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at a loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign to it an origin having much semblance of probability. It might have been suggested by the phases of the moon, or by the number of the planets known in ancient times, an origin which is rendered more probable from the names universally given to the different days of which it is composed. In the Egyptian astronomy, the order of the planets, beginning with the most remote, is Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon. Now, the day being divided into twenty-four hours, each hour was consecrated to a particular planet, namely, one to Saturn, the following to Jupiter, the third to Mars, and so on according to the above order; and the day received the name of the

planet which presided over its first hour. If, then, the first hour of a day was consecrated to Saturn, that planet would also have the 8th, the 15th, and the 22nd hour; the 23rd would fall to Jupiter, the 24th to Mars, and the 25th, or the first hour of the second day, would belong to the Sun. In like manner the first hour of the 3rd day would fall to the Moon, the first of the 4th day to Mars, of the 5th to Mercury, of the 6th to Jupiter, and of the 7th to Venus. The cycle being completed, the first hour of the 8th day would return to Saturn, and all the others succeed in the same order. According to Dio Cassius, the Egyptian week commenced with Saturday. On their flight from Egypt, the Jews, from hatred to their ancient oppressors, made Saturday the last day of the week.

The English names of the days are derived from the Saxon. The ancient Saxons had borrowed the week from some Eastern nation, and substituted the names of their own divinities for those of the gods of Greece. In legislative and justiciary acts the Latin names are still retained.

Latin.	English.	Saxon.
Dies Solis.	Sunday.	Sun's day.
Dies Lunæ.	Monday.	Moon's day.
Dies Martis.	Tuesday.	Tiw's day.
Dies Mercurii.	Wednesday.	Woden's day.
Dies Jovis.	Thursday.	Thor's day.
Dies Veneris.	Friday.	Friga's day.
Dies Saturni.	Saturday.	Seterne's day.

MONTH.—Long before the exact length of the year was determined, it must have been perceived that the synodic revolution of the moon is accomplished in about 29½ days. Twelve lunations, therefore, form a period of 354 days, which differs only by about 11¼ days from the solar year. From this circumstance has arisen the practice, perhaps universal, of dividing the year into twelve *months*. But in the course of a few years the accumulated difference between the solar year and twelve lunar months would become considerable, and have the effect of transporting the commencement of the year to a different season. The difficulties that arose in attempting to avoid this inconvenience induced some nations to abandon the moon altogether, and regulate their year by the course of the sun. The month, however, being a convenient period of time, has retained its place in the calendars of all nations; but, instead of denoting a synodic revolution of the moon, it is usually employed to denote an arbitrary number of days approaching to the twelfth part of a solar year.

Among the ancient Egyptians the month consisted of thirty days invariably; and in order to complete the year, five days were added at the end, called supplementary days. They made use of no intercalation, and by losing a fourth of a day every year, the commencement of the year went back one day in every period of four years, and consequently made a revolution of the seasons in 1461 years. Hence 1461 Egyptian years are equal to 1460 Julian years of 365¼ days each. This year is called *vague*, by reason of its commencing sometimes at one season of the year, and sometimes at another.

The Greeks divided the month into three decades, or periods of ten days,—a practice which was imitated by the French in their unsuccessful attempt to introduce a new calendar at the period of the Revolution. This division offers two advantages: the first is, that the period is an exact measure of the month of thirty days; and the second is, that the number of the day of the decade is connected with and suggests the number of the day of the month. For example, the 5th of the decade must necessarily be the 5th, the 15th, or the 25th of the month; so that when the day of the decade is known, that of the month can scarcely be mistaken. In reckoning by weeks, it is necessary to keep in mind the day of the week on which each month begins.

The Romans employed a division of the month and a method of reckoning the days which appear not a little extraordinary, and must, in practice, have been exceedingly inconvenient. As frequent allusion is made by classical writers to this embarrassing method of computation, which is carefully retained in the ecclesiastical calendar, we here give a table showing the correspondence of the Roman months with those of modern Europe.

Days of the Month.	March. May. July. October.	January. August. December.	April. June. September. November.	February.
1	Calendæ.	Calendæ.	Calendæ.	Calendæ.
2	6	4	4	4
3	5	3	3	3
4	4	Prid. Nonas.	Prid. Nonas.	Prid. Nonas.
5	3	Nonas.	Nonas.	Nonas.
6	Prid. Nonas.	8	8	8
7	Nonas.	7	7	7
8	8	6	6	6
9	7	5	5	5
10	6	4	4	4
11	5	3	3	3
12	4	Prid. Idus.	Prid. Idus.	Prid. Idus.
13	3	Idus.	Idus.	Idus.
14	Prid. Idus.	19	18	16
15	Idus.	18	17	15
16	17	17	16	14
17	16	16	15	13
18	15	15	14	12
19	14	14	13	11
20	13	13	12	10
21	12	12	11	9
22	11	11	10	8
23	10	10	9	7
24	9	9	8	6
25	8	8	7	5
26	7	7	6	4
27	6	6	5	3
28	5	5	4	Prid. Cal. Mart.
29	4	4	3	
30	3	3	Prid. Calen.	
31	Prid. Calen.	Prid. Calen.		

Instead of distinguishing the days by the ordinal numbers first, second, third, &c., the Romans counted *backwards* from three fixed epochs, namely, the *Calends*, the *Nonas*, and the *Ides*. The *Calends* (or *Kalends*) were invariably the first day of the month, and were so denominated because it had been an ancient custom of the pontiffs to call the people together on that day, to apprise them of the festivals, or days that were to be kept sacred during the month. The *Ides* (from an obsolete verb *idare*, to divide) were at the middle of the month, either the 13th or the 15th day; and the *Nonas* were the *ninth* day before the *Ides*, counting inclusively. From these three terms the days received their denomination in the following manner:—Those which were comprised between the *Calends* and the *Nonas* were called *the days before the Nonas*; those between the *Nonas* and the *Ides* were called *the days before the Ides*; and, lastly, all the days after the *Ides* to the end of the month were called *the days before the Calends* of the succeeding month. In the months of March, May, July, and October, the *Ides* fell on the 15th day, and the *Nonas* consequently on the 7th; so that each of these months had six days named from the *Nonas*. In all the other months the *Ides* were on the 13th and the *Nonas* on the 5th; consequently there were only four days named from the *Nonas*. Every month had eight days named from the *Ides*. The number of days receiving their denomination from the *Calends* depended on the number of days in the month and the day on which the *Ides* fell. For example, if the month contained 31 days, and the *Ides* fell on the 13th, as was the case in January, August, and December, there would remain 18 days after the *Ides*, which, added