Athenians Politically Active in Pnyx II

P. J. Bicknell

I. Introduction

In an article published in this journal in 1987[1] Stanton and I argued that in the periods of Pnyx I and II Athenian citizens in the *ekklesia* were grouped by phylai and trittyes. In the period of Pnyx I, we submitted, the ecclesiasts from city trittyes sat at the front of the auditorium, those from inland trittyes behind them, and members of coastal trittyes at the rear. In the period of Pnyx II, it was further proposed, this order was changed; participants from inland trittyes now occupied the foremost seats and those from city trittyes were positioned furthest back.

In the second appendix to the article I offered a statistical argument to the effect that Athenian citizens registered in inland demes were politically more active in the *ekklesia* in the period of Pnyx II than their counterparts from coastal and city demes. I suggested that this fact supported our conclusions about seating arrangements in the assembly for the years concerned. Their position closest to the *bema* and presiding officials gave would-be *politeuomenoi* from inland demes a decided, if not decisive, advantage.

I took care in my appendix to indicate the rough and ready nature of my calculations, and in what follows I seek to provide a less impressionistic and more rigorous analysis. Comprehensive reworking was dictated in particular by two lines of criticism communicated orally and by way of correspondence.

The first group of objections relates to the source of the data base upon which my computations were founded. This was an inventory published in 1983[2] of 368 Athenian citizens active in the fourth century B.C. as *rhetores* and *strategoi*. Since the appearance of our article Hansen has published a list of *addenda*

[1] "Voting in Tribal Groups in the Athenian Assembly," *GRBS* 28 (1987) 51–92.

[2] M. H. Hansen, "*Rhetores* and *Strategoi* in Fourth-century Athens," *GRBS* 24 (1983) 151–80.

and *corrigenda* to his inventory[3] and subsequently made further revisions which he generously communicated to me during a recent visit to Australia. Equally generously R. Develin furnished me with detailed comments which suggested that further modifications were in order. Further, in compiling my list I failed to take account of proposers of decrees whose demotics are discernible but whose names are obliterated or only partially preserved in the inscriptions that attest their activity. A full list of such was provided by Hansen in an important article published in this journal in 1984.[4]

The other criticisms concerned the criteria that I chose to adopt for political activity in the assembly. The bases for inclusion in my list (90f) were proposal of a decree in the *ekklesia*, the addition of a rider to a decree, and an address to the gathered citizens. It has been objected that I failed to draw a relevant distinction between decrees that were probouleumatic (and thus originated in the council of 500 and were sponsored in the assembly by a council member) and those that were proposed on the assembly floor, and that I should have included in my list of names those who objected in the assembly that this or that *psephisma* was illegal and so instigated *graphai paranomon* cases. With the latter criticism I am now inclined to concur. As to failure to distinguish the two types of decree, my rationale was that a council member whose name was attached to a *probouleuma* and who was responsible for its subsequent fate in the *ekklesia* would more likely than not be an individual experienced in speaking on the assembly floor. It is true, if Hansen's view of *procheirotonia* in the assembly is correct[5] (I have some reservations), that some *probouleumata* might be adopted without debate; but such untrammeled passage, obviating the necessity for active verbal support, can never, I would submit, have been confidently guaranteed. I concede now that irrelevance, for my purposes, of the distinction between the two types of decree should not have been taken for granted. The difference ought to have been noted and its bearing on my calculations explicitly assessed.

[3] *GRBS* 28 (1987) 209–11.

[4] "The Number of *Rhetores* in the Athenian *Ecclesia*, 355–322 B.C.," *GRBS* 25 (1984) 123–55.

[5] See Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia* (Copenhagen 1983) 123–30.

II. Inventories and Statistics

Athenians Politically Active in the Ecclesia, 403/2–346/5

After much reconsideration I have come to the conclusion that Pnyx II will have been completed by and become operational in 403/2. The following analysis then embraces the period commencing with and including that year and concluding with and including 346/5, which brings us close to the construction of Pnyx III. I continue to concur with H. A. Thomson's suggestion[6] that proposals mentioned at Aeschines 1.81–84 provide for clearing the way, literally, for enlargment and revamping of the assembly place.

The basis of my revised inventory of Athenians politically active in Pnyx II whose demotics are recorded is Hansen's 1983 list of *rhetores* and *strategoi* together with his 1984 list of proposers of decrees whose names are obliterated or only partially preserved. Hansen's 1987 and subsequent modifications to his 1983 catalogue are taken into account, as too are the comments communicated to me by R. Develin.

The following activities are criteria for inclusion:

(1) Proposal of a decree in the assembly whether non-probouleumatic or probouleumatic. The two types of *psephisma* are now distinguished, with D standing for the former, DP for the latter; a decree whose type is uncertain is signified by DU. I am aware of Hansen's conviction (*supra* n.4: 127) that some citizens moved decrees without addressing the *ekklesia* in support of their proposals, but remain unconvinced that the evidence he adduces commits us to such a counter-intuitional conclusion. My own view of [Dem.] 59.43, central to Hansen's argument, emerges below in the final section.

(2) Contribution of a rider to a decree; signified by R.

(3) An address to the assembly in a non-professional capacity and in non-extraordinary circumstances; signified by A.

(4) Objection in the assembly to the legality of a decree which resulted in a *graphe paranomon* case; signified by GP.

The appearance of LA at the end of an entry signifies activity in the *ekklesia* later than 346/5 on the part of the individual concerned.

[6] *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 145 n.40. At some stage work in progress will have necessitated transfer of *ekklesia* meetings to alternative locations.

I continue to exclude figures active and in the public eye under the old democracy on the ground that previously acquired expertise and recognition will have facilitated their ecclesiastic activity. These now comprise:

Ἀνδοκίδης Λεωγόρου Κυδαθηναιεύς (*PA* 828).
Ἄνυτος Ἀνθεμίωνος Εὐωνυμεύς (*PA* 1324, *APF*). He was active in the council in 413/2 (Ar. *Thesm.* 809) and *strategos* in 409/8 (Diod. 13.64.6).
Ἀρχῖνος ἐκ Κοιλῆς (*PA* 2526). See Ar. *Ran.* 367 with scholia and Plato Com. fr.133 (I 636 K.).
Θεοζοτίδης Ἀθμονεύς (*PA* 6913+6914, *APF*; *SEG* XXVIII 190 supplies the demotic). See Cratinus fr.337 (I 112 K.).
Θρασύβουλος Λύκου Στειριεύς (*PA* 7310).

I also continue to exclude essentially military figures whose interventions in the *ekklesia* are likely either to have been in a professional capacity or to have been facilitated by *auctoritas* acquired as a consequence of military success: Ἰφικράτης Τιμοθέου Ῥαμνούσιος, Τιμόθεος Κόνωνος Ἀναφλύστιος, Φωκίων Φώκου Ποτάμιος (?).

The following who also served as *strategoi* during our period have not been excluded because analysis of their activity very strongly suggests that essentially they were *politeuomenoi* and that their political *auctoritas* may well have contributed to eventual election to military office: Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀζηνιεύς, Καλλίστρατος Καλλικράτους Ἀφιδναῖος, Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰξωνεύς.

Exclusion is maintained of individuals who as likely as not proposed decrees or addressed the assembly either in some professional or specialist capacity, or in extraordinary circumstances. These now include:

Ἀριστόμαχος Κριτοδήμου Ἀλωπεθῆκεν (*PA* 1969), who addressed the assembly in 353/2 (Dem. 23.13, 110) as the representative of Charidemus and Cersebleptes.
Θεαίτητος Ἐρχιεύς (*PA* 6631), who may well have addressed the assembly in 361/0 concerning alliance with Thessaly (*IG* II^2 116.45) in the capacity of envoy or *proxenos*.
Ναυσικλῆς Κλεάρχου Ὀῆθεν (*PA* 10552), who was ambassador to Philip of Macedon in 347/6 when he addressed the assembly recommending Aeschines as envoy (Aeschin. 2.18).
Φρύνων Ῥαμνούσιος (*PA* 10352), who had a very special reason for

being given the floor for proposing a mission to Philip in 348/7; he had recently been ransomed and hoped to recover the money (Aeschin. 2.12).

I now reject the following as chronologically doubtful, insecure, or mistaken:

Ἐξηκεστίδης Χαρίου Θορίκιος. I heed Develin's warning against combining *PA* 4710 and 4718.

Μενίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθηναιεύς (*PA* 10055). I follow Hansen 1987 and Develin.

Πάνδιος Σωκλέους ἐξ Οἴου (*PA* 11575). Given the emergence of Πάνδιος Ἀχαρνεύς (*IG* II² 5830) and Πάνδιος Τειθράσιος (*SEG* XXIV 151.6) it is no longer safe, as Hansen has pointed out to me, to identify the proposer of *IG* II² 103 and 105 with the *grammateus* of 355/4 (*IG* II² 131.4, 132.19, 133.6).

Πολυκράτης Πολυεύκτου Φηγαιεύς. Develin indicates that the proposer of *IG* II² 207a is Πολυκράτης Πολυκράτου, deme unknown.

Dates and references are normally supplied only by way of clarifying which decrees listed in Hansen's 1983 catalogue are non-probouleumatic, which probouleumatic, and which cannot be assigned with any real confidence to one of the two categories for lack of information. All other dates and references may be culled from his original list together with his 1987 schedule of modifications. With respect to differentiation of the two categories of decree, I am heavily indebted to tables C and D of pp.246–68 of P. J. Rhodes' *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972).

In some cases demes appear with more than one trittys affiliation. The first represents allocation within Cleisthenes' organisation (which in the view of some remained in effect until the inception of the two Macedonian phylai in 307/6) of the Athenian citizen body. Despite speculations by Traill to the contrary,[7] I remain convinced that the Cleisthenic trittyes were strictly topographic. The second, in *italics*, reflects my conviction that in the fourth century the Cleisthenic trittyes were modified with several demes being shunted from their original grouping to another belonging to the same phyle in defiance of geographical reality. Such transpositions to my mind constitute the best explanation of the ordering of demes in inscribed

[7] See n.11 *infra*.

fourth-century lists of *prytaneis* and *bouleutai*.[8] I draw the conclusion that the original groupings of demes in trittyes, together with the demes' bouleutic quotas, were altered by way of a single, comprehensive renovation probably more or less coincident with the democracy's restoration.[9] Both features—new structure and new representations—were dictated by demographic considerations. After the face-lift all demes were once again (assuming, that is, that Cleisthenes played fair when he devised his original groupings and quotas) proportionately represented in the council of 500, and in nine out of ten phylai (on the single recalcitrant exception, Oineis, see below) trittyes roughly equal in population were achieved, each of which presented a bouleutic complement of 16 or 17. The following transpositions, all but the third derived from Traill, are relevant in the present context overall:

Erechtheid Anagyrous from coast to inland (Traill 104f)
Pandionid Probalinthos from coast to city (Traill 101)
Leontid Upper and Lower Potamos from coast to city[10]

[8] The arrangements of demes in these lists was the subject of a seminal discussion by W. E. Thompson, *Historia* 15 (1966) 1–10. His investigations provided the foundation for the explorations of J. S. Traill.

[9] That the Cleisthenic system sustained a substantial reorganisation was the view arrived at by J. S. TRAILL in the body of his article, "Diakris, the Inland Trittys of Leontis," *Hesperia* 47 (1978 [hereafter 'Traill']) 89–109. In an addendum, however, he changes his mind and suggests that trittyes not strictly topographic go back to Cleisthenes; so too *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 162–71, and *Demos and Trittys* (Toronto 1986). Traill seems to me to fail to give due consideration to the inevitable effects, surely disparate with respect to different groupings, on the Athenian population of the plague, huge losses in the Peloponnesian War, and the purges carried out by the Thirty. The phylai themselves can hardly have been equal in population at the beginning of the fourth century, when there must have been a temptation to shift demes from one to another. For whatever reason (I hesitate to invoke the alleged Athenian conservatism that has been so overworked by many scholars) it was resisted. A by-product of the restructuring I envisage was, I think, the formation of a handful of new demes, all very small. These included Erechtheid Sybridai, first in evidence in 377/6 (*IG* II² 1410.1).

[10] Traill, *Demos* (*supra* n.9: 130–32), now contends that Upper and Lower Potamos were city demes in the topographic sense, while Potamos Deiradiotes belonged to the coastal trittys. My present position is that all three demes were originally coastal and that the two former were transferred to the modified city trittys at the beginning of the fourth century; hence the grouping of the two demes at *Agora* XV 13 (370/69). At *Agora* XV 42 (336/5) geographic reality overwhelms administrative convenience.

Hippothontid Azenia from coast to inland[11]
Aiantid Rhamnous from coast to city (Traill 102)
Antiochid Eroiadai and Krioa from inland to city (Traill 104)

Still finding no good reason to conclude that Acharnai was multi-nuclear I continue to discount transference of part of this Oeneid deme from inland to city.[12] As before, I am unable to accept Traill's revision of 1982[13] in conformity with which Anagyrous would remain a coastal deme while Upper Lamptrai was shifted from Erechtheid coast to inland.

1. Αἰσχίνης Ἀτρομήτου Κοθωκίδης (*PA* 354). Phyle VI, trittys Coast. A (more than once); LA.
2. Ἀλεξίμαχος Πήληξ (*PA* 545). IV, Inland. D.
3. Ἀνδροτίων Ἄνδρωνος Γαργήττιος (*PA* 913+915, *APF*). II, Inland. D 2 (356/5, Dem. 22.48, 24.160f; 347/6, *IG* II² 212.8); DU 3 (365/4?, *IG* II² 216a.13, b.6; 356/5?, Dem. 22.70, 24.178; 356/5, Dem. 22.5, 8–10); A 3; GP.
4. Ἀπολλόδωρος Πασίωνος Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 1411). VI, Inland. DP.
5. Ἀριστοτέλης Μαραθώνιος (*PA* 2065). IX, Coast. D.
6. Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀζηνιεύς (*PA* 2108). VIII; Coast: *Inland*.[14] D 2 (363/2, *IG* II² 111.4; 361/0, *IG* II² 118.4); DP 2 (357/6, *IG* II² 121.9; 355/4, *IG* II² 130.8); DU 5 (403/2, Dem. 57.31–34; 403/2, Dem. 20.149; 363/2, Hyp. fr.44; 362/1, Dem. 50.4–6; 354/3, Dem. 24.11); LA.
7. Ἁρμόδιος Προξένου Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 2234). IX, Inland. GP.
8. Ἀρχέδημος Ἀρχίου Παιονίδης (*PA* 2325). IV, Inland. DP.
9. Ἀστύφιλος Φιλάγρου Ἁλαιεύς (*PA* 2662+2663+2664). VII, Coast. D (373/2: *Hesperia* 3 [1934] 2f no. 3); DP (378/7: *IG* II² 42.3).
10. Ἀφαρεὺς Ἰσοκράτους Ἐρχιεύς (*PA* 2769, *APF*). II, Inland. A (many); LA (?).[15]
11. Βλέπυρος Πειθάνδρου Παιονίδης (*PA* 2881). IV, Inland. R.

[11] Traill, *Demos* (*supra* n.9) 137. I agree with him that the coastal site south of Kokkini would suit Azenia well. I do not, of course, share his view that Azenia's grouping with inland demes goes back to Cleisthenes.

[12] See Traill 105 and Stanton and Bicknell (*supra* n.1) 92 n.134.

[13] *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 166f (he adheres to the view expressed here in *Demos* 126) and Stanton and Bicknell (*supra* n.1: 91f n.134).

[14] For the probable location, and hence original trittys affiliation, of Azenia see *supra* n.11.

[15] Despite Develin's scepticism I agree with Hansen, who discussed the matter with me, that in all probability the activity of Aphareus in the *ekklesia* commenced in the period of Pnyx II. As Davies (*APF* 247) observes, he cannot have been born later than 388.

12. Γνάθων Λακιάδης (not in *PA*). VI, City. DP.
13. Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3597). III, Inland. D 4 (352/1, Dem. 4.13–33; 347/6, Aeschin. 2.17; 347/6, Aeschin. 2.53f; 347/6, Aeschin. 2.53, 61); DP (347/6, Dem. 19.234, Aeschin. 2.46); LA.
14. Διοπείθης Διοπείθους Σφήττιος (*PA* 4328). V, Inland. R; LA.
15. Διόφαντος Θρασυμήδους Σφήττιος (*PA* 4438). V, Inland. DP 2 (368/7, *IG* II² 106.6, 107.8); DU (352/1, Dem. 19.86).
16. Ἐπικράτης Κηφισιεύς (*PA* 4859). I, Inland. A.
17. Ἐπικράτης Μενεστράτου Παλληνεύς (*PA* 4909). X, Inland. R.
18. Ἐπικράτης . .οτήτου Παλληνεύς (*PA* 4863, *APF*) X, Inland. DU.
19. Εὐβουλίδης Ἀντιφίλου Ἁλιμούσιος (*PA* 5323). IV, City. DP.
20. Εὔβουλος Σπινθάρου Προβαλίσιος (*PA* 5369). III, Coast: *City*. DU 2; LA.
21. Εὐθυκλῆς Θριάσιος (*PA* 5581). VI, Coast. GP.
22. Εὐριπίδης Ἀδειμάντου Μυρρινούσιος (*PA* 5949+5955+ 5956, *APF*). III, Coast. D (403/2, *IG* II² 145.3f); DU (before 393, Ar. *Eccl.* 825).
23. Ἡγήσανδρος Ἡγησίου Σουνιεύς (*PA* 6307). IV, Coast. DP; A.
24. Ἡγήσιππος Ἡγησίου Σουνιεύς (*PA* 6351). IV, Coast. D (357/6, *IG* II² 125.1); DU (365/4, Aeschin. 3.118); GP; A.
25. Ἱεροκλείδης Τιμοστράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*PA* 7463). X, City. D (349/8, *IG* II² 209.5); DP (349/8, 206.5–7, 26f).
26. Καλλικράτης Χαροπίδου Λαμπτρεύς (*PA* 7946+7973+8213). I, Coast. DP; LA (D [340/339, *IG* II² 233.51]).
27. Κάλλιππος Παιανιεύς (*PA* 8078). III, Inland. DU.
28. Καλλίστρατος Καλλικράτους Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 8517+8129). IX, Inland. DP (369/8, *IG* II² 107.36); DU 2 (392/1, Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 149a; 370/369, Dem. 59.27), one of which must have been non-probouleumatic; R.
29. Κέφαλος Κολλυτεύς (*PA* 8277). II, City. DU many (379/8, Deinarch. 1.39; others at unspecified times, Aeschin. 3.194); R.
30. Κηφισόδοτος ἐκ Κεραμέων (*PA* 8331). V, City. D (ca 364, *IG* II² 141.30); DU 2 (369/8, Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.12–14; 358/7, Arist. *Rh.* 1411a6–11); A.
31. Κηφισοφῶν Παιανιεύς (*PA* 8400+8401+8415+8416, *APF*). III, Inland. DP; R.
32. Κηφισοφῶν Καλλιβίου Παιανιεύς (*PA* 8417, *APF*). III, Inland. D (347/6, Aeschin. 2.73); A; LA.
33. Λεωδάμας Ἐρασιστράτου Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 9077). VI, Inland. GP.
34. Λεπτίνης ἐκ Κοίλης (*PA* 9046). VIII, City. A.
35. Μειδίας Κηφισοδώρου Ἀναγυράσιος (*PA* 9719). I, Coast: *Inland*. A (numerous).
36. Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 9788). VII, Coast. DP; A (frequent).

37. Περίανδρος Πολυαράτου Χολαργεύς (*PA* 11800). V, City. D.
38. Πολύευκτος Σωστράτου Σφήττιος (PA 11925+11934+11950). V, Inland. DP; LA (including D [324/3, *IG* II² 363.7f]; DU 2 [332/1, *IG* II² 363.7f, 368.8]).
39. Πολύευκτος Τιμοκράτους Κριωεύς (*PA* 11946). X, Inland: *City*. R.
40. Πύρρανδρος 'Αναφλύστιος (*PA* 12496). X, Coast. DP; A.
41. Στέφανος 'Αντιδωρίδου 'Εροιάδης (*PA* 12887). VIII, City, or X, Inland: *City*. D (347/6, *IG* II² 213.5); DU (several, Dem. 59.43); GP.
42. Τίμαρχος 'Αριζήλου Σφήττιος (*PA* 13636). V, Inland. DP (347/6, Dem. 19.286f); DU more than one hundred (Aeschin. 1.81, hypoth., Suda *s.v.*), of which most must have been non-probouleumatic.
43. 'Υπερείδης Γλαυκίππου Κολλυτεύς (*PA* 13912). II, City. GP (363/2, Σ Aeschin. 1.64); LA.
44. Φιλέψιος Λαμπτρεύς (*PA* 14256). I, Coast. A (frequent).
45. Φιλοκράτης Πυθοδώρου 'Αγνούσιος (*PA* 14599+14576). V, Inland. DP (before 353/2, *IG* II² 182.5); DU 6 (352/1, Androt. *FGrHist* 324 F 30, Philoch. 328 F 155, *IG* II² 204.54f; 348/7, Aeschin. 2.13; 347/6, Aeschin. 2.18; 347/6, Aeschin. 3.54, Dem. 18.21; 347/6, Dem. 19.47f); since Philocrates could not have been a member of the *boule* in more than one of the years concerned, some of these must have been non-probouleumatic; R.
46. Φιλωτάδης Φιλοστράτου Παλληνεύς (*PA* 14927). X, Inland. DP.
47. —ς 'Αριστύλλου Στειριεύς (Hansen [1984] 137 no. 6). III, Coast. DP (351/0, *IG* II² 205.9).

For 46 out of the 47 individuals in the revised data bank, affiliation in terms of the strictly topographical trittyes created by Cleisthenes is more or less certain. The single exception now is Stephanus (41) whose deme, Eroiadai, could belong to either city Hippothontis or inland Antiochis. Leaving Stephanus out of account, 23 (2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 38, 39, 42, 45, and 46) out of 46 individuals, that is 50%, were registered in inland demes; 15 (1, 5, 6, 9, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 35, 36, 40, 44, 47), that is 33%, in coastal demes; and 8 (12, 19, 25, 29, 30, 34, 37, 43), that is 17%, in city demes.

In terms of the modified trittyes that in my view were operative for all purposes during the fourth century from the restoration of the democracy until the creation of the Macedonian phylai, the trittys affiliation of all 47 individuals is now more or less established. 24 (2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 42, 45, 46), 51%, belonged to inland demes; 12 (1, 5, 9, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 36, 40, 44, 47), 26%, to coastal

demes; and 11 (12, 19, 20, 25, 29, 30, 34, 37, 39, 41, 43), 24%, to city demes.

Of our 47 individuals, 6 (4, 8, 12, 19, 46, 47) appear in the inventory on the basis of a singleton probouleumatic decree. I still incline to the supposition that *bouleutai* whose names were attached to a probouleuma were as likely as not men with experience in speaking on the assembly floor, and point out that another 9 (6, 9, 13, 25, 26, 28, 38, 42, 45) of those listed proposed decrees of both varieties, probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic.[16] If, nevertheless, the former six individuals are excluded, the following statistics result. In terms of topographic trittyes, with Stephanus (41) perforce left out of account, 20 out of 40 individuals, 50%, belong to inland demes; 14, 35%, to coastal demes; and 6, 15%, to city demes. In terms of the modified trittyes that I consider relevant, 21 of 41 individuals, 51%, are members of inland demes, 11, 27%, of coastal demes; and 9, 22%, of city demes.

Given that as a result of the modifications carried out by the restoration democracy the constituent trittyes of all phylai except Oineis were more or less equalised, the figures, provided that we have at least a reasonable approximation to an adequate and non-aberrant statistical sample, are extremely remarkable. Other things being equal and with allowance duly made for considerable migration from peripheral demes to the Athens-Peiraeus complex, we would expect neither such a relatively poor showing on the part of the city, nor the vast disproportion between inland and coast. I continue to countenance and to commend serious attention to the possibility that the figures reflect differing potentialities for active participation in an assembly in which members of inland demes sat across the front of the auditorium closest to the *bema*, members of coastal demes behind them, and members of city demes at the rear.

Strategoi, 403/2–346/5

The following list comprises all Athenians whose demotics are recorded who held the office of *strategos* in one or more years from 403/2 through 346/5. Dates and references may be found

[16] So also Pandius, now excluded. *IG* II² 103 (369/8) is probouleumatic, 105 (368/7) non-probouleumatic.

in Hansen's 1983 catalogue of *rhetores* and *strategoi*; I have noted the relevant 1987 additions and corrections and taken heed of further revisions communicated to me personally. The latter account for the absence of Μόλοττος Εὐνόμου Ἀφιδναῖος: the existence of Μόλοττος Ἰφιστιάδου, *bouleutes* in 336/5 (*Agora* XV 42.203) renders unsafe the equation of the general of 349/8 (*PA* 10403) with the *diaitetes* of *ca* 325 (10406; see *IG* II² 1927.129). Phyle and deme are indicated in terms of the modified trittyes of the fourth century until 307/6. *Italics* are used where the affiliation differs from its counterpart in the strictly topographical organisation of Cleisthenes.

1. Ἀγύρριος Κολλυτεύς (*PA* 179). II, City.
2. Ἀλκίμαχος Ἀναγυράσιος (*PA* 616). I, *Inland*.
3. Ἀντισθένης Ἀντιφάτους Κυθήρριος (*PA* 1184+1196). III, Coast.[17]
4. Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀζηνιεύς (*PA* 2108). VIII, *Inland*.
5. Ἀρχῖνος ἐκ Κοίλης (*PA* 2526). VIII, City.
6. Αὐτοκλῆς Στρομβιχίδου Εὐωνυμεύς (*PA* 2727). I, City.
7. Δημαίνετος Δημέου Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3265+3276). III, Inland.
8. Διοκλῆς Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*PA* 3990+4015). X, City.
9. Διότιμος Ὀλυμπιοδώρου Εὐωνυμεύς (*PA* 4370, *APF*). I, City.
10. Ἐξηκεστίδης Θορίκιος (*PA* 4718). V, Coast.
11. Ἡγησίλεως Προβαλίσιος (*PA* 6339). III, *City*.
12. Θρασύβουλος Θράσωνος Ἐρχιεύς (*PA* 7304). II, Inland.
13. Θρασύβουλος Θράσωνος Κολλυτεύς (*PA* 7305). II, City.
14. Θρασύβουλος Λύκου Στειριεύς (*PA* 7310). III, Coast.
15. Ἰφικράτης Τιμοθέου Ῥαμνούσιος (*PA* 7737). IX, *City*.
16. Καλλίας Ἱππονίκου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*PA* 7826). X, City.
17. Καλλίστρατος Καλλικράτους Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 8157+8129). IX, Inland.
18. Κηφισόδοτος Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 8313). VI, Inland.
19. Κλεόβουλος Γλαύκου Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 8558). VI, Inland.

[17] At *Mnemosyne* SER. IV 28 (1975) 57–62 I suggested that Kytherros was a deme of inland Pandionis which was to be associated with the ancient remains near Vourva, 2.5 km. northeast of Spata. Traill provisionally accepted this identification (*Hesperia* 47 [1978] 101 n.37) and abandoned his previous association (*Hesperia* Suppl. 14 [1975] 41) of the site with Aigeid Myrrhinoutta which he had tentatively assigned to the inland trittys. Traill then went on to suggest that Kytherros was a coastal rather than an inland deme. Recently he has argued that it is to be identified with a deme site at Pousi Kaloyerou; he continues to assign it to coastal Pandionis (*Demos* [*supra* n.9] 47–51). For a number of reasons I am reluctant to abandon my 1975 identification, and am puzzled by the fact that the Vourva site is ignored in Traill's latest work. I am prepared to accept the affiliation of Kytherros to Pandionis' coastal trittys.

20. Κόνων Τιμοθέου Ἀναφλύστιος (*PA* 8707). X, Coast.
21. Λάχης Λάχητος Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 9018). VII, Coast.
22. Λεωσθένης Κεφαλῆθεν (*PA* 9141). V, Coast.
23. Μαντίας Μαντιθέου Θορίκιος (*PA* 9667). V, Coast.
24. Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 9788). VII, Coast.
25. Μενεσθεὺς Ἰφικράτους Ῥαμνούσιος (*PA* 9988). IX, *City*.
26. Ναυσικλῆς Κλεάρχου Ὀῆθεν (*PA* 10552). VI, Coast.
27. Πάμφιλος Κειριάδης (*PA* 11545). VII, City.
28. Πρόξενος Ἀρμοδίου Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 12270). IX, Inland.
29. Ῥίνων Χαρικλέους Παιανιεύς (*PA* 12532). III, Inland.
30. Τιμόθεος Κόνωνος Ἀναφλύστιος (*PA* 13700). X, Coast.
31. Τιμόμαχος Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 13797). VI, Inland.
32. Φαῖδρος Καλλίου Σφήττιος (*PA* 13964). V, Inland.
33. Φιλοχάρης Ῥαμνούσιος (*PA* 14779). IX, *City*.
34. Φίλων Καλλίππου Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 14825, *APF*). VII, Coast.
35. Φωκίων Φώκου Ποτάμιος (?) (*PA* 15076).[18] V, Coast or *City*.
36. Χαβρίας Κτησίππου Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 15086). VII, Coast.
37. Χάρης Θεοχάρους Ἀγγελῆθεν (*PA* 15292). III, Coast.
38. Χαρίδημος Φιλοξένου Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 15380). VI, Inland.

I take it to be a non-controversial proposition that in the fourth century, by and large, Athenian generals were chosen on the basis of actual or supposed military capacity. This granted, and given equalisation at the time of the democracy's restoration of the trittyes within all phylai except Oineis, we would expect those individuals who held the *strategia* within our period to be distributed more or less evenly across inland, coastal, and city demes. If the above list is an adequate statistical sample, analysis should confirm such anticipation.

I exclude from computation Conon (20) and Thrasybulus of Steiria (14) on the ground that the electorate would have been predisposed in their favour by the fact that both had become established and prestigious military figures in the fifth century.[19] Arguably, Aristophon (4), Archinus (5), Callistratus (17), Melanopus (24), and Rhinon (29)[20] should be eliminated also on the ground that for all acquired political influence may have carried weight with a substantial number of electors. The decision

18 For the possible demotic see *Agora* XV 42.206.

19 Conon's remarkable career from Aegispotami until his triumphant return to Athens must have conferred especial glamour.

20 Rhinon had a very high profile immediately before the restoration of the democracy: see Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 38, Isoc. 18.6–8.

is a difficult one and I calculate with and without them. Phocion (35) is omitted because even if his deme is correctly identified its trittys affiliation is uncertain.

With Aristophon, Archinus, Callistratus, Melanopus, and Rhinon included, 12 (2, 4, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 28, 29, 31, 32, 38) generals out of 35, that is 34.29%, belong to inland demes; 11 (3, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 34, 36, 37), 31.42%, to coastal demes; and 12 (1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 25, 27, 33) 34.29% again, to city demes. With those five ejected 9 out of 30 generals, 30%, belong to inland demes; 10, 33.33%, to coastal; 11, 36.66%, to city.

In the first case the spread conforms as closely as it could to expectation, and in the second it remains very undramatic. I infer that small as it is our batch of generals constitutes a not unrepresentative sample. If this is right the inventory of citizens active in Pnyx II, compiled from the same evidential resources, if comparatively somewhat more exiguous, may have at least some claim to similar reliability.

Athenians Politically Active in the Ekklesia, 345/4–323/2

For comparative puposes I list and then scrutinise Athenians of known demotic, politically active in the assembly, whose earliest attested ecclesiastic contribution falls in the years 345/4 through 323/2, the period during which Pnyx III was constructed and became operational. The basic sources are again Hansen's 1983 list of *rhetores* and *strategoi* and his 1984 list of proposers of decrees whose demotics are preserved but whose names are either broken or obliterated. I am satisfied that numbers 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 27, and 29 of the 1984 list are all distinct individuals and that none can be equated with persons included in the 1983 catalogue whose demotics are ascertainable. I once again take account of Hansen's 1987 modifications and his subsequent revisions. The latter explain the exclusion of Emmenides: as Hansen has pointed out to me, *PA* 4687, whom in 1987 he was inclined to identify with Emmenides of Koile of *IG* II^2 208.4f, might equally well be Emmenides Hekalethen of *Agora* XV 42.463. Philocles son of Phormio Eroiades (*PA* 14521+14591, *APF*) has been excluded as an essentially military figure. Nausicles son of Clearchus Oethen is retained because his overall record suggests that he was basically a *politeuomenos*.

I no longer indicate which decrees were probouleumatic and

which not. Hence there are only four symbols: D, decree; R, rider; A, address; GP, *graphe paranomon.* Only modified trittys affiliation is indicated, with *italics* used where topographic reality has been overridden.

1. Ἀγνωνίδης Νικοξένου Περγασῆθεν (*PA* 176). I, Inland. D.
2. Ἀλκίμαχος ἐγ Μυρρινούττης (*PA* 622). II, Coast. D.
3. Ἀριστογείτων Κυδιμάχου Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 1775).[21] IX, Inland. D; A (frequent); GP.
4. Ἀριστόνικος Ἀριστοτέλους Μαραθώνιος (*PA* 2023+2028). IX, Coast. D.
5. Ἀριστόνικος Νικοφάνους Ἀναγυράσιος (*PA* 2025). I, *Inland.* D.
6. Βράχυλλος Βαθύλλου Ἐρχιεύς (*PA* 2928). II, Inland. D.
7. Δημάδης Δημέου Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3263). III, Inland. D 21.
8. Δημέας Δημάδου Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3322). III, Inland. D; A.
9. Δημήτριος Εὐκτήμονος Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 3392). IX, Inland. D.
10. Δημοκράτης Δημοκλέους Ἀφιδναῖος (*PA* 3521). IX, Inland. A.
11. Δημομέλης Δήμωνος Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3554). III, Inland. D.
12. Δημοσθένης Δημοκλέους Λαμπτρεύς (*PA* 3593). I, Coast. D 2.
13. Δημόφιλος Δημοφίλου Ἀχαρνεύς (*PA* 3675). VI, Inland. D.
14. Δήμων Δημομέλους Παιανιεύς (*PA* 3736). III, Inland. D.
15. Διόφαντος Φρασικλείδου Μυρρινούσιος (*PA* 4435). III, Coast. D 2.
16. Δίφιλος Διοπείθους Σουνιεύς (*PA* 4467+4487, *APF*). IV, Coast. A.
17. Ἐπιτέλης Σωινόμου Περγασῆθεν (*PA* 4963). I, Inland. D.
18. Ἐπιχάρης Χολλείδης (not in *PA*). IV, City. D.
19. Εὐξένιππος Ἐθελοκράτους Λαμπτρεύς (*PA* 5886+5888, *APF*). I, Coast. A.
20. Εὐφίλητος Εὐφιλήτου Κηφισιεύς (*PA* 6054). I, Inland. D.
21. Θεόδωρος Ἀντιφάνου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*PA* 6854). X, City. D.
22. Θεοκρίνης Ὑβάδης (*PA* 6946). IV, Inland. GP 4.
23. Θεομένης Ὀῆθεν (*PA* 6957). VI, Coast. D.
24. Ἱερώνυμος Οἰκωφέλους Ῥαμνούσιος (*PA* 7570). IX, *City.* D.
25. Ἱππόστρατος Ἐτεαρχίδου Παλληνεύς (*PA* 7669). X, Inland. D.
26. Ἱπποχάρης Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*PA* 7670). X, City. D.
27. Κηφισοφῶν Λυσιφῶντος Χολαργεύς (*PA* 8419). V, City. D.
28. Λυκοῦργος Λυκόφρονος Βουτάδης (*PA* 9251+9247). VI, City. D 11, A 2.
29. Μειδίας Μειδίου Ἀναγυράσιος (*PA* 9720). I, *Inland.* D.
30. Μοιροκλῆς Εὐθυδήμου Ἐλευσίνιος (*PA* 10400+10401). VIII, Coast. D; A.
31. Ναυσικλῆς Κλεάρχου Ὀῆθεν (*PA* 10552). VI, Coast. D (many); A.
32. Νόθιππος Λυσίου Διομειεύς (*PA* 11131). II, City. D.

[21] For the demotic see R. Sealey, *BICS* 7 (1960) 33–43.

33. Πάμφιλος Εὐφιλήτου Κηφισιεύς (*PA* 11531). I, Inland. R.
34. Πάταικος 'Ελευσίνιος (*PA* 11676–79, *APF*). VIII, Coast. A.
35. Πολύευκτος Κυδαντίδης (*PA* 11947). II, Inland. D 2.
36. Προκλείδης Πανταλέοντος ἐκ Κεραμέων (*PA* 12200). V, City. D.
37. Πυθοκλῆς Πυθοδώρου ἐκ Κήδων (*PA* 12444). I, City. A.
38. Τηλέμαχος Θεαγγέλου 'Αχαρνεύς (*PA* 13562). VI, Inland. D 3.
39. Φανόδημος Διύλλου Θυμαιτάδης (*PA* 14033). VIII, City. D.
40. Φιλέας 'Αντιγένου Παιονίδης (*PA* 14232+14242). IV, Inland. D.
41. Φιλόδημος Αὐτοκλέους 'Εροιάδης (*PA* 14488). VIII, City, or X, *City*. R.
42. Χαιριωνίδης Λυσανίου Φλυεύς (*PA* 15269). VII, Inland. D.
43. — Οἰνοβίου 'Ραμνούσιος (Hansen 1984 no. 8). IX, *City*. D (344/3; *IG* II² 229.6f).
44. —ου Φρεάρριος (Hansen no. 9). IV, Coast. D (341/0; *IG* II² 220.4f).
45. — Ποτάμιος. IV, Coast or *City* (Hansen no. 12). D (before 336/5; *IG* II² 253.1f).
46. —ου 'Αζηνιεύς (Hansen no. 13). VIII, *Inland*.
47. —όφρονος Λακιάδης (Hansen no. 14). IV, City. D. (334/4; *IG* II² 336a.5f).
48. —κέρδης 'Αναγυράσιος (Hansen no. 17). I, *Inland*. D (333/2?; *IG* II² 343.2f).
49. —δώρου Μελιτεύς (Hansen no. 19). VII, City. D (323/2; *IG* II² 367.9f).
50. — Λακιάδης (Hansen no. 20). VI, City. D (350–320; *IG* II² 403.4f).
51. —κτου Σκαμβωνίδης (Hansen no. 21). IV, City. D (*ca* 330; *IG* II² 410.1f).
52. — Θριάσιος (Hansen no. 27). VI, Coast. D (327/6; *Hesperia* 3 [1934] 3f no. 5).
53. — Παιανιεύς (Hansen no. 29). III, Inland. D 335/4; *Hesperia* 9 [1940] 327f no. 36). D (352–336; *IG* II² 289.6).

Of these 53 individuals 24 (1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, 29, 33, 35, 38, 40, 42, 46,48, 53), that is 45%, are members of inland demes; 12 (2, 4, 12, 15, 16, 19, 23, 30, 31, 34, 44, 52) are definitely coastal, 16 (18, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 36, 37, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 51) definitely city. No. 45 is coastal if Potamos Deiradiotes, city if Upper or Lower Potamos. If the former, 25% of those listed are coastal and 30% city; if the latter, 23% coastal and 32% city.

The representation of the city now conforms to expectation on the basis that no modified regional group of citizens in the assembly was disadvantaged with respect to participation as a consequence of seating arrangements. On the other hand, coastal

representation is depressed and inland, while not so inflated as in the previous half century, is still very high. Some will be reluctant to countenance attribution of the inland's preponderance purely to the circumstance that many of the citizens concerned commenced their ecclesiastic activity in the auditorium of Pnyx II with arrangements such as Stanton and I envisage. The tyranny of distance is a factor difficult to assess. Members actually resident in some of the outlying coastal demes had particularly far to travel from domicile to Pnyx.

III. Conclusion

In the foregoing it has been my aim to strengthen an indirect argument for the grouping of the citizens of Athens in Pnyx II which Stanton and I proposed in 1987. Whether or not I have succeeded is a matter for the reader's judgement. If I have not, the remarkable preponderance of members of inland demes among those active in Pnyx II, and later, still awaits explanation. I am very aware that indirect arguments, however suggestive, cannot be probative. Conclusive direct proofs of our views about the auditorium of Pnyx II are essential and such, I believe, will only be possible when new and decisive evidence comes to light.

In a reply to our article Hansen attempts a definitive refutation of our contentions with respect to Pnyx II on the basis of evidence presently available.[22] I conclude with rejoinders to his two main arguments. The first involves Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, indications from which I sought to adduce in favour of our own views about arrangements in Pnyx II; the second revolves around section 43 of Apollodorus' (?) speech against Neaera.

Hansen first points out, what I do not dispute, that the women with Praxagora in *Ecclesiazusae* are in a great hurry to get to the Pnyx and that they express concern to reach it ahead of men from the city. If, Hansen insists, inland dwellers invariably sat in the front of the auditorium and city dwellers at the back, the women cannot oust the men from the city, and they do not have to hasten. I respond that the reason for the wom-

22 "The Organization of the Athenian Assembly: A Reply," *GRBS* 29 (1988) 51–58.

en's haste, spelled out with the utmost clarity at 289–310, is their fear that the assembly place will be filled before they can reach it with citizens eager to claim the *ekklesiastikon* and that they will thus fail to gain admission. As city dwellers have the least distance to travel to the Pnyx it is they who present the greatest threat to the women's scheme to gain entry. Stanton and I do not envisage that x places in the auditorium were rigidly set aside for members of inland demes, the same number for members of coastal demes, and the same again for members of city demes. It was a matter of first-come first-admitted, and so paid, with the proviso that those inland dwellers who gained admission were grouped up front and so on. It was theoretically possible, and may actually have happened, that the red-painted ropes were brought into action to exclude superfluous ecclesiasts (378f) at a juncture when two-thirds, say, of those admitted were city dwellers. In that case such would spread from the rear quite deeply into the auditorium.

Hansen further adduces the conversation between Blepyrus and Chremes at 372–477. Focussing in particular on 431–33 he maintains that quite obviously the front part of the auditorium was filled, according to Chremes' perception, not with citizens pale as city-dwellers, but with pale city-dwellers whom he opposes to the citizens from the countryside. I continue in my belief that the women with Praxagora were sitting close to the *bema* as a result of successful, albeit somewhat botched, simulation of members of rural demes. Earlier they had attempted to acquire a tan appropriate to outdoor workers but failed (62–64). Hence a conspicuous pallor (387) which distinguished them from rustics who laboured in the fields and led Chremes to liken them to shoe-makers (385–432). Would paleness alone exclude rusticity? Surely not. Hansen appears to assume, and this I cannot believe, that shoe-makers, and indoor workers in general, operated, or could be conceived of as operating, exclusively in the Athens-Peiraeus complex. Chremes thought it unusual that in the front of the auditorium pale country-dwellers[23] outnumbered those ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν. Hansen fails to explain both the

[23] To be precise, pale members of inland demes. As a result of the modifications undertaken after the fall of the Thirty some inland trittyes contained some suburban dwellers. To guarantee their scheme's success Praxagora and her entourage tried to pose as part of the genuinely rural, and agricultural, majority.

concern of Praxagora's cohort to get sun-burned and their explicit masquerade as rustics, which seems to be undeniable, at 277–79.

In section 43 of the speech against Neaera,[24] according to Hansen, the speaker represents Stephanus of Eroiadai at one stage of his career as sitting near the *bema* and shouting at speakers during assembly meetings. Given that in my view both Hippothontid and Antiochid Eroiadai were city demes in the fourth century, how was this possible? In Hansen's view Stephanus, before Callistratus took him up, featured in the assembly as a professional heckler or cheer squad leader. I interpret the passage quite differently. Stephanus, the speaker claims, started out as a crude *sykophantes*; eventually he graduated to a more or less established *rhetor* in his own right. Stephanus' activities in the first phase of his career are spelled out: he brought indictments and laid informations for profit, and his name was attached to decrees that others had drawn up. I am unable to believe that Stephanus did not speak to the resolutions concerned. Accordingly, even when he was a *sykophantes*, Stephanus' verbal contributions in the assembly were formal and directed at, not from, the audience. Their delivery was theatrical in the extreme with Stephanus exemplifying the type of speaker who ranted and raved and, like Timarchus (Aeschin. 1.26), moved about beside the *bema*.[25]

MONASH UNIVERSITY
December, 1988

[24] [Dem.] 49.43: οὐ γάρ πω ἦν ῥήτωρ, ἀλλ' ἔτι συκοφάντης τῶν παραβοώντων παρὰ τὸ βῆμα καὶ γραφομένων μισθοῦ καὶ φαινόντων καὶ ἐπιγραφομένων ταῖς ἀλλοτρίαις γνώμαις, ἕως ὑπέπεσε Καλλιστράτῳ τῷ Ἀφιδναίῳ.

[25] I should like to express my gratitude to A. S. Henry for his supportive comments on [Dem.] 59.43 and to M. H. Hansen not only for furnishing me with his latest revisions to his inventory of *rhetores* and *strategoi* but also for penetrating criticisms of an earlier draft that prompted extensive modification. My especial thanks go to Ms. A. Pretty for patiently coping with a difficult manuscript subject to repeated alteration.